DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

COMMISSION OFFICE (213) 978-1300

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

SAMANTHA MILLMAN PRESIDENT

VAHID KHORSAND VICE-PRESIDENT

DAVID H. J. AMBROZ CAROLINE CHOE HELEN LEUNG KAREN MACK MARC MITCHELL VERONICA PADILLA-CAMPOS DANA M. PERLMAN

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA



ERIC GARCETTI

EXECUTIVE OFFICES 200 N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 525 LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801 (213) 978-1271

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP

KEVIN J. KELLER, AICP EXECUTIVE OFFICER

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN DEPUTY DIRECTOR TRICIA KEANE DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP DEPUTY DIRECTOR

Mailing Date: November 1, 2019

Appeal Period Ends: November 11, 2019

Joel Miller M & M Nicholson Partners (A) 3530 Mound View Ave, Studio City, CA 91604

Marc Annoti Harridge San Feliciano, LLC (O) 6363 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 600 Los Angeles, CA 90031

DS Ventures, LLC (R) 8383 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 1010 Los Angeles, CA 90017

Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 67505

Address: 22241-22255 West Mulholland Drive Council District: 3 - Blumenfeld Existing Zone: R1-1 Community Plan: Canoga Park - Winnetka – Woodland Hills - West Hills Specific Plan: Mulholland Scenic Parkway Related Case: ZA-2007-1255-ZAD Environmental Case: ENV-2005-2301-EIR (Sch. No. 2005111054)

Pursuant to Sections 21082.1(c) and 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, the Advisory Agency has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Environmental Impact Report prepared for this project, which includes the Draft EIR, No. ENV-2005-2301-EIR (SCH No. 2005111054), dated March 2016, and the Final EIR, dated August 2018 (Vesting Tentative Tract No. 67505 EIR), as well as the whole of the administrative record, and

CERTIFIED the following:

- 1) The Vesting Tentative Tract No. 67505 Project EIR has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA);
- 2) The Vesting Tentative Tract No. 67505 Project EIR was presented to the Advisory Agency as a decision-making body of the lead agency; and
- 3) The Vesting Tentative Tract No. 67505 Project EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the lead agency.

ADOPTED the following:

- 1) The related and prepared Vesting Tentative Tract No. 67505 Project Environmental Findings; and
- 2) The Mitigation Monitoring Program prepared for the Vesting Tentative Tract No. 67505 Project EIR (Exhibit B).

Pursuant to Section 17.15 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC), the Advisory Agency **APPROVED:**

Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 67505, for the subdivision of an approximately 6.2-acre (two parcel / 269,857-square-foot) site into **19 lots** for 19 detached single-family dwellings, as shown on map stamp-dated April 10, 2019 (Exhibit A), a new **Private Street**, and a **Haul Route** for the import of 4,200 cubic yards of soil. The lots are based on the R1 Zone.

The subdivider is hereby advised that <u>the LAMC may not permit this maximum approved density</u>. Therefore, verification should be obtained from the Department of Building and Safety, which will legally interpret the Zoning code as it applies to this particular property. For an appointment with the Development Services Center call (213) 482-7077, (818) 374-5050, or (310) 231-2901.

The Advisory Agency's approval is subject to the following conditions:

The final map must record <u>within 36 months of this approval</u>, unless a time extension is granted before the end of such period.

NOTE on clearing conditions: When two or more **agencies** must clear a condition, subdivider should follow the sequence indicated in the condition. For the benefit of the applicant, subdivider shall maintain record of all conditions cleared, including all material supporting clearances and be prepared to present copies of the clearances to each reviewing agency as may be required by its staff at the time of its review.

BUREAU OF ENGINEERING - SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

(Additional BOE Conditions are listed in "Standard Condition" section)

- 1. That a 54-foot wide private street easement be provided for the proposed "A" Street including a 44-foot radius property easement cul-de-sac at the terminus on an alignment satisfactory to the Valley District Engineering Office.
- 2. That sanitary sewer easement be dedicated full-width of the proposed private street.
- 3. That the private street easement be part of the adjoining parcels.
- 4. That the owners of the property record an agreement satisfactory to the City Engineer stating that they will grant the necessary easements for ingress, egress and public facilities over the private street area upon the sale of the respective lots and they will maintain the private street, free and clear of obstructions and in a safe condition for vehicular use at all times.
- 5. That a 5-foot and variable width strip of land be dedicated along San Feliciano Drive adjoining the tract to complete a 55-foot to 60-foot wide total right-of-way. Additional sidewalk easement may be necessary to allow for construction of meandering sidewalk to save the existing trees.
- 6. That arrangement be made with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works prior to recordation of the final map for any necessary permits with respect to discharge into their existing storm drain system within the tract property.
- 7. That a Covenant and Agreement be recorded advising all future owners and builders that prior to issuance of a building permit, a Notice of Acknowledgment of Easement must be recorded and an application to do work in any drainage or sanitary sewer easements and to construct over the existing sanitary sewers and drainage facilities must be submitted to the City Engineer for approval.

- 8. That Board of Public Works approval be obtained, prior to the recordation of the final map, for the removal of any tree in the existing or proposed right-of-way area. The Bureau of Street Services, Urban Forestry Division, is the lead agency for obtaining Board of Public Works approval for removal of such trees.
- 9. That the following requirements in connection with grading and construction in and adjacent to public rights-of-way or private streets be complied with in a manner satisfactory to the City Engineer:
 - a. Cut or fill slopes in artificial fill and residual soils shall be no steeper than 2:1 (H:V). Cut slopes shall be no steeper than 1.5:1 (H:V) in competent bedrock.
 - b. The toes and crests of all cut and fill slopes shall be located on private property and shall be set back 2 and 3 feet respectively, from the property line.
 - c. Where fill overlies a cut slope, the fill shall be keyed horizontally into bedrock a minimum of 12 feet or the slope shall be over excavated a minimum of 12 feet and replaced as a compacted fill slope.
 - d. The consulting soils engineer shall provide methods of mitigating the effects of expansive soil, which underlies the public property and private streets. Prior to the approval of plans, the City Engineer must approve the proposed method.
 - e. All streets shall be founded upon firm natural materials or properly compacted fill. Any loose fill, loose soil, or organic material shall be removed prior to the placement of engineered fill.
 - f. Fill material shall be compacted to a minimum of 90 Percent relative compaction as defined in the Bureau of Engineering Standard Plan S-610. Fill shall be benched into competent material.
 - g. All slopes shall be planted and an irrigation system installed as soon as possible after grading to alleviate erosion.
 - h. Adequate perforated pipe and gravel sub-drain systems approved by the City Engineer shall be placed beneath canyon fills and behind retaining walls.
 - i. Slopes that daylight adversely dipping bedding shall be supported by either a retaining wall or a designed buttress fill.
 - J. Where not in conflict with the above, the recommendations contained in Byer Group Inc.'s geotechnical reports dated July 20, 2006, by the consulting engineering geologist Peter Kilbury (CEG 2401) and Geotechnical Engineer Robert Zweigler (GE 2120), shall be implemented.
 - k. GED required procedures for review and approval of grading and foundation construction as it relates to City Property and the Right-of-way are specified in the Inter-Departmental Correspondence-Geotechnical Engineering Division Requirements for Review and Approval of Grading and Foundation Construction, dated October 12, 2001 (attached). These procedures shall be followed during tract design and construction.

Any questions regarding this report should be directed to Mr. Georgic Avanesian of the Land Development Section, located at 201 North Figueroa Street, Suite 200, or by calling (213) 202-3484.

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY, GRADING DIVISION

- 10. <u>Prior to issuance of a grading or building permit, or prior to recordation of the final map</u>, the subdivider shall make suitable arrangements to assure compliance, satisfactory to the Department of Building and Safety, Grading Division, with all the requirements and conditions contained in Inter-Departmental Letter dated November 21, 2017, Log No. 97648-02:
 - a. Prior to recordation, a grading permit shall be secured and a grading bond posted (106.1.2 & 7006.5).
 - b. The entire site shall be brought up to the current Code standard (7005.9).
 - c. The geologist and the soils engineer shall review and approve the detailed 40 scale grading plans prior to the issuance of the grading permits by the Department. This approval shall be by signature on the plans that clearly indicates the geologist and soils engineer have reviewed the plans prepared by the design engineer; and, that the plans include the recommendations contained in their reports (7006.1).
 - d. Approval shall be obtained from the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering, Development Services and Permits Program for the proposed removal of support and/or retaining of slopes adjoining to public way (3307.3.2).
 - e. Approval shall be obtained from the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering, Development Services and Permits Program, for the proposed construction within a natural watercourse. It shall be noted that approvals from the California Department of Fish and Game, California Regional Quality Control Board, and/or the Army Corps of Engineers may be required.
 - f. Approval shall be obtained from the utility company with regard to proposed construction within or adjacent to utility easement (7006.6).
 - g. Conformance with the Zoning Code Section 12.21 C8, which limits the heights and number of retaining walls, will be determined during the structural plan check.
 - h. All recommendations of the reports by Irvine Geotechnical, Inc. signed by Jon A. Irvine GE 2891, and Jon A. Irvine, CEG 1691, which are in addition to or more restrictive than the conditions contained herein shall also be incorporated into the plans for the project (7006.1).
 - i. Secure the notarized written consent from all owners upon whose property proposed grading/construction access is to extend, in the event off-site grading and/or access for construction purposes is required (7006.6). The consent shall be included as part of the final plans.
 - j. The geologist and soils engineer shall review and approve the detailed plans prior to issuance of any permits. This approval shall be by signature on the plans that clearly indicates the geologist and soils engineer have reviewed the plans prepared by the design engineer; and, that the plans include the recommendations contained in their reports (7006.1).

- k. A copy of the subject and appropriate referenced reports and this approval letter shall be attached to the District Office and field set of plans (7006.1). Submit one copy of the above reports to the Building Department Plan Checker prior to issuance of the permit.
- I. All existing and new graded slopes shall be no steeper than 2H:1V, as recommended (7010.2 & 7011.2).
- m. All graded, brushed or bare slopes shall be planted with low-water consumption, native-type plant varieties to protect slopes against erosion (7012).
- n. All man-made fill shall be compacted to a minimum 90 percent of the maximum dry density of the fill material per latest version of ASTM D 1557. Where cohesionless soil having less than 15 percent finer than 0.005 millimeters is used for fill, it shall be compacted to a minimum of 95 percent relative compaction based on maximum dry density. Placement of gravel in lieu of compacted fill is only allowed if complying with LAMC Section 91.7011.3.
- o. If imported soils are used, no footings shall be poured until the soils engineer has submitted a compaction report containing in-place shear test data and settlement data to the Grading Division of the Department; and, obtained approval (7008.2).
- p. Compacted fill shall extend beyond the footings a minimum distance equal to the depth of the fill below the bottom of footings or a minimum of three feet whichever is greater, as recommended (7011.3).
- q. Existing uncertified fill shall not be used for support of footings, concrete slabs or new fill (1809.2, 7011.3).
- r. Sub-drains must be installed in all natural drainage courses where compacted fill is to be placed (7013.8).
- s. Drainage in conformance with the provisions of the Code shall be maintained during and subsequent to construction (7013.12).
- t. Grading shall be scheduled for completion prior to the start of the rainy season, or detailed temporary erosion controls plans shall be filed in a manner satisfactory to the Grading Division of the Department and the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering, B-Permit Section, for any grading work in excess of 200 cubic yards (7007.1).
- u. All loose foundation excavation material shall be removed prior to commencement of framing. Slopes disturbed by construction activities shall be restored (7005.3).
- v. The applicant is advised that the approval of this report does not waive the requirements for excavations contained in the General Safety Orders of the California Department of Industrial Relations (3301.1).
- w. Temporary excavations that remove lateral support to the public way, adjacent property, or adjacent structures shall be supported by shoring or constructed using ABC slot cuts as recommended. Note: Lateral support shall be considered to be removed when the excavation extends below a plane projected downward at an angle of 45 degrees from the bottom of a footing of an existing structure, from the edge of the public way or an adjacent property. (3307.3.1)

- x. Prior to the issuance of any permit that authorizes an excavation where the excavation is to be of a greater depth than are the walls or foundation of any adjoining building or structure and located closer to the property line than the depth of the excavation, the owner of the subject sire shall provide the Department with evidence that the adjacent property owner has been given a 30-day written notice of such intent to make an excavation (3307.1).
- y. The soils engineer shall review and approve the shoring plans prior to issuance of the permit (3307.3.2).
- z. Prior to the issuance of the permits, the soils engineer and the structural designer shall evaluate all applicable surcharge loads for the design of the retaining walls and shoring.
- aa. Unsurcharged temporary excavations exposing unsupported geology and/or unsupported bedding planes shall be trimmed back at a 2H:1V slope inclination, as recommended.
- bb. Unsurcharged temporary excavation may be cut vertical up to 5 feet. For excavations over 5 feet up to 12 feet, the lower 5 feet may be cut vertically and the portion of the excavation above 5 feet shall be trimmed back at a gradient not exceeding 1:1, as recommended.
- cc. Shoring shall be designed for a maximum lateral deflection of 1 inch, provided there are no structures within a 1:1 plane projected up from the base of the excavation. Where a structure is within a 1:1 plane projected up from the base of the excavation, shoring shall be designed for a maximum lateral deflection of ½ inch, or to a lower deflection determined by the consultant that does not present any potential hazard to the adjacent structure.
- dd. A shoring monitoring program shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the soils engineer.
- ee. ABC slot-cut method may be used for unsurcharged temporary excavations with each slot not exceeding 7 feet in height and not exceeding 8 feet in width, as recommended. The soils engineer shall verify in the field if the existing earth materials are stable in the slot-cut excavation. Each slot shall be inspected by the soils engineer and approved in writing prior to any worker access.
- ff. All foundations shall derive entire support from a blanket of properly placed fill a minimum of 3 feet thick, as recommended and approved by the geologist and soils engineer by inspection.
- gg. Foundations adjacent to a descending slope steeper than 3:1 (horizontal to vertical) in gradient shall be a minimum distance of one-third the vertical height of the slope but need not exceed 40 feet measured horizontally from the foot in bottom to the face of the slope (1808.7.2). Where the slope is steeper than 1:1, the required setback shall be measured from an imaginary plane 45 degrees to the horizontal, projected upward from the toe of the slope.
- hh. Buildings adjacent to ascending slopes steeper than 3H:1V in gradient shall be setback from the toe of the slope a level distance measure perpendicular to slope contours equal to one-half the vertical height of the slope, but need not exceed 15 feet (1808.7.1). Where the slope is steeper than 1:1, the toe of the slope shall be assumed to be at the intersection of a horizontal plane drawn from the top of the foundation and a plane drawn tangent to the slope at an angle of 45 degrees to the horizontal.
- ii. Footings supported on approved compacted fill or expansive soil shall be reinforced with a

minimum of four (4), $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch diameter (#4) deformed reinforcing bars. Two (2) bars shall be placed near the bottom and two (2) bars placed near the top of the footing.

- jj. The foundation/slab design shall satisfy all requirements of the Information Bulletin P/BC 2014-116 "Foundation Design for Expansive Soils" (1803.5.3).
- kk. The building design for lots 5 through 19 shall incorporate provisions for total anticipated differential settlements of 2 inches, which include 1 and 1 inches for static and seismic-induced loads, respectively. (1808.2)
- II. Special provisions such as flexible or swing joints shall be made for buried utilities and drain lines to allow for differential vertical displacement.
- mm. Slabs placed on approved compacted fill shll be at least 4 inches thick, as recommended, and shall be reinforced with ½-inch diameter (#4) reinforced bars spaced a maximum of 16 inches on center each way.
- nn. Concrete floor slabs placed on expansive soil shall be placed on a 4-inch fill of coarse aggregate or on a moisture barrier membrane.
- oo. The seismic design shall be based on a Site Class D, as recommended. All other seismic design parameters shall be reviewed by LADBS building plan check.
- pp. Retaining walls shall be designed for the lateral earth pressures specified in the section titled "Retaining Walls" starting on page 24 of the 04/06/2017 report. All surcharge loads shall be included into the design.
- qq. Retaining walls at the base of ascending slopes shall be provided with a minimum freeboard of 12 inches, as recommended.
- rr. The recommended equivalent fluid pressure (EFP) for the proposed retaining wall shall apply from the top of the freeboard to the bottom of the footing.
- ss. All retaining walls shall be provided with a standard surface backdrain system and all drainage shall be conducted in a non-erosive device to the street in an acceptable manner (7013.11).
- tt. With the exception of retaining walls designed for hydrostatic pressure, all retaining walls shall be provided with a subdrain system to prevent possible hydrostatic pressure behind the wall. Prior to issuance of any permit, the retaining wall subdrain system recommended in the soils report shall be incorporated into the foundation plan which shall be reviewed and approved by the soils engineer of record (1805.4).
- uu. Installation of the subdrain system shall be inspected and approved by the soils engineer of record and the City grading/building inspector (108.9).
- vv. Basement walls and floors shall be waterproofed/damp-proofed with an LA City approved "Below-grade' waterproofing/damp-proofing material with a research report number (104.2.6).
- ww. Prefabricated drainage composites (Miradrain, Geotextiles) may be only used in addition to traditionally accepted methods of draining retained earth.

- xx. The structure shall be connected to the public sewer system per P/BC 2014-027.
- yy. All roof, pad and deck drainage shall be conducted to the street or proposed dispersal wall in an acceptable manner; water shall not be dispersed on to descending slopes without specific approval from the Grading Division and the consulting geologist and soils engineer (7013.10).
- zz. An on-site storm water infiltration system at the subject site shall not be implemented, as recommended.
- aaa. All concentrated drainage shall be conducted in an approved device and disposed of in a manner approved by the LADBS (7013.10).
- bbb. Sprinkler plans for irrigation shall be submitted and approved by the Mechanical Plan Check Section (7012.3.1).
- ccc. Any recommendations prepared by the geologist and/or soils engineer for correction of geological hazards found during grading shall be submitted to the Grading Division of the Department for approval prior to use in the field (7008.2, 7008.3).
- ddd. The geologist and soils engineer shall inspect all excavations to determine that conditions anticipated in the report have been encountered and to provide recommendations for the correction of hazards found during grading (7008 & 1705.6).
- eee. Prior to pouring concrete, a representative of the consulting soils engineer shall inspect and approve the footing excavations. The representative shall post a notice on the job site for the LADBS Inspector and the Contractor stating that the work inspected meets the conditions of the report. No concrete shall be poured until the LADBS Inspector has also inspected and approved the footing excavations. A written certification to this effect shall be filed with the Grading Division of the Department upon completion of the work. (108.9 & 7008.2)
- fff. Prior to excavation an initial inspection shall be called with the LADBS Inspector. During the initial inspection, the sequence of construction; shoring; ABC slot cuts; underpinning; pile installation; protection fences; and, dust and traffic control will be schedule (108.9.1).
- ggg. Installation of shoring, underpinning, slot cutting excavation and/or pile installation shall be performed under the inspection and approval of the soils engineer and deputy grading inspector (1705.6).
- hhh. Prior to the placing of compacted fill, a representative of the soils engineer shall inspect and approve the bottom excavations. The representative shall post a notice on the job site for the LADBS Inspector and the Constractor stating that the soil inspected meets the conditions of the report. No fill shall be placed until the LADBS Inspector has also inspected and approved the bottom excavations. A written certification to this effect shall be included in the final compaction report filed with the Grading Division of the Department. All fill shall be placed under the inspection and approval of the soils engineer. A compaction report together with the approved soil report and Department approval letter shall be submitted to the Grading Division of the Department upon completion of the compaction. In addition, an Engineer's Certificate of Compliance with the legal description as indicated in the grading permit and the permit number shall be included (7011.3).

iii. No footing/slab shall be poured until the compaction report is submitted and approved by the Grading Division of the Department.

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY, ZONING DIVISION

- 11. <u>Prior to recordation of the final map</u>, the Department of Building and Safety, Zoning Division shall certify that no Building or Zoning Code violations exist on the subject site once the following items have been satisfied:
 - a. Obtain permits for the demolition or removal of all existing structures on the site. Accessory structures and uses are not permitted to remain on lots without a main structure or use. Provide copies of the demolition permits and signed inspection cards to show completion of the demolition work.
 - b. Provide a copy of ZA-2007-1255-ZAD. Show compliance with all the conditions/requirements of the above case as applicable.
 - c. Show all street dedication(s) as required by Bureau of Engineering and provide net lot area after all dedication. "Area" requirements shall be re-checked as per net lot area after street dedication.
 - d. Private Street to comply with Bureau of Engineering and Fire Department requirements. Notes:

The existing or proposed building plans have not been checked for and shall comply with Building and Zoning Code requirements. Any vested approvals for parking layouts, open space, required yards or building height, shall be "to the satisfaction of the Department of Building and Safety at the time of Plan Check."

An appointment is required for the issuance of a clearance letter from the Department of Building and Safety. The applicant is asked to contact Laura Duong at (213) 482-0434 to schedule an appointment.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

- 12. <u>Prior to recordation of the final map</u>, satisfactory arrangements shall be made with the Department of Transportation to assure:
 - a. All requirements and conditions listed in the DOT traffic assessment letter dated June 15, 2015, and all subsequent revisions to this traffic assessment, be applied to the tract map.
 - b. A minimum 20-foot reservoir space is required between any security gate or parking space and the property line, to the satisfaction of DOT.
 - c. A driveway width of W=26 feet is required for single family residential sites taking direct access to a 3 car garage and a driveway width of W=18 feet is required for all other single family residential sites with direct street access.
 - d. A parking area and driveway plan should be submitted to the Citywide Planning Coordination Section of the Department of Transportation for approval prior to submittal of building permit plans for plan check by the Department of Building and Safety. Transportation approvals are conducted at 6262 Van Nuys Blvd., Room 320, Van Nuys,

CA 91401.

- e. That the subdivision report fee and condition clearance fee be paid to the Department of Transportation as required per Ordinance No. 183270 and LAMC Section 19.15 prior to recordation of the final map. Note: the applicant may be required to comply with any other applicable fees per this new ordinance.
- f. See Condition 25: Mitigation Monitoring Program (Exhibit B) PDF I-1 regarding red curb requirements on San Feliciano Drive.

DOT contact: Taghi.Gharagozli@lacity.org or 818-374-4699.

FIRE DEPARTMENT

13. <u>Prior to the recordation of the final map</u>, a suitable arrangement shall be made satisfactory to the Fire Department, binding the subdivider and all successors to the following:

a. Fire Flow

(i). Improvements to the water system in this area may be required to provide 4,000 G.P.M. fire-flow. The cost of improving the water system may be charged to the developer. For more detailed information regarding water main improvements, the developer shall contact the Water Services Section of the Department of Water and Power.

b. Firefighting Personnel Access

(i). Access for Fire Department apparatus and personnel to and into all structures shall be required.

(ii). The entrance or exit of all ground dwelling units shall not be more than 150 feet from the edge of a roadway of an improved street, access road, or designated fire lane.

(iii). Any roof elevation changes in excess of 3 feet may require the installation of ships ladders.

c. Firefighting Apparatus Access

(i). No building or portion of a building shall be constructed more than 150 feet from the edge of a roadway of an improved street, access road, or designated fire lane.

(ii). Fire lane width shall not be less than 20 feet. When a fire lane must accommodate the operation of Fire Department aerial ladder apparatus or where fire hydrants are installed, those portions shall not be less than 28 feet in width.

(iii). The width of private roadways for general access use and fire lanes shall not be less than 20 feet, and the fire lane must be clear to the sky.

(iv). Fire lanes, where required and dead ending streets shall terminate in a cul-de-sac or other approved turning area. No dead ending street or fire lane shall be greater than 700 feet in length or secondary access shall be required.

(v). Submit plot plans indicating access road and turning area for Fire Department approval.

(vi). Adequate off-site public and on-site private fire hydrants may be required. Their number and location to be determined after the Fire Department's review of the plot plan.

(vii). The Fire Department may require additional roof access via parapet access roof ladders where buildings exceed 28 feet in height, and when overhead wires or other obstructions block aerial ladder access.

(viii). This project is located in the very high fire hazard severity zone and shall comply with requirements set forth in the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code 57.25.01.(ix). Mitigating measures shall be considered. These measures shall include, but not be limited to the following:

- a. Boxed-in eaves.
- b. Single pane, double thickness (minimum 1/8" thickness) or insulated windows.
- c. Non-wood siding.
- d. Exposed wooden members shall be two inches nominal thickness.
- e. Noncombustible finishes.

(x). Irrigated and managed greenbelts around the perimeter of all structures for a distance of 100 feet shall be considered as a buffer between the brush and the proposed project.

(xi). All landscaping shall use fire-resistant plants and materials. A list of such plants is available from the Fire Department.

(xii). All homes shall have noncombustible roofs. (Non-wood)

(xiii). The brush in the area adjacent to the proposed development shall be cleared or thinned periodically by the Homeowner's Association under supervision to the Los Angeles City Fire Department in order to reduce the risk of brush fires spreading to the homes.

(xiv). Any required roadway improvement within the Hillside Ordinance shall be completed <u>prior</u> to the Fire Department signing off and building plans or building permit application.

(xv). For any new construction of, or addition to, a one-family dwelling on a lot that does not have a vehicular access route from a street improved with a minimum 20 foot wide continuous paved roadway from the driveway apron that provides access to the main residence to the boundary of the Hillside Area, no building permit or grading permit shall be issued unless the construction or addition meets the requirements of this Subdivision or has been approved pursuant to Section 12.24 x 21.

(xvi). No framing shall be allowed until the roadway is installed to the satisfaction of the Fire Department.

(xvii). Any required fire hydrants to be installed shall be fully operational and accepted by the Fire Department prior to any building construction.

For additional information, please contact Inspector Robert Duff or Inspector Urrea of the Construction Services Unit at (213) 482-6543.

DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER

- 14. Satisfactory arrangements shall be made with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) for compliance with LADWP's Water System Rules and requirements. Upon compliance with these conditions and requirements, LADWP's Water Services Organization will forward the necessary clearances to the Bureau of Engineering. (This condition shall be deemed cleared at the time the City Engineer clears Condition No. S-1(c).)
 - a. Financial Arrangements Prior to Tract Recordation:
 - i. Complete financial arrangements for an acreage supply charge for the supply system.
 - ii. Complete financial arrangements for the existing water mains.
 - iii. Install two (2) private hydrants per LAFD (See Note 7).
 - b. Engineering Requirements Prior to Tract Recordation:
 - i. Submit an accurate street and site grading plan to the LADWP to determine safety or accessibility of existing or proposed facilities, and to determine accurately the conditions or limitations of service.
 - c. Prior to receiving water service the developer must attande for the Department to install services in the right-of-way.
 - d. Other Conditions or Requirements Applicable to this Tract:
 - i. As there are no proposed right-of-way dedications occurring in conjunction with this tract, LADWP's Water Service will only provide service up to the exterior boundary of the subdivision.
 - ii. In addition to the acreage supply charges and water main charges outlined in line item 16.A, the developer shall pay the LADWP to install services and meters, to which the developer's contractor may connect in order to supply water to the individual lots.
 - iii. Until the individual number of services and flow requirements of each service are specified, LADWP's Water Service makes no claim as to whether or not the existing system can satisfy those flow requirements.
 - iv. In event that the existing system cannot satisfy flow requirements, the developer may pay LADWP's Water Service to upgrade existing mains in the area.
 - v. Please note that the hydrant requirement outlined in items A through G are imposed by LAFD; not LADWP's Water Service.
 - e. Conditions Under Which Water Service will be Rendered:
 - i. Pressure regulators will be required in accordance with the Los Angeles City Plumbing Code for the entire subdivision where pressures exceed 80 psi at the building pad elevation.
 - f. Conditions for Existing Water Mains that are Located in or Adjacent to this Tract:
 - i. The following water mains may be inadequate to serve this tract and may need to be enlarged at the Developer's expense.
 - 1. 6-inch water main on San Feliciano Drive
 - 2. 12-inch water main on Mulholland Drive

- g. Los Angeles City Fire Department Requirements:
 - i. Install new (private) fire hydrants and/or top upgrades to existing fire hydrants that are in accordance with the Los Angeles Fire Code.
 - ii. Install replacement of the following existing water mains (if demands are determined to exceed existing capability).

BUREAU OF STREET LIGHTING

15. Prior to the recordation of the final map or issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy (C of O), street lighting improvement plans shall be submitted for review and the owner shall provide a good faith effort via a ballot process for the formation or annexation of the property within the boundary of the development into a Street Lighting Maintenance Assessment District.

Note: See also Condition S-3(g) for Street Lighting Improvement conditions.

BUREAU OF SANITATION

16. Satisfactory arrangements shall be made with the Bureau of Sanitation, Wastewater Collection Systems Division for compliance with its sewer system review and requirements. Upon compliance with its conditions and requirements, the Bureau of Sanitation, Wastewater Collection Systems Division will forward the necessary clearances to the Bureau of Engineering. (This condition shall be deemed cleared at the time the City Engineer clears Condition No. S-1(d).)

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGENCY

17. To assure that cable television facilities will be installed in the same manner as other required improvements, please email <u>cabletv.ita@lacity.org</u> that provides an automated response with the instructions on how to obtain the Cable TV clearance. The automated response also provides the email address of 3 people in case the applicant/owner has any additional questions.

DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND PARKS

18. That the Quimby Fee be based on the R1 Zone. The application was filed prior to the effective date of Ordinance No. 184,505.

URBAN FORESTRY DIVISION AND THE DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

19. <u>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</u>, a plot plan prepared by a reputable tree expert, indicating the location, size, type, and condition of all existing trees on the site shall be submitted for approval by the Department of City Planning. All trees in the public right-of-way shall be provided per the current Urban Forestry Division standards and the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan.

Note: Removal of all trees in the public right-of-way shall require approval of the Board of Public Works. Contact: Urban Forestry Division at: (213) 485-5675. Failure to comply with this condition as written shall require the filing of a modification to this tract map in order to clear the condition.

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING-SITE SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

- 20. <u>Prior to the recordation of the final map</u>, the subdivider shall prepare and execute a Covenant and Agreement (Planning Department General Form CP-6770) in a manner satisfactory to the Planning Department, binding the subdivider and all successors to the following:
 - a. Limit the proposed development to up to 19 detached, single-family residences and maximum height of up to two stories and 33 feet for each residence. No second dwelling units or accessory dwelling units shall be permitted on each lot.
- 21. <u>Prior to the issuance of the building permit or the recordation of the final map</u>, a copy of the ZA-2007-1255-ZAD shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Advisory Agency. In the event ZA-2007-1255-ZAD is not approved, the subdivider shall submit a tract modification.
- 22. <u>Prior to the issuance of any building permit, grading permit, retaining wall permit, or tree</u> <u>removal permit, the project shall comply with any necessary and applicable review required</u> by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan.
- 23. <u>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit</u>, the subdivider shall record and execute a Covenant and Agreement (Planning Department General Form CP-6770), binding the subdivider to the following haul route conditions:

General Conditions

- a. The owner or contractor shall keep the construction area sufficiently dampened to control dust caused by grading and hauling, and at all times shall provide reasonable control of dust caused by wind, at the sole discretion of the grading inspector.
- b. Hauling and grading equipment shall be kept in good operating condition and muffled as required by law.
- c. The Emergency Operations Division, Specialized Enforcement Section of the Los Angeles Police Department shall be notified at least 24 hours prior to the start of hauling, (213) 486-0777.
- d. Loads shall be secured by trimming or watering or may be covered to prevent the spilling or blowing of the earth material. If the load, where it contacts the sides, front, and back of the truck cargo container area, remains six inches from the upper edge of the container area, and if the load does not extend, at its peak, above any part of the upper edge of the cargo container area, the load is not required to be covered, pursuant to California Vehicle Code Section 23114 (e) (4).
- e. Trucks and loads are to be watered at the import site to prevent blowing dirt and are to be cleaned of loose earth at the import site to prevent spilling.
- f. Streets shall be cleaned of spilled materials during grading and hauling, and at the termination of each workday.
- g. The owner/contractor shall be in conformance with the State of California, Department of Transportation policy regarding movements of reducible loads.
- h. The owner/contractor shall comply with all regulations set forth by the State of California Department of Motor Vehicles pertaining to the hauling of earth.
- i. A copy of the approval letter from the City, the approved haul route and the approved grading plans shall be available on the job site at all times.
- j. The owner/contractor shall notify the Street Services Investigation and Enforcement Division, (213) 847-6000, at least 72 hours prior to the beginning of hauling operations and shall also notify the Division immediately upon completion of hauling operations. Any change to the prescribed routes, staging and/or hours of operation must be approved by the concerned governmental agencies. Contact the Street Services Investigation and Enforcement Division prior to effecting any change.
- k. Hauling vehicles shall not stage on any streets adjacent to the project, unless specifically

approved as a special condition in this report.

- Hauling vehicles shall be spaced so as to discourage a convoy affect. This approval pertains only to the City of Los Angeles streets. Those segments of the haul route outside the jurisdiction of the City of Los Angeles may be subject to permit
- requirements and to the approval of other municipal or governmental agencies and appropriate clearances or permits is the responsibility of the contractor.

Specific Conditions

- m. Loaded haul vehicles travelling to the Project Site shall go south on US-101, take Exit 29 toward Mulholland Drive/Valley Circle Blvd., turn left (east) on to Calabasas Road, turn right (southeast) on Mulholland Drive to arrive at the site.
- n. Empty haul vehicles traveling from the Project Site facility shall utilize the same travel path in reverse.
- o. Hauling hours of operation are restricted to the hours between 9:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M., Monday through Saturday.
- p. No hauling activity occurs on Sunday.
- q. A total of approximately 24 truck trips per day will occur over an estimated 14 days of hauling.
- r. Haul vehicles are 14.0 cubic yard capacity semi-trailer trucks or smaller. There shall be no staging or parking of construction vehicles, including vehicles to transport workers on any of the adjacent residential streets.
- s. Total net import of material is approximately 4,200 cubic yards.
- t. "Truck Crossing" warning signs shall be placed 300 feet in advance of the exit in each direction
- u. A minimum of two flag attendants, each with two-way radios, will be required during hauling hours to assist with staging and getting trucks in and out of the project area. Additional flag attendants may be required by the LADBS Inspector, LADOT, or BOSS to mitigate a hazardous situation (e.g. blind curves, uncontrolled intersections, narrow portions of roads or where obstacles are present). Flag attendants and warning signs shall be in compliance with Part II of the latest Edition of "Work Area Traffic Control Handbook."
- v. A surety or cash bond shall be posted in an amount satisfactory to the City Engineer for maintenance of haul route streets. The forms for the bond will be issued by the Valley District Engineering Office, 6262 Van Nuys Blvd, Suite 251, Van Nuys CA, 91401. Further information regarding the bond may be obtained by calling 818-374-5082.
- 24. Indemnification and Reimbursement of Litigation Costs.

Applicant shall do all of the following:

- (i) Defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City from any and all actions against the City relating to or arising out of, in whole or in part, the City's processing and approval of this entitlement, including <u>but not limited to</u>, an action to attack, challenge, set aside, void, or otherwise modify or annul the approval of the entitlement, the environmental review of the entitlement, or the approval of subsequent permit decisions, or to claim personal property damage, including from inverse condemnation or any other constitutional claim.
- (ii) Reimburse the City for any and all costs incurred in defense of an action related to or arising out of, in whole or in part, the City's processing and approval of the entitlement, including but not limited to payment of all court costs and attorney's fees, costs of any judgments or awards against the City (including an award of attorney's fees), damages, and/or settlement costs.

- (iii) Submit an initial deposit for the City's litigation costs to the City within 10 days' notice of the City tendering defense to the applicant and requesting a deposit. The initial deposit shall be in an amount set by the City Attorney's Office, in its sole discretion, based on the nature and scope of action, but in no event shall the initial deposit be less than \$50,000. The City's failure to notice or collect the deposit does not relieve the applicant from responsibility to reimburse the City pursuant to the requirement in paragraph (ii).
- (iv) Submit supplemental deposits upon notice by the City. Supplemental deposits may be required in an increased amount from the initial deposit if found necessary by the City to protect the City's interests. The City's failure to notice or collect the deposit does not relieve the applicant from responsibility to reimburse the City pursuant to the requirement in paragraph (ii).
- (v) If the City determines it necessary to protect the City's interest, execute an indemnity and reimbursement agreement with the City under terms consistent with the requirements of this condition.

The City shall notify the applicant within a reasonable period of time of its receipt of any action and the City shall cooperate in the defense. If the City fails to notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding in a reasonable time, or if the City fails to reasonably cooperate in the defense, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify or hold harmless the City.

The City shall have the sole right to choose its counsel, including the City Attorney's office or outside counsel. At its sole discretion, the City may participate at its own expense in the defense of any action, but such participation shall not relieve the applicant of any obligation imposed by this condition. In the event the applicant fails to comply with this condition, in whole or in part, the City may withdraw its defense of the action, void its approval of the entitlement, or take any other action. The City retains the right to make all decisions with respect to its representations in any legal proceeding, including its inherent right to abandon or settle litigation.

For purposes of this condition, the following definitions apply:

"City" shall be defined to include the City, its agents, officers, boards, commissions, committees, employees, and volunteers.

"Action" shall be defined to include suits, proceedings (including those held under alternative dispute resolution procedures), claims, or lawsuits. Actions includes actions, as defined herein, alleging failure to comply with <u>any</u> federal, state or local law.

Nothing in the definitions included in this paragraph are intended to limit the rights of the City or the obligations of the applicant otherwise created by this condition.

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING – MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

25. **Implementation.** The Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP), attached as "Exhibit B" and part of the case file, shall be enforced throughout all phases of the Project. The Applicant shall be responsible for implementing each Project Design Features (PDF) and Mitigation Measure (MM) and shall be obligated to provide certification, as identified below, to the appropriate monitoring and enforcement agencies that each PDF and MM has been implemented. The Applicant shall maintain records demonstrating compliance with each PDF and MM. Such

records shall be made available to the City upon request.

26. **Construction Monitor.** During the construction phase and prior to the issuance of building permits, the Applicant shall retain an independent Construction Monitor (either via the City or through a third-party consultant), approved by the Department of City Planning, who shall be responsible for monitoring implementation of PDFs and MMs during construction activities consistent with the monitoring phase and frequency set forth in this MMP.

The Construction Monitor shall also prepare documentation of the Applicant's compliance with the PDFs and MMs during construction every 90 days in a form satisfactory to the Department of City Planning. The documentation must be signed by the Applicant and Construction Monitor and be included as part of the Applicant's Compliance Report. The Construction Monitor shall be obligated to immediately report to the Enforcement Agency any noncompliance with the MMs and PDFs within two businesses days if the Applicant does not correct the non-compliance within a reasonable time of notification to the Applicant by the monitor or if the non-compliance is repeated. Such non-compliance shall be appropriately addressed by the Enforcement Agency.

27. **Substantial Conformance and Modification.** After review and approval of the final MMP by the Lead Agency, minor changes and modifications to the MMP are permitted, but can only be made subject to City approval. The Lead Agency, in conjunction with any appropriate agencies or departments, will determine the adequacy of any proposed change or modification. This flexibility is necessary in light of the nature of the MMP and the need to protect the environment. No changes will be permitted unless the MMP continues to satisfy the requirements of CEQA, as determined by the Lead Agency.

The Project shall be in substantial conformance with the PDFs and MMs contained in this MMP. The enforcing departments or agencies may determine substantial conformance with PDFs and MMs in the MMP in their reasonable discretion. If the department or agency cannot find substantial conformance, a PDF or MM may be modified or deleted as follows: the enforcing department or agency, or the decision maker for a subsequent discretionary project related approval finds that the modification or deletion complies with CEQA, including CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164, which could include the preparation of an addendum or subsequent environmental clearance, if necessary, to analyze the impacts from the modifications to or deletion of the PDFs or MMs. Any addendum or subsequent CEQA clearance shall explain why the PDF or MM is no longer needed, not feasible, or the other basis for modifying or deleting the PDF or MM, and that the modification will not result in a new significant impact consistent with the requirements of CEQA. Under this process, the modification or deletion of a PDF or MM shall not, in and of itself, require a modification to any Project discretionary approval unless the Director of Planning also finds that the change to the PDF or MM results in a substantial change to the Project or the non-environmental conditions of approval.

BUREAU OF ENGINEERING - STANDARD CONDITIONS

- S-1. (a) That the sewerage facilities charge be deposited prior to recordation of the final map over all of the tract in conformance with Section 64.11.2 of the LAMC.
 - (b) That survey boundary monuments be established in the field in a manner satisfactory to the City Engineer and located within the California Coordinate System prior to recordation of the final map. Any alternative measure approved by the City Engineer would require prior submission of complete field notes in support of the boundary survey.

- (c) That satisfactory arrangements be made with both the Water System and the Power System of the Department of Water and Power with respect to water mains, fire hydrants, service connections and public utility easements.
- (d) That any necessary sewer, street, drainage and street lighting easements be dedicated. In the event it is necessary to obtain off-site easements by separate instruments, records of the Bureau of Right-of-Way and Land shall verify that such easements have been obtained. The above requirements do not apply to easements of off-site sewers to be provided by the City.
- (e) That drainage matters be taken care of satisfactory to the City Engineer.
- (f) That satisfactory street, sewer and drainage plans and profiles as required, together with a lot grading plan of the tract and any necessary topography of adjoining areas be submitted to the City Engineer.
- (g) That any required slope easements be dedicated by the final map.
- (h) That each lot in the tract complies with the width and area requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.
- (i) That 1-foot future streets and/or alleys be shown along the outside of incomplete public dedications and across the termini of all dedications abutting unsubdivided property. The 1-foot dedications on the map shall include a restriction against their use of access purposes until such time as they are accepted for public use.
- (j) That any 1-foot future street and/or alley adjoining the tract be dedicated for public use by the tract, or that a suitable resolution of acceptance be transmitted to the City Council with the final map.
- (k) That no public street grade exceeds 15%.
- (I) That any necessary additional street dedications be provided to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990.
- S-2. That the following provisions be accomplished in conformity with the improvements constructed herein:
 - (a) Survey monuments shall be placed and permanently referenced to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. A set of approved field notes shall be furnished, or such work shall be suitably guaranteed, except where the setting of boundary monuments requires that other procedures be followed.
 - (b) Make satisfactory arrangements with the Department of Transportation with respect to street name, warning, regulatory and guide signs.
 - (c) All grading done on private property outside the tract boundaries in connection with public improvements shall be performed within dedicated slope easements or by grants of satisfactory rights of entry by the affected property owners.
 - (d) All improvements within public streets, Private Street, alleys and easements shall be constructed under permit in conformity with plans and specifications approved by the Bureau of Engineering.
 - (e) Any required bonded sewer fees shall be paid <u>prior to recordation of the final</u> <u>map</u>.
- S-3. That the following improvements be either constructed prior to recordation of the final map or that the construction be suitably guaranteed:

- (a) After submittal of hydrology and hydraulic calculations and drainage plans for review by the City Engineer prior to recordation of the final map. Construction of public and/or private drainage facilities or removal and reconstruction of any existing system within the existing easements may be required to drain private and public street and any existing and new storm drain systems within the property to outlets satisfactory to the City Engineer.
- (b) Improve the private street by the construction of the following:
 - (1) Concrete curbs, concrete gutters, and 4-foot concrete sidewalks.
 - (2) Suitable surfacing to join the existing pavement and to complete a 36-foot roadway.
 - (3) Any necessary removal and reconstruction of the existing improvements.
 - (4) The necessary transitions to join the existing improvement.
 - (5) The suitable improvement of the 35-foot curb radius cul-de-sac.
- (c) Improve Mulholland Drive adjoining the tract by the construction of the following:
 - (1) Suitable surfacing to join the existing pavement and to complete a variable width half-roadway in accordance with the **Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan**. If the existing roadway improvements are satisfactory to the DOT, then additional improvements are not required.
 - (2) Any necessary removal and reconstruction of the existing improvements.
 - (3) The necessary transitions to join the existing improvements specially existing road to the west.
- (d) Improve San Feliciano Drive adjoining the tract by construction of 5.5-foot wide concrete sidewalk including any necessary removal and reconstruction of the existing improvements.
- (e) Construct mainline and house connection sewers to serve the development.
- (f) Install street lighting facilities to serve the tract as required by the Bureau of Street Lighting, and in accordance with any applicable standards, design guidelines, and design review procedures required by the **Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan**.

Construct new street lights:

- eight (8) on Mulholland Drive
- five (5) on San Feliciano Drive

Notes: The quantity of street lights identified may be modified slightly during the plan check process based on illumination calculations and equipment selection. Conditions set: 1) in compliance with a Specific Plan, 2) by LADOT, or 3) by other legal instrument excluding the Bureau of Engineering conditions, requiring an improvement that will

change the geometrics of the public roadway or driveway apron may require additional or the reconstruction of street lighting improvements as part of that condition.

- (h) Plant street trees and remove any existing trees within dedicated streets or proposed dedicated streets as required by the Street Tree Division of the Bureau of Street Maintenance. All street tree plantings shall be brought up to current standards. When the City has previously been paid for tree planting, the subdivider or contractor shall notify the Street Tree Division (213-485-5675) upon completion of construction to expedite tree planting.
- (i) Repair or replace any off-grade or broken curb, gutter and sidewalk satisfactory to the City Engineer.
- (j) Construct access ramps for the handicapped as required by the City Engineer.
- (k) Close any unused driveways satisfactory to the City Engineer.
- (I) Construct any necessary additional street improvements to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990.

NOTES:

The Advisory Agency approval is the maximum number of units permitted under the tract action. However the existing or proposed zoning may not permit this number of units. This map does not constitute approval of any variations from the Municipal Code, unless approved specifically for this project under separate conditions.

Approval from Board of Public Works may be necessary before removal of any street trees in conjunction with the improvements in this tract map through Bureau of Street Services Urban Forestry Division.

Satisfactory arrangements shall be made with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Power System, to pay for removal, relocation, replacement or adjustment of power facilities due to this development. The subdivider must make arrangements for the underground installation of all new utility lines in conformance with LAMC Section 17.05-N.

The Advisory Agency hereby finds that this tract conforms to the California Water Code, as required by the Subdivision Map Act.

The subdivider should consult the Department of Water and Power to obtain energy saving design features which can be incorporated into the final building plans for the subject development. As part of the Total Energy Management Program of the Department of Water and Power, this no-cost consultation service will be provided to the subdivider upon his request.

FINDINGS OF FACT (CEQA)

I. INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR), consisting of the Draft EIR and the Final EIR, is intended to serve as an informational document for public agency decision-makers and the general public regarding the objectives and environmental impacts of the Vesting Tentative Tract No. 67505 Project (Project), located at 22241-22255 Mulholland Drive (Site or Project Site). The Project is a subdivision of a 6.2-acre property (two parcels) into 19 lots and the subsequent development of 19 detached, single-family residences. Each residence would have three to four bedrooms and a two-car garage, and a maximum height of two stories or 33 feet. The project would construct a new private street from San Feliciano Drive to access 12 of the homes, a entrance on San Feliciano Drive to access three of the homes, and one new entrance off of Mulholland Drive to access the remaining four homes. The Project includes demolition and removal of one existing vacant single-family residence with its associated structures, grading of 7,240 cubic yards of soil which includes the import of 4,200 cubic yards of soil, and the removal of 28 (15 protected) trees.

The City of Los Angeles (the "City"), as Lead Agency, has evaluated the environmental impacts of implementation of the Vesting Tentative Tract No. 67505 Project by preparing an EIR (Case Number: ENV-2005-2301-EIR/State Clearinghouse No. 2005111054). The EIR was prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq. ("CEQA") and the California Code of Regulations Title 15, Chapter 6 (the "CEQA Guidelines"). The findings discussed in this document are made relative to the conclusions of the EIR.

CEQA Section 21002 provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]" The procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects." CEQA Section 21002 goes on to state that "in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof."

The mandate and principles announced in CEQA Section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. (See CEQA Section 21081[a]; CEQA Guidelines Section 15091[a].) For each significant environmental impact identified in an EIR for a proposed project, the approving agency must issue a written finding, based on substantial evidence in light of the whole record, reaching one or more of the three possible findings, as follows:

1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts as identified in the EIR.

2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been, or can or should be, adopted by that other agency.

3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the EIR.

The findings reported in the following pages incorporate the facts and discussions of the environmental impacts that are found to be significant in the Final Environmental Impact Report for the project as fully set forth therein. Although Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines does not require findings to address environmental impacts that an EIR identifies as merely "potentially significant", these findings nevertheless fully account for all such effects identified in the Final EIR for the purpose of better understanding the full environmental scope of the Project. For each environmental issue analyzed in the EIR, the following information is provided:

- Description of Significant Effects A description of the environmental effects identified in the EIR.
- Project Design Features A list of the project design features or actions that are included as part of the Project.
- Mitigation Measures A list of the mitigation measures that are required as part of the Project to reduce identified significant impacts.
- Finding One or more of the three possible findings set forth above for each of the significant impacts.
- Rationale for Finding A summary of the rationale for the finding(s).
- Reference A reference of the specific section of the EIR which includes the evidence and discussion of the identified impact.

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened either through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or feasible environmentally superior alternatives, a public agency, after adopting proper findings based on substantial evidence, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project's benefits rendered acceptable its unavoidable adverse environmental effects. (CEQA Guidelines §15093, 15043[b]; see also CEQA § 21081[b].)

Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081.6(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(e), the documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City has based its decision are located in and may be obtained from the Department of City Planning, as the custodian of such documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings, located at 221 North Figueroa Street, Room 1350, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS AND RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings, the Record of Proceedings for the Project includes (but is not limited to) the following documents:

Initial Study. The Project was reviewed by the City of Los Angeles (Lead Agency) in accordance with the requirements of the CEQA (PRC 21000 et seq.). The City prepared an Initial Study in accordance with Section 15063(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. §§ 15000 et seq.).

Notice of Preparation. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City then circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to State, regional and local agencies, and members of the public for a 30-day period from November 8, 2005 to December 8, 2005. The purpose of the NOP was to formally inform the public that the City was preparing a Draft EIR for the Project, and to solicit input regarding the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the Draft EIR. Written comment letters responding to the NOP and the Scoping Meeting were submitted to the City by various public agencies, interested

organizations and individuals. The NOP, Initial Study, and NOP comment letters are included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR.

Previous Draft EIR and Final EIR. The City circulated a Draft EIR for public review and comment from February 20, 2007 to April 6, 2007 for the development of 37 detached, single-family condominium homes, known as the "Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 61533 Project EIR". During that time, the Department of City Planning received a total of 45 comment letters. The City prepared a Final EIR, including responses to all comments, and released it for public review in January 2008. Subsequently, however, the previous Project Applicant placed the Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 61533 Project application on hold and the City ultimately did not take any action on either the VTT-61533 Project or EIR. Subsequently, the Project was reduced in scope, and a new tract map application (VTT-67505) was submitted to the City in May 2015. Based on the revised project, a new Draft EIR was completed.

Draft EIR. The Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 67505 Project Draft EIR evaluated in detail the potential effects of the Project. It also analyzed the effects of a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project, including a "No Project" alternative. The Draft EIR for the Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2016071049), incorporated herein by reference in full, was prepared pursuant to CEQA and State, Agency, and City CEQA Guidelines (City of Los Angeles California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines). The Draft EIR was circulated for a 45-day public comment period beginning on March 17, 2016, and ending on May 2, 2016. A Notice of Availability (NOA) was distributed on March 17, 2016 to all property owners within 500 feet of the Project Site and interested parties, which informed them of where they could view the document and how to comment. The Draft EIR was available to the public at the City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, and the following local libraries: Los Angeles Central Library, Woodland Hills Branch Library, and Platt Branch Library. A copy of the document was also posted online at https://planning.lacity.org. Notices were filed with the County Clerk on March 17, 2016.

Notice of Completion. A Notice of Completion was sent with the Draft EIR to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse for distribution to State Agencies on December 22, 2015, and notice was provided in newspapers of general and/or regional circulation.

Final EIR. The City released a Final EIR for the Project on August 30, 2018, which is hereby incorporated by reference in full. The Final EIR constitutes the second part of the EIR for the Project and is intended to be a companion to the Draft EIR. The Final EIR also incorporates the Draft EIR by reference. Pursuant to Section 15088 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City, as Lead Agency, reviewed all comments received during the review period for the Draft EIR and responded to each comment in Section 2, Responses to Comments, of the Final EIR. On August 30, 2018, responses were sent to all public agencies that made comments on the Draft EIR at least 10 days prior to certification of the EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088(b). Notices regarding availability of the Final EIR were also sent to property owners and occupants within a 500-foot radius of the Project Site, as well as anyone who commented on the Draft EIR, and interested parties.

Public Hearing. A noticed public hearing for the Project was held by the Deputy Advisory Agency and on behalf of the Zoning Administrator on October 2, 2018.

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings, the Record of Proceedings for the Project includes (but is not limited to) the following documents and other materials that constitute the administrative record upon which the City approved the Project. The following information is incorporated by reference and made part of the record supporting these Findings of Fact:

- All Project plans and application materials including supportive technical reports;
- The City of Los Angeles General Plan and related EIR;
- The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)'s 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) and related EIR (SCH No. 2015031035);
- Municipal Code of the City of Los Angeles, including but not limited to the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Ordinance;
- All records of decision, resolutions, staff reports, memoranda, maps, exhibits, letters, minutes of meetings, summaries, and other documents approved, reviewed, relied upon, or prepared by any City commissions, boards, officials, consultants, or staff relating to the Project;
- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings of Fact, in addition to those cited above; and
- Any and all other materials required for the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code Section 21167.6(e).

Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081.6(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(e), the documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City has based its decision are located in and may be obtained from the Department of City Planning, as the custodian of such documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings, located at the City of Los Angeles, Figueroa Plaza, 221 North Figueroa Street, Room 1350, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

In addition, copies of the Draft EIR and Final EIR are available on the Department of City Planning's website at <u>http://planning.lacity.org</u> (to locate the documents click on the "Development Services" tab on the top of the page, then "Published Document", "Environmental Impact Reports" and search for the EIR number). The Draft and Final EIR are also available at the following three Library Branches:

- Central Library, 630 West Fifth Street, Los Angeles, CA 90071
- Woodland Hills Branch Library, 22200 Ventura Boulevard, Woodland Hills, CA 91364
- Platt Branch Library, 23600 Victory Boulevard, Woodland Hills, CA 91367

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 6.2-acre Project Site is located at 22241 and 22251 Mulholland Drive in the City of Los Angeles, within the community of Woodland Hills. The irregularly shaped Project Site is bound by San Feliciano Drive to the north and west and Mulholland Drive to the south and east. The Girard Reservoir (drained in 1989 and currently empty) is adjacent to and north of the Project Site. Regional access is provided by the Ventura Freeway (US-101), the primary east-west arterial in this portion of the San Fernando Valley. The Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills Community Plan (adopted August 17, 1999) designates the Project Site for Low Residential land uses. The site is zoned R1-1, which allows for single-family residential developments with a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet, and a maximum building height of 33 feet.

The Project Site also lies within the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan (Specific Plan) area, which is comprised of Mulholland Drive and the areas immediately adjacent to the Mulholland Drive right-of-way. The entire Project Site is located within 500 feet of the Mulholland Scenic

Parkway right-of-way, which is referred to as the Inner Corridor. The Specific Plan contains density requirements, building standards and grading restrictions that are applicable to the Inner Corridor. In addition, the Project Site is subject to the Specific Plan's accompanying design guidelines and review by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board. The Project Site is also within a Mountain Fire District and is subject to the Hillside Grading Ordinance.

Existing Project Site Conditions

A chain link fence surrounds the Project Site. A vacant single-family residence, sheds, and an aged kennel occupy the site. These structures are located at the east-central portion of the property along Mulholland Drive. The remaining portion of land is undeveloped and occupied by various trees, shrubs, low-lying weeds and grasses. There are a total of 199 trees on the Project Site (including 166 protected trees consisting of Coast Live Oaks and Southern California black walnuts). Other trees on the site include Willows, Mexican Elderberry and a variety of ornamental trees. There are no National Register or California State Historic Resource properties, California Historical landmarks, California Points of Historic Interest, or City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments on the Project Site. The existing topography consists of a north-draining main ravine and a secondary ravine. A north-trending bedrock spur-ridge separates the main and easterly secondary canyon. The existing residential structure was built on the bedrock ridge. Minor cut and fill grading techniques were employed to create a level building site for the structure. Past grading, associated with the construction of Mulholland Drive, has consisted of placing fill where the roadway crosses the main and secondary canyons. Fill was also placed along the margins of the main canyon and within a secondary canyon to support residential development and San Feliciano Drive to the west. Placing fill within the main canyon created the now-abandoned Girard Reservoir. There is a 15-foot flood control easement that runs along the southwest property line, from Mulholland Drive to San Feliciano Drive.

Overview of Project

An application for a Vesting Tentative Tract Map (VTT- 61553) on the Project Site was originally submitted to the City in 2005. This proposed development would have consisted of the development of 37 detached single-family condominium homes ("Original Project"). A Draft EIR and Final EIR were prepared for the Original Project, but the City ultimately did not take action on either the Original Project or the EIR. Subsequently, the Project was reduced in scope, and a new tract map application (VTT-67505) was submitted to the City in May 2015. Based on the revised project, a new Draft EIR and Final EIR were completed.

The revised Project consists of a 19-lot subdivision of an irregularly-shaped 6.2-acre site, and the subsequent development of 19 single-family residences. Each residence would be comprised of three or four bedrooms and a two-car garage. The maximum height of each building would be limited to two stories or 33 feet, and each residence would be required to be built and designed pursuant to the established regulations and design guidelines of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan. This could potentially further limit the size and scale of each residential dwelling Development on the site would be primarily focused along a new private street, extending from San Feliciano Drive into the Project Site, and terminating in a cul-de-sac. Three residences would have direct access from San Feliciano Drive via a new entrance, and twelve residences would be accessed from the private street. In addition, a separate entrance would extend from Mulholland Drive into the Project Site to provide access to the remaining four residences.

A majority of the existing trees on the site would be maintained, including a grouping of trees on the south of the property along Mulholland Drive near the intersection with Mulholland Highway, and tree groupings along the north end of the property adjacent to the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (DWP) property. Currently, the site contains 3.7 acres of coast live oak woodland vegetation communities, including some that is mixed with ornamental trees and vegetation. Under the Project, approximately 3.5 of these acres containing most of the site's oak canopy would remain intact. Specifically, of the 199 trees (including 166 protected trees) located on-site, 15 coast live oaks are expected to be removed, and replaced at a 4:1 ratio on-site.

Grading for the Project would involve the excavation (cut) of approximately 3,040 cubic yards. All excavated material would be used as fill on the Project Site. The proposed grading would require approximately 7,240 cubic yards of fill to balance the site, resulting in the proposed import of 4,200 cubic yards of material to the site. The Project would also utilize five retaining walls up to 10 feet 6 inches in height in lieu of slopes, to reduce the number of impacted coast live oak trees.

IV. NO IMPACT OR LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WITHOUT MITIGATION

Impacts of the Project that were determined to have no impact or be less than significant in the EIR (including having a less than significant impact as a result of implementation of project design features and compliance with existing regulations) and that require no mitigation are identified below. The City has reviewed the record and agrees with the conclusion that the following environmental issues would not be significantly affected by the Project and therefore, no additional findings are needed.

These findings do not repeat the full discussions of environmental impacts contained in the EIR. The City ratifies, adopts, and incorporates the analysis, explanation, findings, responses to comments, and conclusions of the EIR. The City adopts the reasoning of the EIR, City staff reports, and presentations regarding the Project.

<u>Aesthetics</u>

Under CEQA's Guidelines (Appendix G), a project could have a potentially significant impact related to aesthetics if it were to: (a) have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; (b) substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; (c) substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and is surroundings; or (d) create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Impacts related to (b) scenic resources and (c) visual character are discussed in Section V. Less Than Significant Impacts with Mitigation of the Findings.

Scenic Vistas

The Project's impacts with respect to scenic vistas would be less than significant. The Project would transform a wooded area into a residential setting, with one of the proposed homes wholly visible and three homes partially visible from the Mulholland Scenic Parkway. However, these homes would be screened from view by the implementation of the Landscape Plan, set forth in Project Design Feature B-1. The consulting landscape architect has indicated that full screening from the new landscaping would occur in approximately five years following planting. Since the proposed homes would not be visible from the scenic parkway upon the maturity of landscaping, the project can therefore be found to "preserve and enhance the unique character and scenic features of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway".

Since the proposed retaining walls would only be minimally visible from Mulholland Drive, the retaining walls would not be expected to have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

Therefore, the aesthetic impact of the retaining walls on a scenic vista would be less than significant.

The Project would remove a total of 28 trees, including 15 *Quercus agrifolia* and 13 other native trees (Mexican elderberry). Since these species are protected trees, these trees would be required to be replaced on-site pursuant to regulatory compliance with the City's adopted Protected Tree Ordinance and the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with scenic vistas have been identified. In addition, all new buildings and landscaping on the site will need to undergo additional review by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for conformance with the screening requirements of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan. Furthermore, Project Design Feature B-1 provides additional screening guidance and will ensure impacts associated with the Project would remain less than significant.

Project Design Features

B-1 – The Project Applicant shall prepare and implement a Landscape Plan. The Landscape Plan shall provide planting and maintenance guidance for common landscaped areas, slopes, and undeveloped building pads. The Project Applicant shall be responsible for the Plan's implementation until the individual homes are occupied by residents who will take over landscape maintenance responsibilities. The Landscape Plan shall be subject to the review and approval by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan Design Review Board and the City of Los Angeles' Planning Department prior to issuance of the grading permit. Landscaping and irrigation for each lot shall be fully installed prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for the residence on any individual lot. Major features of the landscape plan shall include:

- A listing of plant species appropriate for use for both temporary slope stabilization purposes and long-term landscaping designs for common slope and private yard areas. The plan shall emphasize the use of drought-tolerant, fire retardant, native plant species. Only non-invasive non-native plant species shall be included in the listing of acceptable planting materials. In addition, wherever practical, plants which are relatively pest resistant and which require a minimum of added nutrients shall be utilized in landscaping;
- 2) Retention of a landscape contractor thoroughly familiar with the provisions of the Landscape Plan for ongoing implementation of the Landscape Plan;
- 3) Preservation and protection of existing trees and shrubs, wherever possible. Procedures for the care and maintenance of native trees retained on the Project Site shall be specified, and shall include supplemental irrigation for trees located along the existing fill slope supporting Mulholland Drive (including the areas in which Tree Nos. 18-35, 186, and 192 are located) during the rainy season. The Project Applicant shall provide protected tree maintenance information to the purchasers of individual homes within the Proposed Project; and
- 4) Utilization of a design that achieves the total screening of Project homes from the Mulholland Drive public right-of-way through the planting of new native trees and shrubs.

Shade and Shadows

The Proposed Project would not lead to impacts with respect to shading or shadows as the maximum height of the single-family homes proposed to be constructed on the Project Site would be 33 feet. According to the L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide, a project that is less than 60 feet in height above the ground elevation would normally result in a less-than-significant shading impact.

No mitigation measures are required because no significant impacts associated with shadows have been identified.

Nighttime Light and Daytime Glare

Under the CEQA Guidelines, a project could have a significant impact related to light and glare if it would create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect the day or nighttime views the area. Under the L.A. City CEQA Thresholds Guide, a project's potential impacts related to light and glare should be made on a case-by-case basis considering the following two factors: (1) the change in ambient illumination levels as a result of project sources; and (2) the extent to which project lighting would spill off the project site and affect adjacent light-sensitive areas.

The Project would create a new source of light that would be visible from the Mulholland Scenic Parkway. The project proposes to provide low intensity lighting and the remaining tree canopy on the Project Site would be an effective screen for the new lighting. In addition, the area surrounding the Project Site (on Mulholland Drive, San Feliciano Drive, and Mulholland Highway) is already subject to substantial levels of night lighting. The new source of illumination from the Project Site would not be of substantial light or glare which would affect nighttime views in the area. Therefore, the aesthetic impact of the Proposed Project's night lighting would be adverse but less than significant.

Project Design Features

B-2 – Lighting within the Project Site shall focus illumination downward and into the Project Site. A combination of shielding, screening, and directing the lighting away from off-site areas shall be utilized to minimize "spill-over" effects onto adjacent roadways, properties and open space areas. Wherever possible, lighting fixtures shall be located on the shielded side of the visual barriers.

B-3 – Lighting fixtures that cut off light directed to the sky shall be installed in combination with an expanded tree canopy to minimize atmospheric light pollution.

B-4 – The use of exterior up-lighting fixtures for building facades and trees shall be prohibited. Only down-lighting for exterior-building mounted fixtures shall be permitted.

B-5 – Use of "glowing" fixtures that would be visible from adjacent properties or public roads shall be prohibited. A glowing fixture is a lantern style fixture, or any fixture that allows light through its vertical components.

B-7 – All roofs visible from Mulholland Drive shall be surfaced with non-reflective materials.

Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Project, in conjunction with the Related Projects, would not have significant cumulative impacts associated with aesthetics. With respect to the visual character of the Project Site, the Related Projects are subject to applicable development standards and environmental review. The only specific cumulative development project that has been identified as being proposed within a 1.5-mile radius of the Project Site are the Clarendon Street Apartments, which are located approximately 1.3 miles from the Project Site. Due to the distance of this site from the Proposed Project location, the cumulative project would not combine with the Proposed Project to result in the loss of scenic vistas, damage to scenic resources, alteration of existing visual character, or the creation of substantial light and/or glare.

No mitigation measures are required because no significant cumulative impacts associated with aesthetics have been identified.

Agricultural and Forestry Resources

The Proposed Project would cause no impacts on agricultural or forestry resources. Under the CEQA Guidelines, a project may have a significant impact on agricultural or forestry resources if it were to result in (a) the conversion of state-designated agricultural land from agricultural use to another non-agricultural use; (b) conflicts with zoning for agricultural use; (c) conflicts with existing zoning or cause rezoning of forest/timber land; (d) result in the loss of forest land; or (e) other changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. The Project Site is located in a developed portion of Woodland Hills and does not include any state-designated agricultural lands. Neither the Project Site nor any adjacent properties are zoned for agricultural uses and there are no Williamson Act contracts in the area. The site is not classified in any "Farmland" category designated by the State of California. Therefore, no impact would occur.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with agricultural or forestry resources have been identified.

<u>Air Quality</u>

Under CEQA's Guidelines, a project may have a significant air quality impact if the project would cause any of the following: (a) conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; (b) violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; (c) result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard; (d) expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or (e) create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. For impacts related to (b) air quality violations during construction and (c) criteria pollutants during constriction, see Section V. Less Than Significant Impacts With Mitigation of these Findings.

The City has not adopted specific citywide significance thresholds, but instead relies on regional significance thresholds identified by the South Coast Air Quality Management District ("SCAQMD") in its CEQA Air Quality Handbook ("SCAQMD CEQA Handbook") as revised in November 1993 for construction and operational emissions impacts. The City's analysis of air quality impacts was prepared consistent with applicable SCAQMD guidance as well CalEEMod guidance, including the User's Guide.

Consistency with Air Quality Plan

The proposed residential land use will neither conflict with the SCAQMD's AQMP nor jeopardize the region's attainment of air quality standards. The AQMP focuses on achieving clean air standards while accommodating population growth forecasts by SCAG. Specifically, SCAG's growth forecasts are largely built off local growth forecasts from local governments like the City of Los Angeles.

The Project Site is located in the City's Canoga Park–Winnetka–Woodland Hills–West Hills Community Plan area. The Proposed Project is consistent with the City's projected growth capacity for the Community Plan area. This would marginally increase population in the Basin. The Project Site is classified as "Low Residential" in the Community Plan, a zoning classification

that allows residential uses. As such, the RTP/SCS' assumptions about growth in the City likely accommodate housing and population growth on this site. As such, the Project does not conflict with the growth assumptions in the regional air plan and this impact is considered less than significant.

The City's General Plan Air Quality Element identifies 30 policies that identify specific strategies for advancing the City's clean air goals. The Proposed Project is consistent with the applicable policies of the Air Quality Element. As such, the Proposed Project's impact would be considered less than significant.

Regional Impacts - Operational Phase

The Proposed Project's operation would lead to less than significant regional impacts. The Project would produce long-term air quality impacts to the region primarily from motor vehicles that access the Project Site. However, regional net operational emissions of the Project would not exceed any of the applicable SCAQMD significance thresholds. Therefore, the impact on regional air quality is considered less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required because no significant regional impacts related to the Project's operation have been identified.

Local Impacts/Sensitive Receptors - Operational Phase

The Project's localized emissions would not approach the SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds for human health impacts at nearby sensitive receptors during long-term operations. Impacts would be less than significant. With regard to local air quality impacts, the Project would generate only negligible pollutant concentrations of CO, NO_x, PM_{2.5}, or PM₁₀ at sensitive receptors and would be considered less than significant. In addition, long-term operation of the Project would not result in exceedances of CO air quality standards at roadways in the area. Thus, the Project would have a less-than-significant impact.

No mitigation measures are required because no significant impacts related to localized air emissions from the Project's operation have been identified.

Odors - Construction Phase Impacts

The Proposed Project's construction would cause no impacts related to odors. Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include equipment exhaust and architectural coatings. Odors from these sources would be localized and generally confined to the immediate area surrounding these construction activities. Any odor impacts from the construction phase will likely not adversely impact local residents or sensitive receptors. The Project would utilize typical construction techniques, and odors would be typical of most construction sites and temporary in nature. Because construction of the Project is not expected to cause an odor nuisance, no significant impact would occur.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts related to odors from construction have been identified.

Odors - Operational Phase Impacts

No impact related to odors would result from the Project's operation. The Project is the development of 19 single-family homes on the Project Site. Odors are typically associated with

food related activities and industrial projects involving the use of chemicals, solvents, petroleum products, and other strong-smelling elements used in manufacturing processes, as well as sewage treatment facilities and landfills. As the proposed project involves no elements related to these types of uses, no significant odors are anticipated. Therefore, the Project would have no impact with respect to odors.

No mitigation measures are required because no significant impacts related to odors from the Project's operation have been identified.

Biological Resources

Under the CEQA Guidelines, a project may have a significant impact on biological resources if it (a) has a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; (b) has a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in the City or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife service; (c) has a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; (d) may 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; (e) may conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; or (f) may conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. For impacts related to (a) sensitive species, (b) sensitive natural communities, (c) jurisdictional resources, and (e) conformance with local policies and ordinances, see Section V. Less Than Significant Impacts with Mitigation of these Findings.

Wildlife Movement/Habitat Connectivity

Impacts related to wildlife movement and habitat connectivity resulting from the Project's development would be less than significant. Although mammals and reptiles may currently use cross over Mulholland Drive between the Project Site and the relatively natural habitat areas on the school and park property to the south of Mulholland Drive, the Project Site does not function as part of a true wildlife corridor since wildlife dispersal across the site is currently compromised by vehicle traffic on Mulholland Drive. In addition, the site does not act to connect two significant or large core habitat areas; rather, the site is a relatively small habitat island surrounded almost completely by suburban development. Given that much of the Project Site is nearly surrounded by suburban development or nursery use. In addition, no major migratory routes for mule deer or other important migratory animals have been identified on or adjacent to the site. Therefore, no significant impacts to wildlife movement, migration corridors, or nursery sites will occur from the Project.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with wildlife movement/habitat connectivity have been identified. In addition, Project Design Feature D-7 will ensure that issues regarding rodents and pests on-site are remediated. Impacts associated with the Project would remain less than significant.

Project Design Features

D-7 – Prior to the start of demolition activities at the Project Site, the Project Applicant shall contract with a pest control/pest extermination company to perform a survey of potential rodent issues on the Project Site. This survey will consist of setting traps for a period of time to establish whether or not a rodent problem exists. If a rodent problem is found, remediation shall begin approximately one month prior to the start of any demolition.

Conformance with Regional Conservation Plans

No Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other such local or regional plans have been adopted that encompass the Project Site; therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

Cumulative Impacts

The only cumulative development project that is currently proposed within the vicinity of the Project Site, the Clarendon Street Apartments project, is located approximately 1.3 miles from the Project Site and is adjacent to the US 101 (Ventura) Freeway. Because this project is located in an existing developed area at a considerable distance from the Project Site, it would not combine with the Proposed Project to result in a significant cumulative impact with respect to biological resources. Since no other cumulative development projects are proposed within the Project area, impacts are not anticipated to be cumulatively considerable or significantly adverse.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant cumulative impacts associated with biological resources have been identified.

Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources

Under the CEQA Guidelines, a project may have a significant impact on cultural resources if it (a) will cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5; (b) will cause a substantial adverse change in significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5; (c) will directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or (d) will disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. For impacts related to (b) archaeological resources, (c) paleontological resources, and (e) human remains/tribal cultural resources, see Section V. Less Than Significant Impacts with Mitigation of these Findings.

Historical Resources

No impact to historical resources would occur with development of the Project. The State Office of Historic Preservation recommends that properties over 45 years of age be evaluated for their potential as historic resources. There are no National Register or California State Historic Resource properties, California Historical landmarks, California Points of Historic Interest, or City of Los Angeles Historic- Cultural Monuments on the proposed project site. According to the Phase I Archaeological Survey, no historical structures or features were shown for the project site on the 1947 USGS Calabasas topographical quadrangle, and very little development had occurred within the general vicinity by 1947. The existing structures on the site include two-story residence, sheds, and kennel. These structures lack the physical integrity required for listing in the National and California Registers. Therefore, no impacts to historical resources would occur.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with historic resources have been identified.

Geology and Soils

Under CEQA's Guidelines, a project may have a significant impact to geology and soils if the project would result in one or more of the following: (a) exacerbate existing environmental conditions so as to increase the potential to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving – (i) rupture of a known earthquake fault, (ii) strong seismic ground-shaking, (iii) seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, or (iv) landslides; (b) result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; (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 resulting in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsistence, liquefaction, or collapse caused in whole or in part by the project's exacerbation of the existing environmental conditions; (d) be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property caused in whole or in part by the project exacerbating the expansive soil conditions; or (e) have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.

The L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide requires the geotechnical analysis to address the following areas of study (1) geologic hazards; (2) sedimentation and erosion; (3) landform alternation; and (4) mineral resources. The City concluded in the initial study that the Project would not result in impacts related to geology and soils (see below).

Fault Rupture

The Proposed Project would not lead to significant impacts related to fault rupture. Fault rupture is defined as the surface displacement that occurs along the surface of a fault during an earthquake. There are no known active faults within close vicinity of the Project Site. None of the City-designated Fault Rupture Study Zones or State-designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones cross the project site. The closest Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone or Fault Rupture Study Area to the Project Site, according to City mapping, is located approximately 4.25 miles north of the Project Site. Thus, impacts due to on-site rupture of a known earthquake fault would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required because no significant impacts related to fault rupture have been identified.

Strong Seismic Ground Shaking

Compliance with existing regulations will ensure that the Proposed Project would have a lessthan-significant related to strong seismic ground shaking. A significant impact may occur if a project represents an increased risk to public safety or destruction of property by exposing people, property or infrastructure to seismically induced ground shaking hazards that are greater than the average risk associated with locations in the Southern California region.

Adherence to current building codes and engineering practices would ensure that the Project would not expose people, property or infrastructure to seismically induced ground shaking hazards that are greater than the average risk associated with locations in the southern California region and would minimize the potential to expose people or structures to substantial risk, loss, or injury. Therefore, no significant impacts related to seismic ground shaking would occur.

No mitigation measures are required because no significant impacts related to strong seismic shaking have been identified.

Liquefaction

The Proposed Project's impacts with respect to liquefaction would be less than significant. Liquefaction is a form of earthquake-induced ground failure that occurs primarily in relatively shallow, loose, granular, water-saturated soils. Liquefaction can occur when certain types of soils lose their inherent shear strength due to excess water pressure that builds up during repeated movement from seismic activity. Low groundwater table and the presence of loose medium dense sand and silty sand are factors that could contribute to the potential for liquefaction. The Project Site is not identified by ZIMAS and the State Seismic Hazard Zone Map as being within a liquefaction zone. In addition, the City of Los Angeles Seismic Safety Element does not identify the Project Site as being located within a potentially liquefiable area. According to the Geologic and Soils Engineering Exploration Report prepared by the J. Byer Group, Inc., groundwater was encountered during onsite explorations at depths which ranged from 16 to 23 feet. However, the historic groundwater for this area of Woodland Hills is not indicated by the California Geological Survey.

The Project Site is underlain by fill, natural alluvium and bedrock. The alluvium consists of mixtures of silty sand, clayey sand and sand that is mottled brown, brownish gray, moist to saturated and slightly dense to very dense. The bedrock consists of (consisting of siltstone, sandstone and claystone). According to the Geological and Soil Engineering Exploration Report prepared by the J. Byer Group, Inc., numerous layers within the alluvium are subject to liquefaction. The liquefaction potential across the project site is variable because of the interfingering nature of the clayey and sandy alluvium. The highest liquefaction potential is located near the center of the site. However, the Geological and Soil Engineering Exploration Report indicates that the proposed project is feasible from a geologic and soils engineering standpoint provided the recommendations for remedial grading and construction are implemented during construction. Other than compliance with the Building Code and the City's specific requirements, no further mitigation is necessary.

No mitigation measures are required because no significant impacts with respect to liquefaction have been identified.

Landslides

The Proposed Project would not lead to significant impacts related to landslides. A significant adverse effect may occur if a project is located in a hillside area with soil conditions that would suggest high potential for sliding. Landslides can occur on slopes under normal gravitational forces and during earthquakes when strong ground motion can cause failure. Landslides tend to occur in loosely consolidated, wet soil, and/or rock on unstable sloping terrain. The Project Site is within a hillside area, although slopes are relatively mild across the site. The Project Site is not in a landslide inventory area. Therefore, no impact from seismically induced landslides would be expected.

No mitigation measures are required because no significant impacts related to landslides have been identified.

Substantial Soil Erosion or Loss of Topsoil

The Proposed Project's impacts to substantial erosion or the loss of topsoil would be less than significant. A project may have a significant impact if it exposes large areas to the erosional effects of wind or water for a protracted period of time. Development of the Project Site would include the demolition of the existing two-story residence, sheds and kennel, to be replaced with 19 single-family residences. During construction, grading would expose approximately 2.75 acres of soil for a limited time, allowing for possible erosion, although the amounts would not be expected to be substantial.

Although Project development has the potential to result in minor erosion of soils during site preparation and construction activities, erosion would be minimized by implementation of standard City required erosion controls imposed during grading and via building permit regulations. For example, all grading permits from the Department of Building and Safety include provisions to limit the erosion potential. Specifically, grading and site preparation must comply with all applicable provisions of Chapter IX, Division 70 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code which addresses grading, excavations, and fills. With implementation of the applicable grading and building permit requirements and the application of Best Management Practices, no significant impacts would occur related to erosion or loss of topsoil.

No mitigation measures are required because no significant impacts related to substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil have been identified.

Soil Stability

The Proposed Project's impacts on soil stability will be less than significant. A project may have a significant impact related to soil stability if the project is built in an unstable area without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for the project buildings, thus posing a hazard to life and property. Construction activities must comply with the City's Building Code, which is designed to ensure safe construction, including building foundation requirements appropriate to site conditions. The Project Site is not at risk for landslides. The potential for slope stability hazards is considered low. Project impacts with respect to soil stability would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required because no significant impacts related to soil stability have been identified.

Expansive Soil

The Project's impacts with respect to expansive soil would be less than significant. A significant impact may occur if a project would be built on expansive soils without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for project buildings, thus, posing a hazard to life and property. According to the Geotechnical Report prepared for the proposed project, subsurface materials at the Project Site consist of natural alluvium that is made up of silty sand, clayey sand, and sand that is mottled brown, brownish gray, moist to saturated, and slightly dense to dense. Soft to slightly dense areas within the alluvium are also located at or near the groundwater level, which lies between 16 and 23 feet below the surface. These earth materials have some expansion potential, which would be adequately addressed by the foundation recommendations provided in the Geotechnical Report. The potential for unsuitable soils to create settlement problems for structures, roads, and utility lines through vertical or lateral movement would be eliminated through soils re-engineering (i.e., remediation) during excavation and construction. As part of the construction permitting process, the City requires completed reports of soil conditions at construction sites to identify, and recommend treatment for, potentially unsuitable soil conditions. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soil conditions would be considered less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required because no significant impacts related to expansive soil have been identified.

Septic Tanks

The Proposed Project would have no impact related to septic tanks. A project may have a significant impact related to septic tanks if the project is located in an area not served by an

existing sewer system. The Project Site is located in a developed area of the City, which is served by a wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment system operated by the City. No septic tanks or alternative disposal systems are necessary, nor are they proposed. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Project's impacts in conjunction with the Related Project related to geology and soils would be less than significant. Geotechnical impacts related to the Related Projects in the development area would involve hazards related to site-specific soil conditions, erosion, and ground-shaking during earthquakes. The impacts on each site would be specific to that site and its users and would not be common or contribute to (or shared with, in an additive sense) the impacts on other sites. Thus, the Project, together with the Related Project, would not create an impact that is cumulatively considerable.

The Related Project does not contain elements or activities that would cause or accelerate geologic hazards off-site that would contribute to increased geological hazards on the Project Site. In addition, the design and construction of the Project and the cumulative projects shall conform to the Uniform Building Code seismic standards as approved by the Department of Building and Safety. In addition, development on each site would be subject to uniform site development and construction standards that are designed to protect public safety, which includes a geotechnical report. Therefore, incremental impacts related to geology and soils would not be cumulatively considerable.

No mitigation measures are required because no significant cumulative impacts related to geology and soils have been identified.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under CEQA's Guidelines, as amended in 2010, a project could have a significant impact related to greenhouse gases ("GHGs") if it would: (1) generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or (2) conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

In the absence of any adopted, numeric threshold, the City evaluated the significance of the Project's potential GHG emissions consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.4(b)(2) by considering whether the Project complies with applicable regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction of mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions.

Project Construction and Operation

The Proposed Project's construction and operation would not cause significant impacts with respect to GHG emissions. The Project's construction would emit GHG emissions through the combustion of fossil fuels by heavy-duty construction equipment and through vehicle trips generated by construction workers traveling to and from the Project Site. Since there are no defined thresholds of significance for temporary emission of GHGs, construction emissions are considered as part of the long-term GHG impacts of the Proposed Project.

According to DEIR, Summary of Project Impacts, Section E. the Construction of the Proposed Project would emit GHG emissions through the combustion of fossil fuels by heavy-duty construction equipment and through vehicle trips generated by construction workers and vendors traveling to and from the Project Site. These impacts would vary day to day over the duration of
construction activities. Construction emissions of CO2e are estimated to reach a peak level of 15,489 pounds of CO2e per day. Specific significance thresholds for short-term GHG emissions have not been established. Therefore, analysis of focuses on consistency with GHG policies.

The NAT scenario is used to establish a comparison with project-generated GHG emissions. The NAT scenario does not consider site-specific conditions, project design features, or prescribed mitigation measures. The GHG emissions for the Project and its associated NAT scenario are estimated to be 413 and 607 MTCO2e per year, respectively, which shows the Project will reduce emissions by 32 percent from the NAT scenario through Project Design Features, the Project's design, sustainability, site, and land use characteristics, combined with compliance with regulatory requirements. This reduction demonstrates the efficiency of GHG reduction plans policies and measures.

GHG Plan and Policy Consistency

The Project will contribute to cumulative increases in GHG emissions over time in the absence of policy intervention. The Proposed Project would be consistent with a number of relevant plans and policies that govern climate change. In particular, the Proposed Project is consistent with the State's Executive Order S-3-05, which calls for reducing GHG emissions statewide to 1990 levels, including 15.3 percent reductions by 2020. In addition, the Proposed Project is consistent with SCAG's 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, which calls for regional growth and transportation emissions to be consistent with regional and State air pollution objectives. With regard to local policies and regulations, the Proposed Project will comply with the City of Los Angeles' Green Building Ordinance standards that reduce emissions. The Project would be consistent with all applicable strategies recommended in the AB 32 Scoping Plan. As a result, the Proposed Project's individual and cumulative impact on climate change is considered less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Project, in conjunction with the Related Project, would not result in significant cumulative GHG emissions impact. Given the global nature of GHG emissions, the analysis of GHG emissions is by its nature a cumulative impacts analysis. The City's analysis of the Project's GHG impacts accounted for the Project's potential to contribute to the cumulative impact of global climate change. The Project would be consistent with a number of relevant plans and policies that govern climate change. For example, the Project is consistent with the State's Executive Order S-3-05, which calls for reducing GHG emissions statewide to 1990 levels, including 15 percent reductions by 2020. The Project would also comply with the City's Green Building Ordinance standards that reduce emissions beyond a "business-as-usual" scenario. Finally, as discussed further above, the Project would be consistent with and will help achieve all feasible and applicable strategies as recommended in the AB 32 Scoping Plan, which provides the basis for policies that will reduce cumulative GHG emission within California to 1990 levels by 2020. As a result, the Project's cumulative impact on climate change is considered less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant cumulative impacts associated with GHG emissions impacts have been identified.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials

Construction Impacts

Asbestos-Containing Materials (ACMs) Demolition of the buildings on site could release asbestos containing materials, if present in the structures. Exposure to workers or residents in the surrounding community to ACMs during demolition could be a significant impact. However, in accordance with the EPA's NESHAP regulation and SCAQMD's Rule 1403, all materials, which are identified as ACMs must be removed by a trained and licensed asbestos abatement contractor. Provided the removal and disposal of ACMs from the Project Site follows the various required guidelines, the Proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Based on their age, the potential also exists for the on-site structures to contain lead-based paint. Exposure to workers to lead paint during demolition structures could be a significant impact. However, prior to demolition, a qualified lead-paint abatement consultant would be required to comply with applicable state and federal rules and regulations governing lead paint abatement. Provided that abatement rules and regulations are followed, hazardous materials impacts caused by exposure to lead-paint would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

The Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The Project's construction would involve the temporary transport, use, or disposal of potentially hazardous materials, including paints, adhesives, surface coatings, cleaning agents, fuels, and oils. All of those materials would only be used in a short-term nature during construction activities. All potentially hazardous materials would be used and stored in accordance with manufacturers' instructions and handled in compliance with applicable standards and regulations, which would ensure that impacts would be less than significant. Any emission from the use of such materials would be minimal and localized to the Project Site. Since the Project's construction would comply with applicable regulations and would not expose persons to substantial risk resulting from the release of hazardous materials or exposure to health hazards in excess of regulatory standards, no impacts associated with the potential release of hazardous substances during the Project's construction would occur.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the transport, use or handling of hazardous materials have been identified.

Operation

Operations of the Project would consist of typical and common activities associated with operation of a single-family residential development. No hazardous materials would be utilized during dayto-day operation of the Project other than typical housekeeping, restaurant, vehicle, and landscape maintenance materials such as cleaning supplies, paints, fertilizers. The use of these materials would be in small quantities and in accordance with the manufacturers' instructions for transport, use, storage, and disposal. Compliance with these standard practices avoids substantial exposure hazards. Therefore, operation of the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Impacts would be less than significant.

Release of Hazardous Materials within One-Quarter Mile of Schools

The types of hazardous materials associated with routine, day-to-day operation of the Project would include landscaping chemicals that would be used in quantities typical for landscaped residential developments and typical cleaning solvents used for janitorial purposes. Typically, residential landscaping materials and household cleaning supplies are approved for use by the State of California, such that the transport, use and disposal of these materials would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, although the Project Site is located

within one-quarter mile of a school (Louisville High School), Project impacts related to this issue would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the release of hazardous materials within 0.25 miles of existing or proposed schools have been identified.

Listed Hazardous Materials Sites

The risk of environmental contamination affecting the Project Site from surrounding land uses is minimal and thus no significant impacts would occur. As part of the Phase I ESA, a review was performed of reported environmental conditions within ASTM-recommended search distances of the site. The report did not identify any sites within the specified search radii from the Project Site which are listed on governmental databases. Therefore, the risk of the site being affected by an environmental impact from surrounding land uses is considered to be minimal, and as such, no significant impact would occur.

No mitigation measures are required as no significant impacts associated with listed hazardous materials sites have been identified.

Airport Land Use Plan, Or Two Miles Of A Public Airport Or Vicinity Of Private Airstrip

The Proposed Project is not within two miles of a public airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the Project would not have significant impacts related to an airport land use plan or nearby public airports or private airstrips. The Project Site is also not located within two miles of public airport and is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur under the Project.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with a public or public use airport have been identified.

Impair Implementation or Interfere with an Adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan

The Project Site is located in an established suburban area that is well served by the surrounding roadway network. While it is expected that the majority of construction activities for the Project would be confined on-site, short-term construction activities may temporarily affect access on portions of adjacent streets during certain periods of the day. In these instances, the Project would implement traffic control measures (e.g., construction flagmen, signage, etc.) to maintain flow and access. Furthermore, the Project would ensure that adequate emergency access is maintained during construction. Therefore, construction is not expected to result in inadequate emergency access. In addition, operation of the Project would generate traffic in the Project vicinity. Nonetheless, the Project is required to provide adequate emergency access and to comply with Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) access requirements. Subject to review and approval of site access and circulation plans by the LAFD, the Project would not impair implementation or physically interfere with adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plans. Since the Project would not impair the implementation of the City's emergency response plan, the Project would have a less than significant impact with respect to these issues. This impact will also be less than significant.

Wildland Fires

The Proposed Project includes development of residential uses and is located in a mountain fire district and a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) based on criteria that includes fuel

loading, slope, fire weather, and other relevant factors. These areas must comply with the Brush Clearance Requirements of the County Fire Code. The Project Site consists of mostly level or gently sloping terrain. Additionally, the Project Site is surrounded by suburban development and is not immediately adjacent to wildlands. There are no severe site limitations that would restrict access for firefighting equipment. Furthermore, water mains are available adjacent to the site. While the Project Site is located beyond the recommended 1.5-mile response distance from the nearest fire station, the regulatory compliance requirement to provide automatic fire sprinkler systems would mitigate this concern. When considered together, these factors suggest that the Proposed Project would not expose people or structures to a greater than average risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. Therefore, Project impacts related to this issue would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with wildland fires have been identified.

Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Project, in conjunction with the Related Project, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to hazards and hazardous materials. Development of the Proposed Project in conjunction with other anticipated growth in the general area is likely to result in the development of residential and commercial uses. The only specific cumulative development project that is currently being proposed within a 1.5-mile radius of the Project Site is the Clarendon Street Apartments project. This project would develop 335 residential units near the intersection of Topanga Canyon Boulevard and the US 101 (Ventura) Freeway, approximately 1.3 miles from the Project Site. As is typical of residential developments, this cumulative project would be expected to utilize common household products that, while potentially hazardous, have typically been approved as safe by the State of California when used according to instructions. Thus, cumulative impacts related to risk of upset from release of hazardous materials at this residential cumulative development site would be expected to be less than significant. As is the case with the Proposed Project, future cumulative development projects located within a designated wildland fire zone would be required by their respective local jurisdictions to mitigate their individual impacts by compliance with standard Fire Department requirements. Therefore, no significant cumulative impacts pertaining to hazards or wildfire hazards would be anticipated.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant cumulative impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials have been identified.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Violate Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements or Otherwise Degrade Water Quality

The Proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The impact would be less than significant.

Runoff from the Project Site does not directly discharge into Los Angeles River (or any other water body). Accordingly, runoff from the Project Site is considered a non-point source discharge for potential pollutants. Thus, the Proposed Project would not result in any impacts related to point-source discharge that could violate water quality standards.

The Project Site is largely pervious, with little hardscape cover. Approximately 29.3 percent of the Project Site would be covered with impervious surfaces following development of the Project; the

remaining 70.7 percent would remain pervious. The Project Site would be required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") water quality permit from the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. Implementation of appropriate project design features and compliance with local, state, and federal regulations, code requirements, and permit provisions would prevent both short term (construction) and long-term (operational) impacts to water quality.

During the Project's construction, sediment is usually the constituent of greatest potential concern, especially for construction activities during wet weather periods. The greatest risk of soil erosion during the construction phase occurs when the site disturbance peaks due to grading activity and removal and re-compaction or replacement of fill areas. Other pollutants that could affect surface-water quality during the Project construction phase include petroleum products (gasoline, diesel, kerosene, oil, and grease), hydrocarbons from asphalt paving, paints and solvents, detergents, fertilizers, and pesticides (including insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, and rodenticides). The Project Applicant would comply with the applicable requirements of the City's Building Code, which requires wet weather erosion control measures for construction during the rainy season.

To further minimize potential water quality impacts during the construction phase, the Project Applicant would be required to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP") in accordance with the NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Stormwater Associated with Construction Activity and Land Disturbance Activities. The SWPPP would include Best Management Practices ("BMPs") and erosion control measures to prevent pollution and avoid creating substantial additional sources of polluted runoff in stormwater discharges during construction. The SWPPP would be subject to review and approval by the City for compliance with the City's Best Management Practices Handbook. All Project construction activities must also comply with the City's grading, excavation, and fill regulations, which require the implementation of grading and dust control measures. Since the Project's construction would disturb more than one acre of land, the Project Applicant would also be required to obtain coverage under the General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit ("GCASP"), which requires development and implementation of a SWPPP. Construction projects that include grading during the rainy season must also develop a Wet Weather Erosion Control Plan ("WWECP"). Through compliance with NPDES requirements and City Grading regulations. Project impacts related to water guality during construction would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with water quality have been identified.

Deplete Groundwater Supplies or Interfere with Groundwater Recharge

The Proposed Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Therefore, no significant impact would occur.

A significant impact may occur if a project includes deep excavations resulting in the potential to interfere with groundwater movement or included withdrawal of groundwater or paving of existing permeable surfaces important to groundwater recharge. Currently, the Project Site consists primarily of permeable surfaces; however, the site is not designated for groundwater recharge. The Project does not involve any ground water extraction for wells or dewatering for subterranean construction. The Project will also be served by the municipal water and sewer system and no production wells as a water source would be installed. The Project would also not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, yields, or flow directions. Therefore, impacts to groundwater would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with groundwater have been identified.

Permanently or Substantially Alter the Existing Drainage Pattern of the Site

The Proposed Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the Project Site or surrounding area that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site or in flooding on- or off-site. Therefore, impacts related to drainage would be less than significant.

The Project Site does not contain any surface water features, streams, or rivers. A former USGSidentified blueline stream at the site has been diverted and undergrounded and no longer flows across the Project Site. Similarly, runoff from the Project Site discharges to the local existing storm drain infrastructure and does no directly discharge to a stream or river. The Project would not alter the course of any stream or river. The Project would alter the on-site drainage patterns due to the re-grading of the site's topography and the development of the proposed residences that would modify the elevations of the Project Site. However, this alteration would not result in on-site erosion or siltation because all runoff would be directed to areas of BMPs and/or storm drain infrastructure.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with drainage have been identified.

Create or Contribute Runoff Water Which Would Exceed the Capacity of Existing or Planned Stormwater Drainage Systems / Degrade Water Quality

The Proposed Project would not create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Through compliance with existing regulations governing storm water management, the impact would be less than significant.

With respect to the Project's operation, the Project would generate substances that could degrade the quality of water runoff. For example, chemical deposits by cars in parking areas could have the potential to contribute to metals, oil and grease, solvents, phosphates, hydrocarbons, and suspended solids to the storm drain system. However, impacts to water quality would be reduced, as the Project must comply with water quality standards and wastewater discharge BMPs set forth by the County of Los Angeles and State Water Resources Control Board. Design criteria would also be incorporated into the Project to minimize the off-site conveyance of pollutants. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure that water quality impacts remain less than significant.

The Project is required to comply with the NPDES program as well as the requirements set forth in the LAMC. These regulations control water pollution by regulating point sources that discharge pollutants. Therefore, through compliance with existing regulations, the Project's impacts to runoff would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts related to runoff have been identified.

Place Housing Or Structure Within A 100-Year Flood Hazard Area

The Proposed Project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. Therefore, no significant impact would occur.

The Project Site is not located within an area identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") as potentially subject to 100-year floods. The Project Site is not located within a City-designated 100-year or 500-year flood plain. The Project would not introduce people or structures to an area of high flood risk. Therefore, the project would not contain any significant risks of flooding and would not have the potential to impede or redirect floodwater flows, and no impact would occur.

No mitigation measures are required, as no impacts associated with placing housing within a 100year flood hazard area have been identified.

Flooding, Including From Failure Of A Levee or Dam

The Proposed Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

The Project Site does not lie in a potential inundation area or a potentially affected-by-tsunami area. The Girard Reservoir is located northeast and adjacent to the project site, however, the reservoir has been drained since 1989. Therefore, flooding of the project site as a result of a break in the reservoir is unlikely. Flooding from other sources is not expected and the risk of flooding would not be exacerbated by the Project. Therefore, no impact related to risk of loss involving inundation resulting from the failure of a levee or dam would occur.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or a dam have been identified.

Inundation by Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow

No impact would occur related to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow for the Project. A significant impact may occur if a project is sufficiently close to the ocean or other water body to be potentially at risk of the effects of seismically-induced tidal phenomena (i.e., seiche and tsunami) or if the project site is located adjacent to a hillside area with soil characteristics that would indicate potential susceptibility to mudslides or mudflows. The Project Site is not located in a Tsunami Hazard Area as identified in the Safety Element of the City's General plan. The Project Site is also not located in a Tsunami Inundation Zone as identified in the City's ZIMAS Parcel Profile Report, and is located approximately 8 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean and not near any other major water bodies. Therefore, risks associated with seiches or tsunamis would be considered extremely low at the Project Site. With respect to the potential impact from a mudflow, the Project Site is located in a hilly area, however, the site is primarily surrounded by urban development (including the improved Mulholland Drive to the south) and does not contain any potential source for mudflow. Therefore, the site is not subject to a risk of flooding from inundation by seiche or tsunami or subject to significant risk involving mudflow. This impact is considered less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflows have been identified.

Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Project, in conjunction with the Related Project, would not result in a cumulative hydrology, water quality, and groundwater impact. The Project would have a less than significant impact with respect to all hydrology and water quality issues and its associated incremental impacts are therefore not considered cumulatively considerable. The Project would implement

new BMPs that would control stormwater runoff quantity and quality. Other Related Projects in the area would also be required to adhere to regulatory requirements that control stormwater and pollutant discharges and would be required to prepare and implement a SWPPP and/or Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan ("SUSMP"). Compliance with these standards would ensure that the Related Projects would further the objectives of applicable regional water quality plans. Further, the Project Site and surrounding areas are serviced by an MS4 system that is designed with capacity to handle 50-year storm flows from all areas in the developed condition. While the Project and Related Projects may change the on-site land uses, they would remain urban developments planned or served by the existing MS4 system. Also, future development projects within the Project area are likely to be subject to more stringent BMPs than what are in use under the existing conditions, and generally improve existing stormwater flows that discharge from currently vacant parcels or surface parking lots. As such, cumulative impacts to hydrology and water quality would not be cumulatively considerable.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant cumulative impacts associated with hydrology, water quality, and groundwater impacts have been identified.

Land Use and Planning

Physically Divide Any Established Community

The Proposed Project would not place a barrier between existing land uses or prevent free movement along existing north-south or east-west corridors. Furthermore, the Proposed Project is similar in land use and density to the existing residences in the vicinity of the Project Site. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not physically divide any established communities and there would be no impact.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with dividing an established community have been identified.

Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation

The Project would develop a single-family residential development adjacent to other single-family residential lots, and other uses such as a vacant LADWP site, a school, and a commercial shopping center. The Project would increase the intensity of development on the Project Site, but would be compatible in scale and lot size with the adjacent developments and uses. The Project would also be compatible with applicable plans and policies, including SCAG 2016 RTP/SCS, South Coast Air Quality Management Plan ("AQMP"), Congestion Management Program, General Plan Framework, Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills Community Plan, Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan, and the Municipal Code. Therefore, impacts related to land use compatibility would be less than significant. The Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Therefore, no mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations have been identified.

Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan

The Project would not conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. The Project Site is located in an urbanized area. There is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat

conservation plan that applies to the Project Site. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not conflict with any habitat conservation plans and no impacts would occur.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan have been identified.

Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Project, in conjunction with the Related Project, would not result in a significant cumulative land use impact. Cumulative land use impacts could occur if any cumulative development projects would result in incompatible land uses, or result in land uses that are inconsistent with adopted land use plans when combined with the impacts of the Project. One cumulative development project is currently proposed within a 1.5-mile radius of the Project Site. This project, the Clarendon Street Apartments development near the intersection of Topanga Canyon Boulevard and the US 101 (Ventura) Freeway, is located at such a distance from the Project to result in a cumulatively considerable land use impact. Further, all related projects in the City would be subject to the same local development and mitigation standards as the Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not combine with the Related Projects to create a cumulatively significant land use impact and cumulative impacts.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant cumulative impacts associated with land use have been identified.

Mineral Resources

The Proposed Project would cause no impacts to mineral resources. Under the CEQA Guidelines, a project may have an impact to mineral resources if it will (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; or (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.

The Project Site is located within an area classified as MRZ-1, defined as areas where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or likely to be present. No oil extraction or mineral extraction activities have historically occurred or are presently conducted on the Project Site. The Project Site is not located within an Oil Drilling/Surface Mining Supplemental Use District. Should any future mineral resource be discovered on or near the Project Site, development of the Project would not preclude the mineral's extraction, nor would it alter the potential utility of any minerals located beneath the Site. Furthermore, the Project Site is developed and located in an urbanized area. Therefore, the Project would have no impact with respect to loss of availability of a known regionally-important mineral resource or locally-important mineral resource. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

No mitigation measures are required because no significant impacts related to mineral resources have been identified.

<u>Noise</u>

Under CEQA's Guidelines (Appendix G), a project would have a significant impact on noise if it would cause any of the following conditions to occur: (a) exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; (b) exposure of persons to or generation of excessive

groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; (c) a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the projects; (d) a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; (e) for a project located within an airborne land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels; or (f) for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Operational Noise

The Project's operation would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of applicable standards of the applicable CEQA thresholds of significance. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Project's operations would produce both direct and indirect noise impacts on the Project Site from residential-related activities, as well as direct noise impacts from stationary noises associated with building operations, such as heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems, and indirect noise impacts from vehicles traveling on local roads to access the Project Site. The rooftop heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) systems that would be installed for the new residential buildings would typically result in noise levels that average between 40 and 50 dBA L_{eq} at 50 feet from the equipment. Noise levels associated with the HVAC systems of the proposed homes could exceed the City's exterior noise level standard of 60 dBA CNEL for single-family residential uses. However, through compliance with applicable regulations (including the Noise Insulation Standards of Title 24 of the California Code Regulations, which ensure an acceptable interior noise environment, and other regulations requiring proper shielding for all new HVAC systems used by each proposed new home such that the interior noise levels at each new home and at existing nearby homes would be below 45 dBA CNEL), Project impacts would be less than significant.

Off-site noise-sensitive locations surrounding the Project Site could experience a slight increase in noise resulting from the additional traffic generated by the Project. The Project would increase local noise levels by a maximum of 0.1 dBA L_{eq} at several roadway segments, while the rest of the analyzed roadway segments would not experience any increases in noise levels. Because the increase in local noise levels at these analyzed roadway segments resulting from implementation of the proposed project would not exceed the 5 dBA threshold established under the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, they would not represent a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Therefore, off-site noise impacts from operational mobile sources would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant indirect noise impacts associated with the Project's operation have been identified.

Operational Vibration Levels

The Project's operation would not generate vibration levels that would expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. The impact would be less than significant.

Project construction-related vibration levels may reach approximately 0.027 inches per second PPV at the closest offsite residential property. Because the vibration levels experienced at this off-site property would not exceed the FTA's recommended thresholds for building damage of 0.2 inches per second for non-engineered buildings, this impact would be less than significant. The

vibration level that would be experienced by the closest Louisville High School classroom to the Project Site would be approximately 0.004 inches per second PPV. The vibration levels at this location would not exceed the FTA's recommended thresholds for building damage of 0.2 inches per second for non-engineered buildings and this impact would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with vibration from operation of the Project have been identified.

Within Airport Land Use Plan or 2 Miles of a Public Airport/Private Airstrip

The Proposed Project would not expose people working or residing in the project area to excessive noise associated with an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport. Therefore, no significant impact would occur.

There are no airports or private airstrips within a two-mile radius of the Project Site, and the Project Site is not within any airport land use plan or airport hazard zone. The Project would not expose people to excessive noise levels associated with airport uses. Therefore, no significant impact would occur.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with excessive noise associated with an airport land use plan have been identified.

Population and Housing

Under CEQA's Guidelines (Appendix G), a project may have a significant environmental impact if the project would result in one or more of the following: (a) induce substantial 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); (b) displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or (c) displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction or replacement housing elsewhere.

Construction

The construction of the Project would not induce substantial population or housing growth, either directly or indirectly. There would be no significant impacts.

Construction of the Project would result in increased employment opportunities in the construction field, which could potentially result in increased permanent population and demand for housing in the vicinity of the Project Site. However, the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California are such that it is not likely that they would relocate their households as a consequence of the construction employment associated with the Project. The construction industry differs from most other industry sectors. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with substantial population or housing growth related to construction have been identified.

Operation

The Proposed Project would not induce substantial population or housing growth, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project can be expected to generate a total resident population of 51 persons with development of all 19 single-family detached homes. This would not represent substantial population growth within the SCAG Subregion nor the Community Plan Area and represents a

less than significant impact. Thus, operation of the Project would not cause a substantial increase in population. Therefore, no significant impact related to operation-related indirect population growth would occur.

The Project would not induce substantial growth that exceeds growth forecasted for the area, nor would it introduce unplanned infrastructure or accelerate development in an undeveloped area that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment. The Project Site is currently developed with a vacant single-family residence and is located within an urbanized area in the City. The proposed access roadway would only serve the Project and would not provide a through-traffic route for other vehicles. As development of the Project would not induce substantial indirect population growth and would be supported by the existing infrastructure such as roadways, no impact would occur.

In addition to being consistent with household growth forecasts for the City and the Community Plan Area and the population growth associated with the projected housing growth, the Project would be consistent with applicable residential policies set forth in the Community Plan. The Project responds to the unmet housing demand in both the City and Community Plan area. Thus, while the Project would generate a residential population at the site through the development of new housing, it would not substantially induce housing growth beyond forecasted levels. Therefore, impacts related to population and housing growth would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with substantial population or housing growth related to the Project's operation have been identified.

Displace Housing or Persons

The Proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing. Therefore, no significant impact would occur. The Project Site is currently developed with one vacant residence and development of the Project would not displace any people. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with displacing existing housing or people have been identified.

Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Project, in conjunction with the Related Project, would not contribute to significant cumulative impacts associated with population and housing or employment growth. Thus, cumulative housing and population growth would fall within projected levels for the City and cumulative impacts related to population and housing would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant cumulative impacts associated with housing or employment growth have been identified.

Public Services – Fire Protection Facilities

Under CEQA's Guidelines (Appendix G), a project would have a significant impact if the project would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection.

Construction

Construction of the Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. Impacts would be less than significant.

Overall, construction is not considered to be a high-risk activity, and the LAFD is equipped and prepared to deal with construction-related traffic and fires should they occur. Project construction would not be expected to tax fire-fighting and emergency services to the extent that there would be a need for new or expanded fire facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives of the LAFD, due to the limited duration of construction activities and compliance with applicable codes. Therefore, impacts associated with construction of the Project would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with fire protection facilities from construction have been identified.

Operation

The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

The Project would generate new residents and would also increase the amount of developed square footage on the Project Site. Therefore, the Project could result in an increased need for fire protection and emergency medical services at the Project Site. With respect to fire flow, the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power's Water Operations Division would perform a detailed fire flow study at the time of permit review to determine whether further water system or site-specific improvements would be necessary. Hydrants, water lines, and water tanks would be installed per Division 7, Section 57.09.06 of the Fire Code requirements for the Project. The Project Applicant would also be required to submit the proposed plot plans for the LAFD to review for compliance with the City's Fire Code, California Fire Code, City's Building Code, and National Fire Protection Association standards to ensure no undue fire hazard would be created. The Project Site is not located within an Inadequate Fire Hydrant Service Area recognized by the City. As such, with respect to fire flows, fire protection services would be adequate and the associated impact would be less than significant.

With respect to response distance and time, Fire Station No. 84, located at 21050 Burbank Boulevard in Woodland Hills, approximately 2.8 miles from the Proposed Project, is the closest to the Project Site. As required under the City's Fire Code, the Proposed Project would be required to install automatic sprinkler systems due to its distance from the nearest fire station. Compliance with this requirement is designed to address inadequate response times resulting from response distances greater than 1.5 miles. Through compliance with this requirement, the Proposed Project's fire protection would be considered adequate under the Fire Code and no further mitigation is required.

The LAFD has stated that the Project, in conjunction with other approved or planned projects, may result in the need for increased staffing for existing facilities, additional fire protection facilities, or the relocation of facilities. While increased emergency service demand or staffing may be one of many factors that determine the need for new fire facilities, impacts to fire protection are assessed under CEQA based on whether the demand for the services generated by a project would require the construction of new or physically altered facilities, such as fire stations. The

analysis is in accordance with *City of Hayward v. Trustees of California State University* (2015) 242 Cal. App. 4th 833, which held that an increase in demand for public services could lead to potentially significant environmental impacts only if the construction or expansion of a new facility is required, the construction or operation of which might adversely affect the physical environment. Therefore, increased demand for public services, including increased response time or staffing, does not by itself constitute a significant impact that requires mitigation under CEQA. Analysis of whether there is a significant impact related to emergency services is appropriately based on whether a significant environmental impact would result from the construction of new or expanded facilities.

As discussed on page V.A-15 of the Draft EIR and pages IV-31 through IV-32 of the Initial Study, Appendix A of the Draft EIR, the Project would result in a less-than-significant impact with respect to fire protection. The Initial Study identified regulatory compliance measures and reviews by LAFD and LADWP that would be required of the project, including conformance with California Fire Code requirements and review of water pressure and fire flow requirements. The Initial Study also determined that the project would not generate the need for construction of new or expanded fire protection facilities. The development of 19 single-family residences on the site would be inline the anticipated density for the site, allowed by the existing land use designation and zoning on the property, and the project would not be expected to require the construction or alteration of new fire facilities.

Overall, as described above, the Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with fire protection facilities from Project operation have been identified.

Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Project would not result in cumulatively considerable adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

The LAFD has stated that the Project in conjunction with other approved or planned projects may result in the need for additional fire protection facilities or relocation of existing fire protection facilities. Based on a review of the related project list in Section III, Environmental Setting of the Draft EIR and anticipated development of new fire stations identified in LAFD's Strategic Plan 2018-2020, the LAFD does not currently have any plans for new fire stations to be developed in proximity to the Project Site. Given the unknown size and precise location of any future facilities, the infill nature of any fire facility in proximity to the Project and other approved or planned projects, the Draft EIR's conclusion that cumulative impacts are less than significant is supported by substantial evidence. See *City of Hayward v. Board of Trustees* (2015) 242 Cal.App.4th 833 at 842. In addition, the development of potential future fire service stations would also be subject to further CEQA review and evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Additionally, each related project in the Draft EIR would be required to satisfy the response distance, emergency access, and fire flow requirements pursuant to the Los Angeles Fire Code. Similar to the Project, each of the related projects would be individually subject to LAFD review and would be required to comply with all applicable construction-related and operational fire safety

requirements of the LAFD and the City of Los Angeles in order to adequately mitigate fire protection impacts. As such, the Project would not make a cumulatively considerable impact on fire protection services (see Draft EIR p. V.A-15).

No mitigation measures are required, as no cumulative significant impacts associated with fire protection facilities have been identified.

Public Services – Police Services

Under CEQA's Guidelines (Appendix G), a project could have a significant environmental impact if the project would result in substantial adverse physical impacts with the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities, need for new or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection.

Construction

Construction sites could be sources of attractive nuisances, providing hazards and inviting theft and vandalism that could result in an increase in demand for police protection services. The Project Site is generally closed to access and it is not expected that the construction activities associated with the Project would attract theft and vandalism to any significant degree. Although minor traffic delays due to temporary lane closures needed to facilitate specific construction activities could occur, particularly during the construction of utilities and street improvements, impacts to police response times are considered to be less than significant. Therefore, impacts of the Project would be considered less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with police protection during Project construction have been identified.

Operation

The Project would generate new residents and would also increase the amount of developed square footage on the Project Site. The LAPD does not maintain minimum officer-to-resident population ratio objectives, however, the data can serve as a useful metric to gauge the effect of a proposed project on service levels and response times. The Project's additional 51 residents would require less than one additional officer to maintain the current ratio, which would not require the expansion, consolidation, or relocation of the West Valley Community Police Station. Project impacts would be less than significant.

No additional mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with police services have been identified.

Cumulative Impacts

The Project, in conjunction with the Related Project, would not result in cumulatively considerable adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities in order to maintain acceptable service rations, response times, or other performance objectives. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Implementation of the Project in conjunction with the Related Project would increase demand for police protection services based on an increase in resident population. Any new or expanded police station within the West Valley Area would be funded via existing mechanisms (e.g.,

property and sales tax revenue) to which both the Project and the cumulative projects would contribute and would be required to undergo City environmental review to identify any potential adverse environmental impact associated with its construction and/or operation and to identify mitigation for any significant impacts. Each of the cumulative projects would be individually subject to LAPD review, and would be required to comply with all applicable safety requirements of the LAPD and the City of Los Angeles in order to adequately address police protection service demands.

In addition, the cumulative projects would contribute to funding police protection services in the area by generating annual revenue from property taxes that would be deposited into the City's General Fund and could potentially be used to fund the construction of future police protection facilities and support hiring more officers. This would further ensure that the incremental effect of the Project on police protection services would not be cumulatively considerable. Because it would not result in a substantial incremental contribution to the cumulative demand for police protection services, the Project would not have a cumulatively considerable impact on police protection services.

No mitigation measures are required, as no cumulatively significant impacts associated with police services have been identified.

Public Services – Public Schools

Under CEQA's Guidelines (Appendix G), a project may have a significant environmental impact related to schools if it will result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered school facilities, need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impact, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or performance objectives for the school district.

Construction

Construction of the Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered school facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The nearest school to the Project Site is Louisville High School, located approximately 300 feet to the southwest and separated from the Project Site by Mulholland Drive. No sidewalk closures associated with Project construction would occur near Louisville High School. The proposed Haul Truck Route would not pass Louisville High School or any other schools. Therefore, impacts to schools during Project construction would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with school facilities from the Project's construction have been identified.

Operation

Operation of the Proposed Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered school facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives.

The Project would increase the number of residents at the Project Site and the potential need to enroll school-aged children residing at the Project into LAUSD schools would increase the demand for school services. The Proposed Project is estimated to generate 3 elementary school, 1 middle school, and 2 high school students, based on student generation rates published by the

LAUSD. Current school capacity data provided by the LAUSD indicates that the three public schools that would serve the Project have sufficient capacity to accommodate the Project's projected students. In addition, pursuant to the California Government Code, mandatory payment of the school fees established by the LAUSD in accordance with existing rules and regulations regarding the calculation and payment of such fees would, by law, provide full and complete mitigation for any potential direct and indirect impacts to schools as a result of the Project. Mandatory compliance with the provisions of SB 50 regarding payment of school fees is deemed to provide full and complete mitigation of school facilities impacts and no mitigation is required. Therefore, Project impacts to school services would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with school facilities operation have been identified.

Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Project, in conjunction with the Related Project, would not contribute to significant cumulative impacts associated with schools.

Implementation of the Project in conjunction with the cumulative development projects would generate students based on an increase in dwelling units and non-residential uses (employees' students). All of the cumulative development projects would be served by the LAUSD and a portion of them would be located within the same school service zones as the Project, and thus would be impacting the same schools as the Project. Depending on their location, the cumulative projects would be served by a variety of LAUSD schools located in the area. In addition, the students could be enrolled in private schools or one of the LAUSD charter or magnet schools located in the area. All other future projects would be required to pay a school fee to the LAUSD to help reduce cumulative impacts that they may have on school services. Compliance with the provisions of SB 50 is deemed to provide full and complete mitigation of school facilities impacts. Therefore, with the full payment of all applicable school fees, the Project coupled with expected cumulative growth would reduce potential projected cumulative impacts to schools and the Project would not result in a substantial incremental contribution to the cumulative demand for school services.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant cumulative impacts associated with school facilities have been identified.

Public Services – Parks/Recreation

Under CEQA's Guidelines (Appendix G), a project may have a significant environmental impact if it were to: (a) result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for parks; (b) 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; and (c) include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Construction

Construction of the Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered park facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The nearest park to the Project Site is Alizando Drive Park, located approximately 200 feet to the east of the Project Site's east end and separated from the Project Site by Mulholland Drive. The proposed Haul Truck Route would not pass Alizando Drive Park and no sidewalk closures are expected to affect access to this park. Additionally, construction workers at the Project Site would not typically be expected to generate a demand park or recreational facility use. Therefore, impacts to parks during Project construction would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with parks or recreational facilities from the Project's construction have been identified.

Operation

The Proposed Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered parks and recreational facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

A project's impacts with respect to parks and recreational facilities are determined based on the ability of existing parks and recreational facilities in the project area to accommodate the project's need for such facilities. The Project would generate approximately 51 residents. Under the City's Public Recreation Plan ("PRP") within the City's General Plan, the City's standard ratio of neighborhood and community parks to population is four acres per 1,000 persons and the City's standard ratio of regional parks to population is six acres per 1,000 persons. Based on those ratios, the Project would generate a demand of approximately 0.2 acre of new neighborhood and community parkland and 0.3 acre of regional parkland. The Project would also preserve approximately one-half of the Project Site as protected open space, which would serve to reduce the Project's demands and use upon existing recreation and park facilities in the local area.

The Project would not conflict with, or impede implementation of, any of the policies or goals related to parks described in the Framework Element of the General Plan or the Community Plan, which describe the planning of facilities. The Project, through the payment of the required Quimby fees, would help the LADRP achieve progress toward its goal of ensuring adequate park facilities for existing and future residential populations within the Woodland Hills community.

Because the Proposed Project was deemed fully vested by the City prior to the effective date of the 2016 Park Fee ordinance, the Project is not subject to the requirements of this ordinance. However, the Project is required to comply with the sections of the LAMC pertaining to the payment of Quimby and Parkland fees that were in place prior to the effective date of the new Park Fee ordinance. If a final map is recorded, then the Project is subject to Quimby Fees and/or Finn Fees. The Project's compliance with the above-referenced Code requirements collectively address the Project's future demand upon recreation and park facilities by contribution of funds to be placed in a City-controlled account to be used to acquire and develop new parkland areas within the Project's service area.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with parks and recreational facilities have been identified.

Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Project would not result in significant cumulative impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered parks and recreational facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The extent to which the residential Related Project includes parks or recreational amenities is unknown. However, each residential project in the City will be required to comply with the City's Quimby Ordinance and/or Dwelling Unit Construction Tax payment. Compliance with these ordinances would mitigate potential park and recreational facility impacts associated with the construction of these projects. Additionally, the City can use General Fund revenues from these projects to help meet its target parkland planning ratios in order to meet the needs of existing and future development.

Under CEQA Guidelines section 15130(a)(3), a project's contribution to cumulative impacts is less than cumulatively considerable if the project is required to implement or fund its fair share of a mitigation measure designed to alleviate the cumulative impact. Since the Project would be required to mitigate its impacts upon public recreation and park facilities by paying mandatory Quimby/Park fees and/or Recreation and Park Fees in addition to providing the mandatory code-required open space areas and on-site recreational amenities, the Project's impacts would not be considered cumulatively considerable. Those fees are mandatory and proportionate based on the Project's residential density.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant cumulative impacts associated with parks and recreational facilities have been identified.

Public Services – Libraries

Under CEQA's Guidelines, a project may have a significant environmental impact if the project would: (a) result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for library services.

Construction

Construction of the Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered libraries in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The nearest libraries to the Project Site are the Woodland Hills Branch and the Platt Branch Libraries. Construction workers at the Project Site would not typically be expected to generate a demand for library use. Therefore, impacts to libraries during Project construction would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with libraries from the Project's construction have been identified.

Operation

The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered library facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The Project would generate approximately 51 residents. The Project is served by two nearby LAPL library branches as well as the LAPL's Central Library. The library service population areas overlap so there is no discrete population analysis for library service. However, the LAPL has confirmed that there is no need for any planned improvements, either under its Strategic Plan or

otherwise, to add capacity through expansion to any identified branch or build any new libraries in the Project area. The City's CEQA Thresholds Guide considers features (on-site library facilities, direct support to LAPL) that would reduce the demand for library services. It is likely that the residents of the Project would have individual access to internet service, which provides information and research capabilities that studies have shown reduce demand at physical library locations. Further, Measure L has provided funds to restore adequate services to the existing library system. For all of these reasons, it is not anticipated that the Project would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered library facilities, or need for new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for library services. Consequently, impacts to library service would be less than significant.

The Project would not conflict with, or impede implementation of, any of the policies or goals related to libraries described in the Los Angeles General Plan Framework, Los Angeles Public Library Strategic Plan 2015–2020, and the Community Plan. The Project, through the generation of revenue into the City's General Fund, would help the LAPL achieve Objective 9.21, which seeks to ensure library service for current and future residents and businesses; achieve progress toward Goal 1, which seeks to improve communities by updating the Library Facilities Master Plan, planning new libraries, and increasing service hours, among other activities; and achieve progress toward its goal to ensure adequate library facilities and service, including new libraries or expansion of existing libraries.

Although the Project would increase the demand for library services through its resident population, it would not result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Thus, impacts to library services as a result of the Project would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with library facilities have been identified.

Cumulative Impacts

The Project, in conjunction with the Related Project, would not result in a significant cumulative impact associated with library facilities.

The increase in demand for library facilities as a result of these additional residents would be spread among the libraries that are within a two-mile radius of each individual project. The LAPL has indicated that no improvements are either planned or have been identified as necessary to add capacity through expansion to any branch or to build any new libraries in the Project vicinity. Also, Measure L has provided funding to restore adequate services to the existing library system. Furthermore, the cumulative projects, through the generation of revenue into the City's General Fund, would help the LAPL achieve progress toward its goal to ensure adequate library facilities and service, including new libraries or expansion of existing libraries. As such, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant cumulative impacts associated with library facilities have been identified.

Transportation and Traffic

Conflict with Plan, Policy, Ordinance Establishing Circulation System Performance Measures

Construction

The City's CEQA Thresholds Guide identifies four types of in-street construction impacts, including: (1) temporary traffic impacts – potential impacts on vehicular travelers on roadways; (2) temporary loss of access – potential impacts on visitors entering and leaving sites; (3) temporary loss of bus stops or rerouting of bus lines – potential impacts on bus travelers; (4) temporary loss of on-street parking – potential impacts on parkers. Traffic impacts from construction activities could occur as a result of the following types of activities: (i) increases in truck traffic associated with export of fill materials and delivery of construction materials; (ii) increases in automobile traffic associated with construction workers traveling to and from the site; (iii) reductions in existing street capacity or on-street parking from temporary lane closures necessary for the construction of roadway improvements, utility relocation, and drainage facilities; and (iv) blocking existing vehicle or pedestrian access to other parcels fronting street.

Grading Component

No dirt or excavated materials would be exported from the Project Site. At the end of Project construction, approximately 4,200 cubic yards of dirt would be imported to the site to provide fill material. It is estimated that this activity would take approximately four days, with an average of approximately 75 inbound and 75 outbound haul truck trips per day. The haul route used would comply with the approved truck routes designated within the City. Project construction would also require delivery of construction materials. It is estimated that an average of six delivery truck trips per weekday would occur (three inbound, three outbound). No deliveries are planned on Saturday.

Construction Component

Construction activities are planned over a 26-month period and include a maximum of 37 employees per day. Assuming some level of carpooling among these personnel, and assuming an average vehicle ridership of 1.135 persons per vehicle, there would be a maximum of 66 construction personnel trips per day (33 inbound, 33 outbound), most of which would occur outside of the peak hour periods.

Prior to the commencement of all construction activities, the City requires project developers to prepare a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) that is required to implemented during the construction phase, and which includes street closure information, detour plans, haul routes, and staging plans and formalizes how construction would be carried out and identifies specific actions that would be required to reduce effects on the surrounding community. The CTMP is required to be implemented during the construction phase. The CTMP is based on the nature and timing of the specific construction activities and other projects in the project vicinity and would include the following elements, as appropriate:

- Providing for temporary traffic control during all construction activities adjacent to public right-of-way to improve traffic flow on public roadways (e.g., flag men):
- Scheduling of construction activities to reduce the effect on traffic flow on surrounding arterial streets;
- Rerouting construction trucks to reduce travel on congested streets to the extent feasible;
- Prohibiting construction-related vehicles from parking on surrounding public streets;
- Providing safety precautions for pedestrians and bicyclists through such measures as alternate routing and protection barriers;
- Accommodating all equipment on-site;

- Scheduling of construction-related deliveries to reduce travel during commuter peak hours; and
- Obtaining the required permits for the truck haul routes from the City prior to issuance of any permit for the Project.

The CTMP for the Project would prohibit construction-related vehicles and construction workers from parking on surrounding public streets. Adequate parking for construction workers would be provided at a designated on-site or off-site location. Thus, construction workers and vehicles would not reduce the availability of spaces on streets surrounding the Project Site. Also, no bus stops would be relocated and no bus lines would be rerouted due to Project construction.

Construction of the Project would be largely contained within the Project Site and would not affect adjacent street access. In addition, any delays from additional construction traffic and/or construction activities at locations other than the streets adjacent to the Project Site would not be substantial. Certain construction activities such as roadway improvements, utility relocation or extension, and drainage facility reconstruction could require temporary lane closures, which would in turn temporarily reduce existing street capacity, but such impacts would be short-term in duration.

With the implementation of safety procedures and other controls set forth in the required CTMP, construction would not create hazards for roadway travelers or bus riders. The impacts of construction activity on the overall transportation system would be temporary in nature and would cause minimal interruption to the regular operation of the facilities surrounding the Project site. Impacts on traffic associated with construction (e.g., an intermittent reduction in street and intersection operating capacity) are typically considered short-term impacts, but not significant. Therefore, Project construction traffic impacts would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant cumulative impacts associated with library facilities have been identified.

Operation

The number of trips to be generated by the Project was calculated using trip generation rates from the current Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation manual, 9th Edition. The trip generation calculations were reviewed and approved by LADOT. As shown on Table V.I-6 of the Draft EIR, it is estimated that the Project would generate 181 daily trips, including 14 trips during the AM peak hour and 19 trips during the PM peak hour.

Intersection Impacts to Existing Conditions With the Project

The Proposed Project's traffic impacts compared to existing (2015) conditions would not exceed significance thresholds at the intersections studied in the Study Area.

All five study intersections are expected to continue to operate at LOS C or better during both the morning and afternoon peak hours under Existing with Project Conditions. Additionally, all of the projected increases in intersection volume/capacity (V/C) ratios caused by Project-generated traffic would be less than the threshold for a significant impact to occur. Therefore, the Project would not cause any significant traffic impacts in either the morning or afternoon peak hour when compared to existing conditions.

No mitigation is needed because the impacts would be less than significant.

Intersection Impacts to Future Conditions With the Project

The Proposed Project's traffic impacts under future (2018) conditions would not exceed significance thresholds at the intersections studied in the Study Area.

All five study intersections are expected to continue to operate at LOS D or better during both the morning and afternoon peak hours under Future with Project Conditions. Additionally, all of the projected increases in intersection volume/capacity (V/C) ratios caused by Project-generated traffic would be less than the threshold for a significant impact to occur. Therefore, the Project would not cause any significant traffic impacts in either the morning or afternoon peak hour when compared to future conditions.

No mitigation is needed because the impacts would be less than significant.

Congestion Management Program

The Proposed Project would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program ("CMP"). The impact would be less than significant.

The Los Angeles County CMP requires that a traffic impact analysis be performed for all CMP arterial monitoring intersections where a project would add 50 or more trips during either the weekday morning or afternoon peak hours. The CMP also requires that a traffic impact analysis be performed for all CMP mainline freeway monitoring locations where a project would add 150 or more trips (in either direction) during the weekday morning or afternoon peak hours. The Project's largest peak-hour trip generation would be 19 trips in the PM peak hour, which is well under the 50-trip threshold triggering CMP analyses. Therefore, the Project's CMP impacts are considered to be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the CMP have been identified.

Air Traffic Patterns

The Proposed Project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. No impact would occur.

The Project does not include any aviation-related uses and the Project Site is not located within two miles of an airport. No impact would occur.

No mitigation measures are required, as no impacts associated with air traffic or airports have been identified.

Substantially Increase Hazards Due to a Design Feature

The Proposed Project would not substantially increase traffic hazards due to a design feature. The impact would be less than significant.

A cul-de-sac new private street, extending southerly into the Project Site from San Feliciano Drive, would provide vehicular access for 12 of the 19 homes. Three homes would have direct access on San Feliciano Drive via a single entrance. Another entrance, extending northwesterly into the site from Mulholland Drive, would serve the four remaining homes. There would be no internal vehicular connection between the new private street and Mulholland Drive.

The new private street would intersect a straight section of San Feliciano Drive. The speed limit on San Feliciano Drive is 25 miles per hour (MPH). Assuming a design speed of 35 MPH for San Feliciano Drive, i.e., 10 MPH higher than the 25 MPH speed limit, the current Caltrans Design

Manual, 6th Edition indicates a stopping sight distance of 250 feet for a 35 MPH design speed. Stopping sight distance is the distance required by the driver of a vehicle, traveling at a given speed, to bring the vehicle to a stop after an object on the roadway becomes visible. In this case, the object would be either a vehicle on San Feliciano Drive proceeding toward the new private street intersection or a vehicle on the new private street waiting to turn onto San Feliciano Drive. Based on measurements on the Project tract map, it is estimated that a stopping sight distance of 250 feet would be provided for either vehicle at this new private street location.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts have been identified. However, Project Design Feature I-1 will be required for an additional red curb extension to further reduce the less than significant impacts associated with the Project.

Project Design Features

I-1 – To ensure that vehicles using the Project internal roadway are visible from westbound San Feliciano Drive, the red curb on the southeast corner of the internal Project roadway and San Feliciano Drive intersection will be extended. The red curb shall be continued for 25 feet along the straight curb on the south side of San Feliciano Drive to the east of the intersection.

Inadequate Emergency Access

The Proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access. No impact would occur.

Vehicular access to the Project would be provided by the construction of a curvilinear private culde-sac which connects to San Feliciano Drive at the northern part of the site. Thus, the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Further, the project would be constructed according to California Fire Code requirements regarding length and width of roads and accesses.

No mitigation measures are required, as no impacts associated with emergency access have been identified.

Conflicts with Public Transit, Bicycle, or Pedestrian Facilities

The Proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies concerning public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, nor would it decrease the safety of such facilities. No impact would occur.

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) is the primary service provider in the San Fernando Valley. Route 245 operated by the MTA is within fairly reasonable walking distance (approximately half a mile) from the Project Site. In addition, the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) and the Santa Clarita Transit Authority (SCTA) operate commuter express routes throughout the Valley. The Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Therefore, there would be no impact to adopted policies or existing alternative transportation facilities.

No mitigation measures are required, as no impacts associated alternative transportation facilities have been identified.

Utilities and Service Systems – Wastewater

Under CEQA's Guidelines, a project would have a potentially significant wastewater impact if it were to result in one or more of the following: (a) exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board; (b) require or result in the construction of

new wastewater treatment facility or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects; (c) require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects; or (d) 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.

Wastewater Generation and Infrastructure

The Project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts. Project compliance with City regulations would ensure the Project's impacts associated with wastewater infrastructure remain less than significant.

It is estimated that operation of the Project would generate a net total of approximately 4,370 gallons per day (gpd) (or 0.004 mgd) of wastewater. As part of the building permit process, the City will confirm and ensure that there is sufficient capacity in the local and trunk lines to accommodate the Project's wastewater flows. Further detailed gauging and evaluation would be needed as part of the permit process to identify the specific sewer connection point. If the public sewer is found to have insufficient capacity, then the Project Applicant would be required to build new sewer lines to a point in the sewer system with sufficient capacity. A final approval for sewer capacity and connection permit would be made at that time. During the construction phase of the Project, an application for a sewer connection permit and Sewer Capacity Availability Review (SCAR) must be submitted to the City. The Project Applicant would also pay any required sewer connection fees.

The potential construction of larger capacity sewer lines, or sewer connections, would not result in significant impacts as the construction would be of short duration and would occur with the implementation of best practices, such as the use of a flagman during work within the public right of way, to avoid significantly impacting traffic or emergency access. The Project's 0.004 mgd net increase in wastewater generation would represent a very small fraction of the existing 450 mgd daily treatment capacity at the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP). Therefore, the HTP has enough remaining capacity to accommodate the Project.

The wastewater generated by the Project would be similar to that of other existing residential uses in the area. No industrial discharge into the wastewater or drainage system would occur. As HTP complies with the state's wastewater treatment requirements and the Project's wastewater generation is well within the plant's existing capacity, the Project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of LAWQCB. Therefore, no significant impacts with regard to wastewater treatment requirements or treatment plant outflow quality would occur.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with wastewater treatment facilities have been identified.

Stormwater

The Project would not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. The impact would be less than significant.

The Project would not create or contribute to runoff water that would result in the need for any additional stormwater drainage facilities. In 2011, the City amended the City's Stormwater Ordinance (LAMC 64.70) and expanded on the City's existing Standard Urban Stormwater

Mitigation Plan ("SUSMP") to implement Low Impact Development ("LID"), a stormwater management strategy that seeks to prevent impacts of runoff and storm water pollution as close to its source as possible. Since the Project will add more than 500 feet of square feet of impervious area, it must comply with the LID Ordinance, including the LID's Best management Practices as determined on a case by case basis by public works. If the LID's Best Management Practices are not feasible, the City's SUSMP Best Management Practices would apply. The Project would also be required to obtain a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") water quality permit from the LARWQCB. Further, implementation of appropriate project design features and compliance with local, State, and federal regulations, code requirements, and permit provisions would prevent significant impacts related to the release of potentially polluted discharge into surface water. Construction activities would also be subject to the City's inspection and implementation of stormwater Best management Practices. The Project would also comply with the California Building Standards Commission requirements for irrigation systems. Based on its compliance with all those requirements, the Project would not require the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with new storm drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities have been identified.

Cumulative Impacts

The Project, in conjunction with the Related Project, would not contribute to a significant cumulatively considerable impact associated with wastewater or stormwater. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Implementation of the Project in conjunction with the Related Projects would increase demand for wastewater services provided by the City's sewer system. The Related Projects within the City are served by the same sewer system as the Project Site, and thus are counted as part of the cumulative analysis.

As with the Project, the cumulative projects would rely on the wastewater treatment services provided by the HTP. The existing remaining capacity of the HTP is approximately 88 million gpd. The cumulative sewage generation of the Project and the cumulative projects within the surrounding area would be well within the design capacity of the HTP. As such, the Project's incremental effect on cumulative impacts to wastewater treatment capacity would not be cumulatively considerable.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant cumulative impacts associated with wastewater or stormwater drainage have been identified.

<u>Utilities and Service Systems – Water</u>

Water Demand, Supplies, and Infrastructure

Sufficient water supplies are available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Certain construction activities for the Project would consume water, such as soil watering (i.e. for fugitive dust control), clean up, masonry, painting, and other related activities. Typically, fugitive dust watering is provided by private purveyors and not provided by on-site water sources. Reclaimed water can also be used for dust control. Since the Project's construction would occur in various stages, construction activities would occur intermittently and would be short-term and

temporary in nature. Further, the activities requiring water would not create substantial water demand. Overall, construction activities would require minimal water consumption and would not be expected to have adverse impacts on available water supplies or existing water distribution systems.

As part of the building permit process, the City would confirm that there is sufficient capacity in the water supply and infrastructure to accommodate the Project's water needs. If there is a deficiency that would prevent the Project from receiving an adequate level of service, the Project Applicant will fund the required upgrades to adequately serve the Project. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Project Site is served by the Los Angeles Aqueduct Filtration Plant (LAAFP), which has a capacity to treat approximately 600 million gallons per day (mgd) and is currently operating at 75 percent of its capacity. The Proposed Project would consume approximately 4,807 gallons of water daily (or 0.005 mgd), and therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project is not expected to measurably reduce the LAAFP's capacity. The Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact.

Water services will be provided from the LADWP's 1240 service zone. It is likely that the residential development would entail extension of existing utilities that serve surrounding residential uses. Decisions regarding water distribution system extensions are made during the City's Subdivision process. Data from the LADWP's hydraulic analysis and the Project Applicant's street improvement plans must be evaluated to decide water service options for the Proposed Project. If it is determined that water mains or infrastructure upgrades are required, the Project Applicant would pay for such upgrades and a temporary disruption in service may occur, with proper notification to LADWP customers. Therefore, impacts resulting from water infrastructure improvements would be considered less than significant.

Additionally, given the incremental increase in water consumption for the Project, and compliance with applicable water conservation ordinance and regulations such as California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 20, Section 1604; CCR Title 22; City Ordinances 165,004 and 166,080; the Project would not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities. The 2015 LADWP Urban Water Management Plan takes into account drought conditions. After adjusting for economy and drought conditions, projected water demands can vary by approximately \pm 5 percent in any given year due to average historical weather variability. This means that water demands under cool/wet weather conditions could be as much as 5 percent lower than normal demands on average; while water demands under hot/dry weather conditions could be as much as 5 percent higher than normal demands on average. Therefore, the Project's anticipated operational water demand would be considered to have a less than significant impact.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with impacts to water demand, supply, or infrastructure have been identified.

Fireflow

The Project would not have significant impacts to the water conveyance system for fireflows. The impact would be less than significant.

The Project design includes design features to increase the capacity of existing water infrastructure in accordance with LADWP standards, which take into account LAFD fire flow and pressure requirements. Furthermore, the Water Operations Division of the LADWP would perform a detailed fire flow study at the time of permit review in order to ascertain whether further water system or site-specific improvements would be necessary. Hydrants, water lines, and water tanks

would be installed per Fire Code requirements for the Project. In addition, the Project Applicant would be required to submit the proposed plot plans for the Project to the LAFD for review for compliance with applicable Los Angeles Fire Code, California Fire Code, City of Los Angeles Building Code, and National Fire Protection Association standards, thereby ensuring that the Project would not create any undue fire hazard.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the water conveyance system for water flows have been identified.

Cumulative Impacts

The Project, in conjunction with the Related Project, would not contribute to a significant cumulatively considerable impact associated with water supplies. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Implementation of the Project in conjunction with the Related Projects would increase demand for water services provided by the City's water supply system. The Related Projects within the City are served by the same system as the Project Site (LADWP), and thus are counted as part of the cumulative analysis. Through its UWMP, the LADWP anticipates its projected water supplies will meet demand through the year 2040, including anticipated growth projections and demographic changes. In terms of the City's overall water supply condition, the water requirement for any Related Project that is consistent with the City's' General Plan has been accounted for in the planned growth of the City's water system. Additionally, any Related Project that conforms to the demographic projections from SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan ("RTP") and is located in the service area is considered to have been included in LADWP's water supply planning efforts. Therefore, projected water supplies would meet projected demands. Similar to the Project, each Related Project would also be required to comply with City and state water code and conservation programs for both water supply and infrastructure. Further, each of the Related Projects is required to be consistent with the SCAG RTP projections in order to be accounted for the City's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan's current and projected available water demands. As the Related Projects must be consistent with and accounted for in those projections, no significant cumulative water supply impact is anticipated from development of the Project and the Related Projects, and the LAAFP would have adequate capacity to treat the cumulative water demand from the Project and Related Projects.

In addition, the potential need for the Related Projects to upgrade water lines to accommodate their water needs is site-specific and there is little, if any, relationship between development of the Project and the Related Projects in relation to this issue. Therefore, no cumulative water infrastructure impacts or water treatment facilities impacts are anticipated for the development of the Project and the Related Projects. Also, citywide water conservation efforts would be expected to partially offset the cumulative demand for water. For example, LADWP undertakes expansion or modification of water services infrastructure to serve future growth in the City as required in the normal process of providing water service. For all of those reasons, the Project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable effect on water service and supply. Therefore, the cumulative impacts of the Related Projects in combination with the Project would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant cumulative impacts associated with water service and supply have been identified.

<u>Utilities and Service Systems – Solid Waste</u>

Construction

The Project would be served by landfills with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the solid waste disposal needs from the Project's construction. The impact would be less than significant.

During the 26-month construction period, Project demolition and construction activities would generate a small amount of construction waste. The Project's demolition and construction debris would primarily be classified as inert waste and would be recycled in accordance with the California Green Building Standards Code, which requires 50 percent of C&D debris be recycled, as well as the LAMC Section 66.32 which requires 70 percent of solid waste (including C&D debris) generated in the City to be recycled.

The remaining waste would be disposed of in a Class III landfill or a mixed debris recycling facility. The projected total amount of daily Project construction waste (after diversion) would equate to a fraction of one percent of the combined existing daily intake of the available landfills. Thus, as existing landfills and waste facilities have sufficient capacity to handle the Project's amount of construction waste, construction related solid waste impacts would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with solid waste from construction have been identified.

Operation

The Project would be served by landfills with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the solid waste disposal needs from the Project's operations. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

The Project is estimated to generate a net total of approximately 232 pounds per day of solid waste. This total is a conservative scenario and does not account for the effectiveness of the recycling efforts that the Project would implement. The Project would be required to provide adequate space for disposing of recyclable materials. While landfills have a finite amount of space, proposals for expansions of existing landfills, the opening of new facilities, and the development of new waste disposal technologies would facilitate solid waste disposal facilities and other waste management options to continue to be available to the Project. Thus, solid waste generated during operation of the Project would result in a less than significant impact.

The City is served by the Sunshine Canyon City/County Landfill and the Chiquita Canyon Landfill. The Sunshine Canyon Landfill currently accepts 9,000 tpd on weekdays and 3,000 tpd on Saturday, but can accept 12,100 tpd. Therefore, the Sunshine Canyon City Landfill could accommodate the additional estimated 0.12 ton per day increase in solid waste resulting from the Project's operation. Additionally, pursuant to AB 939, each city and county in the state must divert 50% of its solid waste from landfill disposal through source reduction, recycling, and composting. The City achieved a waste diversion rate of 76.40 percent in FY 2013 and is on track toward its goal to achieve a 90 percent diversion by 2025.

The Project would be served by landfills with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs and would not require an additional solid waste collection route or recycling or disposal facility. Operation of the Project would not require the need for additional solid waste facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects or substantially or incrementally exceed the future scheduled capacity of any landfill. Further the Project would comply with existing regulations for solid waste recycling and diversion. Operational solid waste impacts would be less than significant for the Project.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with solid waste have been identified.

Cumulative Impacts

The Project, in conjunction with the Related Project, would not contribute to a significant cumulatively considerable impact associated with solid waste.

Implementation of the Project in conjunction with the Related Projects would increase solid waste generation. The landfills would have adequate capacity to accept the cumulative projects' construction waste. The cumulative construction debris generated by the Project combined with the Related Projects would constitute a small percentage of remaining inert landfill capacity. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to disposal of demolition and construction debris would not be cumulatively considerable.

With respect to operation, similar to the Project, the Related Projects would participate in regional source reduction and recycling programs pursuant to AB 939, further reducing the amount of solid waste to be disposed of at the landfills serving the City. Related Projects would also be required to participate in recycling programs, thus reducing the amount of solid waste to be disposed of at the landfills servicing the amount of solid waste to be disposed of at the landfills servicing the City. To provide a conservative estimate, the City assumed that all solid waste generated by the Related Projects would be delivered to the Sunshine Canyon Landfill, which can accommodate the additional daily increase in solid waste resulting from the cumulative projects.

The County has also supported State legislation that encourages the development of waste conversion technologies (i.e. AB 1939 in 2000 and AB 2770 in 2002). The ongoing process of improving solid waste facilities and advancing disposal techniques and strategies would further minimize the already less than significant impact on cumulative solid waste generation and disposal. The Related Projects would also act to implement the applicable City and County Waste diversion goals and policies, including the City's Solid Waste Management Policy Plan, the Source Reduction Recycling Element, the Framework Element, the Solid Resources Infrastructure Strategy Facilities Plan, the City's Municipal Code, and the County's Integrated Waste Management Plan, and Source Reduction Recycling Element. For all of those reasons, cumulative impacts associated with solid waste would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant cumulative impacts associated with solid waste have been identified.

Utilities and Service Systems – Energy

Construction

The Project's construction would not require new energy supply facilities; would not lead to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy; would comply with all applicable energy conservation measures; and would incorporate energy conservation measures. Impacts related to energy conservation and energy resources from the Project's construction would be less than significant.

It is estimated that up to 75 haul truck (round) trips per day over a four-day period would be required to haul the imported fill material to the Project Site. The majority of the equipment will likely be diesel-fuels; however, smaller equipment such as air compressors and lifts may be electric-, gas-, or natural-gas fuels. Construction equipment fuels (diesel, gas, or natural gas) would be provided by local regional suppliers and vendors. The transportation fuel required by

construction workers would depend on the total number of worker trips estimated for the duration of construction activity (66 personnel trips per day). The expected construction gasoline and diesel fuel gas for the Project would be negligible compared with statewide supplies and would be accommodated by local or regional suppliers and vendors. Therefore, gas impacts during construction would be less than significant.

The Project would have short-term construction impacts, as construction activities would consume relatively minor quantities of electricity, including temporary use of lighting and small power tools. These tools and lighting would be powered with charging stations supplied by portable generators. There would be no use of any permanent infrastructure for the delivery of electricity until after construction of the buildings. The electrical demand generated by these tools and lighting is substantially less than the Project's operational demand. Electricity for the Project's construction, when needed, would be supplied by the local utility provider (LADWP) via existing on-site connections. This would be consistent with suggested measures in the City's CEQA Thresholds Guide to reduce air pollution by using electricity from power poles rather than from temporary diesel or gasoline powered generators. Therefore, electricity impacts during construction would be less than significant.

Further, the Project would use construction contractors who demonstrate compliance with applicable California Air Resources Board ("CARB") regulations governing the accelerated retrofitting, reporting, or replacement of heavy-duty diesel on- and off-road equipment. Compliance with CARB's anti-idling and emission regulations would result in efficient use of construction-related energy and the minimization or elimination of wasteful and unnecessary consumption of energy.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with energy conservation have been identified from the Project's construction.

Operation

The Project's operation would not require new energy supply facilities; would not lead to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy; would comply with all applicable energy conservation measures; and would incorporate energy conservation measures. Impacts related to energy conservation and energy resources from the Project's operation would be less than significant.

For the Project's electricity demands, electrical conduits, wiring, and associated infrastructure would be conveyed to the Project from existing LADWP lines in the surrounding streets to the Project during construction. LADWP's current and planned electricity supplies would be sufficient to support the Project's electricity consumption. The Project would be in compliance with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (Calgreen) requiring building energy efficiency standards, and would also be in compliance with the LA Green Building Code. Electrical service would be provided in accordance with LADWP's Rules Governing Water and Electric Service. Based on the above analysis, no operational impacts associated with the consumption of electricity would occur.

The Project's natural gas demand would represent a fraction of one percent of Southern California Gas Company's peak demand in 2020. As such, there is adequate supply capacity and no impacts would occur. Further, the Project would be responsible for paying connection costs to connect its on-site service meters to existing infrastructure. The Project would not result in the construction of natural gas facilities (i.e., natural gas distribution lines) that would cause significant environmental impacts. Project design features for building efficiency would also help alleviate

natural gas demand. Therefore, the Project would not lead to impacts on natural gas infrastructure and Project impacts related to natural gas would be less than significant.

The Project would also not lead to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of transportation energy. Project-related vehicles would require a negligible fraction of the state's total transportation fuel consumption. With compliance with regulatory measures, the Project's operations would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of transportation energy.

The Project's potential to use energy provided by alternative resources to meet the Project's operational demands is constrained by the energy portfolio mix managed by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power ("LADWP", the Project's service provider) and by limitations on the availability or feasibility of on-site energy generation. LADWP has committed to meetings the requirements under the California Renewable Energy Resources Act by procuring at least 33 percent of its renewable energy portfolio from renewable sources by 2020 from by the procurement of energy from eligible renewable resources to the extent permitted by fiscal constraints, renewable energy pricing, system integration limits, and transmission constraints. LADWP's existing renewable energy resources included small hydro, wind, solar, and biogas, which accounted for 20 percent of its overall energy mix. This represents the available off-site renewable sources of energy that would meet the Project's demand. With respect to on-site renewable energy sources, due to the Project's location, there are no local sources of energy from the following sources: biodiesel, biomass hydroelectric and small hydro, digester gas, fuel cells, landfill gas, municipal solid waste, ocean thermal, ocean wave, and tidal current technologies, or multi-fuel facilities using renewable fuels. Geothermal energy requires the installation of a heat exchanger consisting of a network of below-ground pipes to convey heated or cooled air into a building. Methane can be a renewable derived biogas, but it is not available on the Project Site in commercially viable quantities or form, and its extraction and treatment for energy purposes would result in secondary impacts. Methane is also currently regulated as a hazardous material by the City. Solar and wind power could be used to augment, but not replace, natural gas-fired energy power generation. However, wind-powered energy is not viable on the Project Site due to the lack of sufficient wind in the Los Angeles basin. The Project Site was not identified in a study by the California Energy Commission as an area with wind resource potential. Also, there are no viable sites within the Project Site for placement and operation of a wind turbine. With respect to solar energy, the California Energy Commission determined Los Angeles County has a relatively high photovoltaic potential. However, most of the high potential areas in Los Angeles County are located in the northeastern corner of the County, approximately 65 miles from the Project Site. Additionally, the California Energy Commission determined inland counties are more suitable for large-scale solar power generation.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with energy conservation have been identified from the Project's operation.

Cumulative Impacts

The Project, in conjunction with the Related Project, would not contribute to a significant cumulatively considerable impact associated with energy conservation.

The Project in conjunction with the Related Projects would increase demand for electricity. Although future development would result in the use of renewable and non-renewable energy during Project construction and operation, the use of such resources would be generally consistent with the growth expectations for the LADWP service area. Each Related Project would also be required to comply with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations ("CalGreen") requiring building energy efficiency standards and would be in compliance with the City's Green

Building Code. Further, each project would need to be consistent with how the LADWP serves each location with its existing distribution infrastructure. Thus, the cumulative projects are within the anticipated demand of the LADWP system and, accordingly, there is adequate energy capacity to service the Project and the cumulative projects. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Implementation of the Proposed Project in conjunction with the Related Projects would also increase demand for natural gas. Although future development projects would result in the irreversible use of natural gas resources which could limit future availability, the use of such resources would be consistent with regional and local growth expectations for SoCalGas's service area.

Also, forecasted growth would incorporate design features and energy conservation measures, as required by Title 24 of the CCR (CalGreen) requiring building energy efficiency standards, and would also be in compliance with the LA Green Building Code, which would reduce the impact on natural gas demand. It is also anticipated that future developments would upgrade distribution facilities, commensurate with their demand, in accordance with all established policies and procedures. There would be sufficient statewide supplies to accommodate the statewide requirements from 2020-2035. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

No mitigation measures are required, as no significant cumulative impacts associated with energy conservation have been identified.

V. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WITH MITIGATION

The EIR determined that the Project has potentially significant environmental impacts in the areas discussed below. The EIR identified feasible mitigation measures to avoid or substantially reduce the environmental impacts in these areas to a level of less than significant. Based on the information and analysis set forth in the EIR, the Project would not have any significant environmental impacts in these areas, as long as all identified feasible mitigation measures are incorporated into the Project. The City again ratifies, adopts, and incorporates the full analysis, explanation, findings, responses to comments, and conclusions of the EIR.

<u>Aesthetics</u>

Impact Summary

Scenic Resources

The major scenic resource on the Project Site is its trees. There are no rock outcroppings, historic buildings, etc. on the Project Site. Native trees (including oaks and black walnuts) are specifically protected by ordinance in the City of Los Angeles, particularly along the Mulholland Scenic Parkway; therefore, any removal of an oak tree must be considered a potentially significant aesthetic impact on scenic resources.

The retaining walls would only be minimally visible from Mulholland Drive and San Feliciano Drive and none of the oak trees would be removed to accommodate the retaining walls; rather, the walls have been proposed to reduce impacts to oak trees. Therefore, the retaining walls would not substantially damage scenic resources and their impact with respect to scenic resources would be less than significant.

The construction of the proposed homes would reduce visibility of the on-site oak woodland, the site's major scenic resource. Because the reduced visibility of the oak trees could be considered

damage to a scenic resource, the Proposed Project would be considered to have a significant aesthetic impact on scenic resources unless mitigated.

Existing Visual Character

Since the proposed development would substantially affect the existing visual character or quality of the Project Site, its impact with respect to existing visual character is considered significant. Since the retaining walls would only be minimally visible from Mulholland Drive and San Feliciano Drive, the use of retaining walls would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The loss of views of the on-site oak woodland would substantially affect the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The loss of views of the Project Site; this impact is therefore considered significant without mitigation.

Project Design Features

B-1 - The Project Applicant shall prepare and implement a Landscape Plan. The Landscape Plan shall provide planting and maintenance guidance for common landscaped areas, slopes, and undeveloped building pads. The Project Applicant shall be responsible for the Plan's implementation until the individual homes are occupied by residents who will take over landscape maintenance responsibilities. The Landscape Plan shall be subject to the review and approval by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan Design Review Board and the City of Los Angeles' Planning Department prior to issuance of the grading permit. Landscaping and irrigation for each lot shall be fully installed prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for the residence on any individual lot. Major features of the landscape plan shall include:

1) A listing of plant species appropriate for use for both temporary slope stabilization purposes and long-term landscaping designs for common slope and private yard areas. The plan shall emphasize the use of drought-tolerant, fire retardant, native plant species. Only non-invasive non-native plant species shall be included in the listing of acceptable planting materials. In addition, wherever practical, plants which are relatively pest resistant and which require a minimum of added nutrients shall be utilized in landscaping;

2) Retention of a landscape contractor thoroughly familiar with the provisions of the Landscape Plan for ongoing implementation of the Landscape Plan;

3) Preservation and protection of existing trees and shrubs, wherever possible. Procedures for the care and maintenance of native trees retained on the Project Site shall be specified, and shall include supplemental irrigation for trees located along the existing fill slope supporting Mulholland Drive (including the areas in which Tree Nos. 18-35, 186, and 192 are located) during the rainy season. The Project Applicant shall provide protected tree maintenance information to the purchasers of individual homes within the Proposed Project; and

4) Utilization of a design that achieves the total screening of Project homes from the Mulholland Drive public right-of-way through the planting of new native trees and shrubs.

Mitigation Measures

B-11 – The replacement trees shall be planted in the newly landscaped areas of the Project.

B-12 – The preserved trees, especially the protected species trees, within 50 feet of the proposed construction areas shall be fenced with a temporary chain-link (or similar) protective fence at their driplines (or at the location of approved encroachment) prior to the start of any on-site grading.

This fencing shall remain intact until the City of Los Angeles' Planning Department or Urban Forestry Division, Bureau of Street Services allows it to be removed or relocated.

B-13 – All footing excavations within the driplines shall be dug by hand work only, to a maximum depth of 5 feet (or to a depth that CAL-OSHA, OSHA or local codes allow). Any excavation below the approved depth may be done with acceptable machinery. All footings within the preserved tree driplines shall be of "post type" rather than of "continuous type" to lessen potential root damage.

B-14 – No other on-site protected species trees shall be encroached upon within their driplines other than those identified in the Horticultural Tree Report in Appendix G of the Draft EIR.

B-15 – No over-excavation outside of any cut and/or fill slopes ("tops" or "toes") for the proposed construction shall occur within the dripline of any on-site oak trees, unless required by the Project's structural engineer and approved by the Department of Building and Safety Grading Division, Department of City Planning, and Urban Forestry Division, Bureau of Street Services.

B-16 – No landscape, irrigation lines, utility lines, and/or grade changes shall be designed and/or installed within the dripline of any protected trees, unless approved by the Department of City Planning Department or Urban Forestry Division, Bureau of Street Services.

B-17 – The bare areas within the driplines of any on-site or overhanging protected trees, or within 50 feet of approved grading/construction near protected trees shall be covered with an insect and disease free organic mulch (minimum depth of 2 inches thick and no closer than 6 inches from their trunks and extending to approximately 10 feet outside the dripline).

B-18 – Mature protected trees to be retained shall be examined by a qualified arborist prior to the start of construction. Some of the Project's saved protected trees are in need of minor dead wood removal. No major structural pruning shall be permitted. A qualified arborist shall complete all dead wood removal and/or pruning.

B-19 – During construction, examination of the trees to be retained shall be performed monthly by a qualified arborist to ensure that they are being adequately protected and maintained. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for each residence, a qualified arborist shall certify in a "letter of compliance" that all concerned tree policies have been adhered to.

B-20 – Copies of the Horticultural Tree Report for the Project, the City's Protected Tree ordinance, and the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan shall be maintained on-site during all Project construction.

B-21 – All Project homes shall incorporate earth-tone palettes and non-reflective, naturalistic building materials for exterior surfaces.

B-22 – All public utilities shall be situated underground.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1)).

Rationale for Finding

Impacts to scenic resources (including individual protected trees and the oak woodland) would be reduced to a less than significant level by the implementation of Mitigation Measures B-10 through B-20, which include various measures for the protection of the remaining existing trees on-site. The Project would convert the 6.2-acre Project Site from its current mostly undeveloped condition to a residential setting. As a result, 28 of the 199 trees on the site would require removal, including 15 Coast Live Oaks. No Southern Clifornia black walnut trees would be removed. As part of regulatory compliance, replacement trees would be required to be planted on-site to address the loss of trees on-site. In addition, a review of Figure V.B-6 in the Draft EIR demonstrates that the 15 oak trees and most of the other trees proposed for removal are located within the interior of the Project Site and are not readily visible from off-site locations. The oak trees are primarily situated behind groves of existing trees and/or behind intervening knolls. Additionally, 12 of the 15 oak trees to be removed have an aesthetic rating of poor or dead (D, E and F), while the remaining three are rated fair to good (C and B). While the oak woodland on the Project Site has high aesthetic values, the individual oak trees slated for removal have not acquired a distinctive significance with reference to the other trees or monuments on the site. Remaining trees on the site would be further protected from grading and development impacts through the implementation of mitigation measures. The protection of these scenic resources would also minimize impacts to visual character and quality of the surround area. Visual character would be further protected through the implementation of Mitigation Measures B-21 and B-22, calling for residences to incorporate earth-tone colors and to situate public utilities underground throughout the development. Therefore, impacts to scenic resources and the existing visual character would be reduced to a less than significant level by implementation of Mitigation Measures B-10 through B-22.

Reference

For a complete discussion of the Project's impacts associated with aesthetics, see Section V.B, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR. See also Section 2, Responses to Comments, of the Final EIR.

<u>Air Quality</u>

Description of Effects Construction Phase Impacts – Regional Impacts

Construction of the Proposed Project would generate pollutant emissions from various construction activities. Construction activities involving site preparation and grading would primarily generate PM₁₀ emissions. Mobile source emissions (use of diesel-fueled equipment onsite and worker trips) would primarily generate NOx emissions. The application of architectural coatings would primarily result in the release of VOC emissions. Construction of the Proposed Project would produce VOC, CO, SO_X, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions that do not exceed the SCAQMD's regional thresholds. However, NO_X emissions during the grading phase would exceed the regional threshold for this ozone precursor. As a result, construction of the Proposed Project could contribute substantially to an existing violation of air quality standards for the regional pollutant ozone. This impact is considered significant prior to mitigation.

Construction Phase Impacts – Local Impacts

At a local level, construction of the Project could produce emissions that potentially impact air quality near the Project Site. To assess the air quality impact of localized construction emissions of PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, CO, and NO₂, the SCAQMD's recommended LST methodologies were used. The Project would not produce significant emissions that exceed the SCAQMD's recommended localized standards of significance for the criteria pollutants, with the exception of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5},
primarily from vehicle exhaust and fugitive dust emissions from off-road construction vehicles during the site preparation and grading phases. As a result, construction impacts on localized air quality are considered significant prior to mitigation.

Cumulative Impacts

For regional ozone precursors, the Proposed Project would exceed SCAQMD mass emission thresholds for the ozone precursor NO_x during construction. As such, the Project's impact on cumulative ozone precursor emissions would be considered significant but capable of being mitigated. When considering local impacts, the Proposed Project would exceed the SCAQMD's PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} Localized Significance Thresholds (LST). The SCAQMD's LST thresholds recognize the influence of a receptor's proximity, setting LST mass emissions thresholds that generally double with every doubling of distance. Cumulative construction emissions are considered when projects are within close proximity of each other that could result in larger impacts on local sensitive receptors. However, the only potential cumulative development project within the general vicinity of the Project Site is located 1.3 miles to the north, which is too great a distance to be considered likely to generate cumulative construction air quality impacts in concert with the Proposed Project. As such, the cumulative impact of the Proposed Project and other construction projects on local sensitive receptors would be considered significant but capable of being mitigated.

With respect to operation, the proposed land use would not produce cumulatively considerable emissions of nonattainment pollutants at the regional or local level. Because the Proposed Project's air quality impacts would not exceed the SCAQMD's operational thresholds of significance, the Project's impacts on cumulative emissions of non-attainment pollutants is not considered cumulatively considerable. The Proposed Project is a residential project that does not include major sources of combustion or fugitive dust. As a result, its localized emissions of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} would be minimal. Similarly, existing land uses in the area include residential and commercial land uses that do not produce substantial emissions of localized nonattainment pollutants. The Project would also be consistent with growth assumptions in the SCAQMD's 2016 Air Quality Management Plan, and would be consistent the City's General Plan Air Quality Element. Operational cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

C-1 – All off-road construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet U.S. EPA Tier 3 emission standards, where available, to reduce NO_x , PM_{10} , and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions at the Project Site. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with Best Available Control Technology devices certified by CARB. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations.

C-2 – The use of 2010 and newer diesel haul trucks (e.g., material delivery trucks and soil import/export) shall be required. If the City determines that 2010 model year or newer diesel trucks cannot be obtained, the City shall require trucks that meet U.S. EPA 2007 model year NO_x emissions requirements in their place.

C-3 – At the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment, a copy of each unit's certified tier specification, BACT documentation, and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit shall be provided to the City.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1)).

Rationale for Finding

Regional construction phase NO_x emissions during the grading phase would exceed the regional threshold for this ozone precursor. As a result, construction of the Proposed Project could contribute substantially to an existing violation of air quality standards for the regional pollutant ozone. Implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-3, requiring equipment and haul trucks meeting stricter air quality standards, would reduce this impact to a less than significant level by lowering NO_x emissions below the applicable SCAQMD significance threshold.

With regards to particulate matter, compliance with existing SCAQMD regulations would substantially reduce localized emissions of particulates from fugitive dust sources. These are required by SCAQMD Rule 403, which calls for the application of best available control measures to all construction activities. Compliance with Rule 403 would reduce PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ emissions associated with construction activities by approximately 61 percent. In addition, Mitigation Measure C-1 would mitigate localized emissions of PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀. The air quality analysis throughout the Draft EIR was conducted consistent with applicable SCAQMD guidance and CalEEMod, including the CalEEMod User's Guide. Through regulatory compliance and implementation of Mitigation Measure C-1, the Project's localized emissions of PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀. Therefore, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

With respect to the cumulative construction scenario, even if nearby projects were to be constructed simultaneously with the Project, impacts would be less than significant for at least three reasons. First, each construction site would be required to meet SCAQMD's applicable LST thresholds at nearby sensitive receptors, which are designed to ensure that a development project does not contribute to localized exceedances of CO, NO_x, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5} concentrations. Second, CO hotspots are not expected from cumulative growth in the Project area as described in Section V.C, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. Third, future development that contributes to cumulative growth would be required to address LST thresholds and perform dispersion modeling if potential violations of health standards were to occur. For these reasons, the Project's contribution to cumulative construction air quality impacts would not be significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure C-1.

With respect to long-term cumulative operational impacts, the Project, in conjunction with nearby development projects, would not cause significant impacts, since they would generate only minimal on-site emissions of localized pollutants, and since they would not cause exceedances of CO air quality standards at roadways in the area, as described in Section V.C, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR.

With respect to cumulative regional air emissions, since the Project would create emissions beneath applicable SCAQMD regional emissions thresholds after mitigation, it is not considered to have a significant cumulative contribution to regional air quality impacts. Thus, cumulative regional impacts are also less than significant.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-3 and through compliance with applicable regulations, the Project's air quality impacts would be less than significant.

Reference

For a complete discussion of the Project's impacts associated with air quality, see Section V.C, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. See also Section 2, Responses to Comments, of the Final EIR.

Biological Resources

Description of Effects Sensitive Species

Removal of natural habitat within the Project Site would contribute incrementally to the loss of natural habitats in the City of Los Angeles. Continuing urbanization displaces and destroys wildlife and permanently removes native plant communities. In particular, the quality of habitats within the Project Site has been diminished by former uses on the Project Site, and surrounding urbanization has largely isolated the property from nearby habitats in the Santa Monica Mountains. Based on these conditions, potential impacts to special status species are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the removal of 15 coast live oak trees as defined by the City of Los Angeles at the time the Tree Report was updated and the site was reevaluated in January 2015. An additional 13 trees, all non-native with the exception of three Mexican elderberry trees, would also be removed to accommodate the Project, for a total of 28 trees removed of the 199 trees on the Project Site. This would be considered a significant impact prior to mitigation.

Sensitive Natural Communities

A substantial portion of the on-site vegetation communities could be impacted due to removal or degradation during Project construction due to grading on-site and along San Feliciano Drive and from the development of residences and road installation. Remaining habitat following Project construction may be indirectly impacted due to invasion from installed landscape plants or increases in irrigation or fertilizer usage from new residential lawn or landscaping maintenance. Therefore, an impact to native trees and shrubs is potentially significant and mitigation is required.

Jurisdictional Resources

In order to address the jurisdictional status of the Project Site and resolve whether any jurisdictional area would be affected by the Proposed Project, CDFW staff met with TERACOR Resource Management (TERACOR) staff on August 12, 2016 at the Project Site. The site was evaluated during the walkover. It was agreed that the USGS blueline stream had been diverted and undergrounded and no longer flows across the Project Site. There was also a lack of evidence of surface waterflow on the site.

During the walkover with Department staff, there was lack of typical field evidence generally utilized to establish jurisdictional status and extent. These indicators include a number of characteristics associated with streams, and include the following: shelving superimposed on banks, sediment deposits, scour lines, water-stained leaves, and debris racks along a streamcourse. The biologists conducting the biological investigations for the Draft EIR also did not observe these or other jurisdictional characteristics, as discussed in the Biological Assessment Report (included in Appendix G of the Draft EIR).

Department staff, however, suggested that the feature in question may retain its jurisdictional status based on 1) stormflows generated on-site, 2) the presence of groundwater from the upstream canyon area associated with the blueline stream, 3) the oak woodland presence, and

4) the presence of a storm drain at the north end of the Project Site on San Feliciano Drive. However, no final conclusion regarding the jurisdictional status of this feature was reached during this site visit. The jurisdictional status will be considered further at the time a Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination and the Notification of Lake or Streambed Alteration is submitted as requested by the Department. Nonetheless, the Project Applicant must comply with the Department's recommendation and will submit a Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination and Notification for an LSA Agreement to the Department following completion of the CEQA process.

Conformance with Local Policies/Ordinances

The Proposed Project would preserve 171 mature trees, including 140 oaks, and require the removal of 28 trees, including 15 oaks on the Project Site. Section 46.00 et seq. of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC), and Los Angeles City Ordinance No. 177,404 set forth regulations for the preservation of certain protected species trees in the City and further provide that a protected species tree cannot be removed or relocated without first obtaining a permit from the Board of Public Works. In addition, the Proposed Project Site is within the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan (MSPSP) and is thus subject to the regulations and requirements of the MSPSP. The MSPSP calls for the preservation of as many mature trees on a Project Site as possible and requires that trees that are removed be replaced as follows: a minimum of two oak trees (minimum of 36-inch box size) are to be planted for each one that is removed, any native tree removed must be replaced at a two for one ratio (minimum of 15-gallon size) with individuals of the same tree type, and any non-native tree removed must be replaced at a one for one ratio (minimum of 15-gallon size). Further, as required by Los Angeles City Ordinance No. 170,978, a comprehensive landscaping program would be implemented for the Proposed Project. Therefore, impacts to protected species trees, native trees and other mature non-native trees on the Project Site from Project construction may be considered potentially significant prior to regulatory compliance and mitigation.

Mitigation Measures

See Project Design Feature B-1 for landscape plan standards, Mitigation Measures B-8 through B-20 for the protection of existing trees, and Mitigation Measures D-1 through D-6 below.

D-1 – The 15 removed coast live oak trees shall be replaced with a minimum 36-inch box-size specimen coast live oaks at a minimum 2:1 ratio.

D-2 – Native trees and shrubs shall be utilized on-site in the landscape plan. Commercially available ornamental trees may be utilized on-site as long as 1) the species is not prohibited for installation by the City of Los Angeles Public Works Department along right-of-ways, and 2) the species has not been identified by the California Invasive Plant Council as an invasive risk in Southern California.

D-3 – Habitat alteration or removal shall be performed outside of the bird nesting season which extends approximately from March 15 through July 31. Should habitat need to be removed during bird nesting season, a detailed nesting survey must be performed by a qualified biologist to determine if active nests are present prior to removal of support resources.

D-4 – Construction fencing (orange safety fencing) shall be placed around the perimeter of the work site during periods of active construction work, including site grading. Periodic monitoring to insure that fence boundaries are maintained shall be conducted.

D-5 – Written and verbal instructions will be provided to all construction personnel on-site contractually obligating these personnel to respect the natural environment and to avoid, to the extent feasible, causing intentional harm to wildlife on-site during construction activity.

D-6 – A 1600 et seq. notification shall be prepared if the CDFW determines any on-site feature to be jurisdictional following submission of a preliminary jurisdictional determination. This Notification for an LSA Agreement will facilitate the determination of avoidance and mitigation measures such as, but not limited to, avoidance or construction best management practices if impacts to any CDFW jurisdictional drainages identified on the Project Site are determined by CDFW. If on-site features are concluded to be jurisdictional by CDFW and would be impacted by the Project, mitigation measures may include, but are not limited to protection in perpetuity and enhancement of on- or off-site mitigation lands that include drainages as negotiated under the LSA Agreement.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1)).

Rationale for Finding

With respect to sensitive species, implementation of Mitigation Measure B-1 would require a comprehensive landscape plan for the project, Mitigation Measures B-8 through B-20 would provide for additional protection of existing trees, and D-1 would replace the 15 removed coast live oak trees at a minimum 2:1 ratio on the Project Site. Review under the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan may further increase the number of required replacement trees. Therefore, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level, as these species would be replaced at an appropriate ratio and would be documented in a submitted landscape plan, and measures would be undertaken to prevent the further loss of trees on-site.

With respect to sensitive natural communities, implementation of Mitigation Measure B-1 and Mitigation Measures D-1 and D-2 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level by requiring a landscape plan and the planting of native trees and shrubs appropriate to the on-site vegetation community. In addition, regulatory compliance with the landscape and planting standards of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan would result in a further review of landscaping on the site.

With respect to jurisdictional resources, implementation of Mitigation Measure D-6 would facilitate the avoidance or minimization of impacts to any potential CDFW-identified jurisdictional resources present on the Project Site. Through this regulatory process, CDFW policies would be implemented with respect to jurisdictional resources and potential Project impacts would remain less than significant.

With respect to local policy/ordinance conformance, with implementation of Mitigation Measures D-1 through D-5 for tree replacement and limiting work to outside of nesting bird season, and through compliance with applicable regulations, the Project's impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Reference

For a complete discussion of the Project's impacts associated with biological resources, see Section V.D, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR. See also Section 2, Responses to Comments, of the Final EIR.

Cultural Resources

Description of Effects

Archaeological Resources

Based upon the criteria established in the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a significant impact may occur if grading or excavation activities associated with a project would disturb archaeological resources that presently exist within the project site. Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines significant archaeological resources as resources that met the criteria for historical resources, as discussed above, or resources that constitute unique archaeological resources. A project-related significant adverse effect could occur if the Proposed Project were to affect archaeological resources that fall under either of these categories. According to the South Central Coastal Information Center (letter included in Appendix D to the Draft EIR), there are no known archaeological resources within the Project Site. However, a recorded archaeological site is located within the Project vicinity, approximately 400 feet to the south of the Project Site.

A Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Project Site was conducted by W&S Consultants, Inc. in 2004. This report is included as Appendix K to the Draft EIR. The Phase I survey concluded that no evidence of archaeological sites of any kind was found on the Project Site. However, the Project Site is archaeologically sensitive. Although impacts would be less than significant, Mitigation Measure A-1 has been added to address the potential for inadvertent discoveries.

Paleontological Resources

Based upon the criteria established in the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a significant impact may occur if grading or excavation activities associated with a project were to disturb paleontological resources or geologic features which presently exist within the project site. According to the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (letter included in Appendix D to the Draft EIR), there are no known paleontological resources within the Project Site. However, known paleontological resources have been found in the general vicinity.

According to the Paleontologic Resource Evaluation conducted for the Project Site (included as Appendix L to the Draft EIR), excavations during construction are unlikely to uncover significant vertebrate fossils. However, the Project Site is considered paleontologically sensitive. Although impacts would be less than significance, adherence to Mitigation Measures A-3 through A-7 will ensure that potential paleontological resources discovered on the site are not disturbed or destroyed and that impacts remain less than significant.

Human Remains

Based upon the criteria established in the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project-related significant adverse effect could occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the Project would disturb previously interred human remains. The Project Site is located in a suburban area. The likelihood of encountering human remains on the site is minimal. According to the Native American Heritage Commission (letter included in Appendix B to the Draft EIR), the Sacred Lands File search did not indicate the presence of any resources within the Project Site. However, during the construction work and excavation of the Project Site, there is a possibility that human remains could be encountered. Although impacts would be less than significant, implementation of

Mitigation Measure A-8 would ensure that impacts with respect to human remains remain less than significant.

Tribal Cultural Resources

The City complied with the requirements of AB 52 by issuing notification letters concerning the Proposed Project to all California Native American Tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Los Angeles area. The City did not receive any requests from Tribal organizations to initiate formal consultation regarding the Proposed Project. Although potential impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant, implementation of Mitigation Measure A-9 would further ensure that inadvertent discoveries of such resources are addressed properly.

Mitigation Measures

A-1 – If any archaeological materials are encountered during the course of Project development, all further development activity shall be halted in the area of the discovery and:

- a. The services of an archaeologist shall then be secured by contacting the South Central Coastal Information Center located at California State University Fullerton, or a member of the Society of Professional Archaeologists (SOPA), or a SOPA-qualified archaeologist, who shall assess the discovered material(s) and prepare a survey, study, or report evaluating the impact.
- b. The archaeologist's survey, study, or report shall contain a recommendation(s), if necessary, for the preservation, conservation, or relocation of the resource.
- c. The applicant shall comply with the recommendations of the evaluating archaeologist, as contained in the survey, study, or report.
- d. Project development activities may resume once copies of the archaeological survey, study, or report are submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University Fullerton.
- e. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit a letter to the case file indicating what, if any, archaeological reports have been submitted, or a statement indicating that no material was discovered.
- f. A covenant and agreement binding the applicant to this condition shall be recorded prior to issuance of a grading permit.

A-3 – Prior to construction, the services of a qualified vertebrate paleontologist approved by the Los Angeles County Vertebrate Paleontology Department (LACM) and the City of Los Angeles shall be retained to implement a mitigation program during earth-moving activities associated with development of the parcel.

A-4 – The paleontologist shall develop a formal agreement with a recognized museum repository, such as the LACM, regarding the final disposition and permanent storage and maintenance of any fossil remains, as well as the archiving of associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data, that might be recovered as a result of the mitigation program, and the level of treatment (preparation, identification, curation, cataloguing) of the remains that would be required before the entire mitigation program fossil collection would be accepted by the repository for storage.

A-5 – Earth-moving activities (particularly grading and trenching for pipelines) shall be monitored by a paleontologic construction monitor. Monitoring shall include the inspection of fresh exposures created by grading of the unnamed marine shale and in the younger alluvium to allow for the recovery of larger fossil remains. Monitoring will be conducted on a full-time basis in areas underlain by the marine shale, and a half-time basis once trenching has reached a depth 5 feet below previous grade in areas underlain by younger alluvium. As soon as practicable, the monitor shall recover all vertebrate fossil specimens, a representative sample of invertebrate or plant fossils, or any fossiliferous rock or sediment sample that can be recovered easily. As warranted, fossiliferous sediment samples shall be recovered from the younger alluvium and processed to allow for the recovery of smaller fossil remains (total weight of samples will not exceed 6,000 pounds) The location and proper geologic context of any fossil occurrence or sampling site shall be documented, as necessary. The monitor shall have the authority to divert grading temporarily around a fossil site until the fossil remains have been evaluated and, if warranted, the remains and/or a fossiliferous rock or sediment sample have been recovered.

A-6 – All fossil specimens recovered from the Project Site as a result of the mitigation program, including those recovered as the result of processing fossiliferous sediment samples, will be treated (prepared, identified, curated, catalogued) in accordance with designated museum repository requirements. As appropriate, a sample of the marine shale will be submitted to a commercial laboratory for microfossil analysis; a sample of fossilized bone, shell, or wood from the younger alluvium will be submitted for carbon-14 dating analysis; and/or a sample of the alluvium will be submitted for pollen analysis.

A-7 – The monitor shall maintain daily monitoring logs that include the location where monitoring was conducted, the rock unit encountered, fossil specimens or samples recovered, and associated specimen or sample data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data. A final technical report of findings summarizing the results of the mitigation program shall be prepared by the paleontologist. The report shall be prepared in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology and museum repository requirements.

A-8 – In the event that human remains are discovered during excavation activities, the following procedure shall be observed:

- a. Stop immediately and contact the County Coroner.
- b. The coroner has two working days to examine human remains after being notified by the responsible person. If the remains are Native American, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission.
- c. The Native American Heritage Commission will immediately notify the person it believes to be the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American.
- d. The most likely descendant has 48 hours after being allowed access to the site to make recommendations to the owner, or representative, for the treatment or disposition, with proper dignity, of the human remains and grave goods.
- e. If the descendant does not make recommendations within 48 hours after being allowed access to the site, the owner shall reinter the remains in an area of the property secure from further disturbance.
- f. If the owner does not accept the descendant's recommendations, the owner or the descendant may request mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission.

A-9 – Prior to commencing any ground disturbance activities including excavating, digging, trenching, plowing, drilling, tunneling, quarrying, grading, leveling, removing peat, clearing, pounding posts, augering, backfilling, blasting, stripping topsoil or a similar activity at the project site, the Applicant, or its successor, shall retain and pay for archeological monitors, determined by the City's Office of Historic Resources to be qualified to identify subsurface tribal cultural resources. The archeological monitors shall observe all ground disturbance activities on the project site at all times the ground disturbance activities are taking place. If ground disturbance activities are simultaneously occurring at multiple locations on the Project Site, an archeological monitor shall be assigned to each location where the ground disturbance activities are occurring.

Prior to the commencement of any ground disturbance activities at the Project Site, the Applicant, or its successor, shall notify any California Native American tribes that have informed the City they are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project that ground disturbance activities are about to commence and invite the tribes to observe the ground disturbance activities, if the tribes wish to monitor.

In the event that any subsurface objects or artifacts that may be tribal cultural resources are encountered during the course of any ground disturbance activities, all such activities shall temporarily cease within the area of discovery, the radius of which shall be determined by the qualified archeologist, until the potential tribal cultural resources are properly assessed and addressed pursuant to the process set forth below:

- Upon a discovery of a potential tribal cultural resource, the Applicant, or its successor, shall immediately stop all ground disturbance activities and contact the following: (1) all California Native American tribes that have informed the City they are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project; (2) and the Department of City Planning, Office of Historic Resources.
- 2. If the City determines, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21074 (a)(2), that the object or artifact appears to be a tribal cultural resource in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, the City shall provide any affected tribe a reasonable period of time, not less than 14 days, to conduct a site visit and make recommendations to the Applicant, or its successor, and the City regarding the monitoring of future ground disturbance activities, as well as the treatment and disposition of any discovered tribal cultural resources.
- 3. The Applicant, or its successor, shall implement the tribe's recommendations if a qualified archaeologist, retained by the City and paid for by the Applicant, or its successor, reasonably concludes that the tribe's recommendations are reasonable and feasible.
- 4. In addition to any recommendations from the applicable tribe(s), a qualified archeologist shall develop a list of actions that shall be taken to avoid or minimize impacts to the identified tribal cultural resources substantially consistent with best practices identified by the Native American Heritage Commission and in compliance with any applicable federal, state or local law, rule or regulation.
- 5. If the Applicant, or its successor, does not accept a particular recommendation determined to be reasonable and feasible by the qualified archaeologist, the Applicant, or its successor, may request mediation by a mediator agreed to by the Applicant, or its successor, and the City. The mediator must have the requisite professional qualifications and experience to mediate such a dispute. The City shall make the determination as to whether the mediator is at least minimally qualified to mediate the

dispute. After making a reasonable effort to mediate this particular dispute, the City may (1) require the recommendation be implemented as originally proposed by the archaeologist; (2) require the recommendation, as modified by the City, be implemented as it is at least as equally effective to mitigate a potentially significant impact; (3) require a substitute recommendation be implemented that is at least as equally effective to mitigate a potentially significant impact; or (4) not require the recommendation be implemented because it is not necessary to mitigate any significant impacts to tribal cultural resources. The Applicant, or its successor, shall pay all costs and fees associated with the mediation.

- 6. The Applicant, or its successor, may recommence ground disturbance activities outside of a specified radius of the discovery site, so long as this radius has been reviewed by a qualified archaeologist and determined to be reasonable and appropriate.
- 7. The Applicant, or its successor, may recommence ground disturbance activities inside of the specified radius of the discovery site only after it has complied with all of the recommendations developed and approved pursuant to the process set forth in paragraphs 2 through 5 above.
- 8. Copies of any subsequent prehistoric archaeological study, tribal cultural resources study or report, detailing the nature of any significant tribal cultural resources, remedial actions taken, and disposition of any significant tribal cultural resources shall be submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) at California State University, Fullerton and to the Native American Heritage Commission for inclusion in its Sacred Lands File.
- 9. Notwithstanding paragraph 8 above, any information determined to be confidential in nature, by the City Attorney's office, shall be excluded from submission to the SCCIC or the general public under the applicable provisions of the California Public Records Act, California Public Resources Code, section 6254(r), and shall comply with the City's AB 52 Confidentiality Protocols.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1)).

Rationale for Finding

Available evidence indicates that archaeological resources, paleontological resources, human remains, or tribal cultural resources are not present at the Project Site. However, both archeological and paleontological finds have been discovered in the close vicinity, including an archeological site approximately 400 feet to the south of the Project Site. Therefore, due to the close proximity of the site to a previously discovered resource, the possibility exists that an inadvertent discovery of unknown or unexpected resources may occur during the earthwork phase of Project construction. In order to address this possibility, Mitigation Measures A-1 and A-3 through A-9 are being required to ensure that, in the event of such an unanticipated discovery, the cultural resources are properly handled, documented, and removed from the Project Site and that, where appropriate, tribal representatives are contacted and consulted. Implementation of these mitigation measures would ensure that impacts remain less than significant.

Reference

For a complete discussion of the Project's impacts associated with cultural resources, see Section V.A, Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant, of the Draft EIR and the cited Draft EIR appendices. See also Section 2, Responses to Comments, of the Final EIR.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Description of Effects

Reasonably Foreseeable Upset and Accident Conditions Involving the Release of Hazardous Materials in the Environment

Construction

Asbestos-Containing Materials

Asbestos-Containing Materials (ACMs) Demolition of the buildings on site could release asbestos containing materials, if present in the structures. Exposure to workers or residents in the surrounding community to ACMs during demolition could be a significant impact. However, in accordance with the EPA's NESHAP regulation and SCAQMD's Rule 1403, all materials, which are identified as ACMs must be removed by a trained and licensed asbestos abatement contractor. Provided the removal and disposal of ACMs from the Project Site follows the various required guidelines, the Proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Lead-Based Paint

Based on their age, the potential also exists for the on-site structures to contain lead-based paint. Exposure to workers to lead paint during demolition structures could be a significant impact. However, prior to demolition, a qualified lead-paint abatement consultant would be required to comply with applicable state and federal rules and regulations governing lead paint abatement. Provided that abatement rules and regulations are followed, hazardous materials impacts caused by exposure to lead-paint would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Construction Materials

The Project's construction would also involve the use of potentially hazardous materials, including paints, adhesives, surface coatings, cleaning agents, fuels, and oils. All of those materials would only be used in a short-term nature during construction activities. All potentially hazardous materials would be used and stored in accordance with manufacturers' instructions and handled in compliance with applicable standards and regulations, which would ensure that impacts would be less than significant. Any emission from the use of such materials would be minimal and localized to the Project Site. Since the Project's construction would comply with applicable regulations and would not expose persons to substantial risk resulting from the release of hazardous materials or exposure to health hazards in excess of regulatory standards, no impacts associated with the potential release of hazardous substances during the Project's construction would occur.

Oil Pipelines

There is a potential for the identified crude oil pipelines in the shoulder of Mulholland Drive to be ruptured during excavation and grading operations for the Proposed Project. Since such a rupture could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions (i.e., grading) involving the release of hazardous materials (i.e., crude oil) into the environment, this is a potentially significant impact. However, there are standard operating procedures for construction in the vicinity of known pipelines, generally consisting of notification and marking requirements, and including contacting Underground Service Alert of Southern California (Dig Alert) a minimum of two full working days (48-hours) prior to the commencement of earthmoving activities on the Project Site to obtain a listing of underground services and utilities.

Operation

Operations of the Project would consist of the typical and common activities associated with operation of a single-family residential development. No hazardous materials would be utilized during day-to-day operation of the Project other than typical housekeeping, vehicle, and landscape maintenance materials such as cleaning supplies, paints, fertilizers. The use of these materials would be in small quantities and in accordance with the manufacturers' instructions for transport, use, storage, and disposal of such products. Therefore, operation of 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 into the environment.

Mitigation Measure

F-3 – A minimum of two full working days (48-hours) prior to the commencement of earthmoving activities on the Project Site, the grading contractor shall contact Underground Service Alert of Southern California (Dig Alert) to obtain a listing of underground utilities in the vicinity of the Project Site. The location of all pipelines in the vicinity of proposed grading shall be clearly marked prior to commencement of grading activities.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1)).

Rationale for Finding

Via contractor compliance with Mitigation Measure F-3, the clear location and demarcation of nearby utilities would ensure that the Project's construction activities would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the potential risk pipeline rupture, and, as such, impacts would be less than significant.

Reference

For a complete discussion of the Project's impacts associated with oil pipelines, see Section V.F, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR. See also Section 2, Responses to Comments, of the Final EIR.

<u>Noise</u>

Description of Effects

Construction Noise

During construction, three basic types of activities would be expected to occur and generate noise. The first activity would involve the preparation of the site for grading by clearing the parcel of debris and vegetation. The second activity would involve the excavation and grading of portions of the Project Site to accommodate the building foundations for the new buildings that are being proposed. The third activity that would generate noise during construction would involve the physical construction and finishing of the new residential buildings.

Construction-related noise levels during excavation and grading site may reach approximately 78.6 dBA L_{eq} .at the nearest residence (a noise increase of 18.1 dBA L_{eq}). Construction-related noise levels may reach approximately 72 dBA L_{eq} at the closest classroom building of Louisville High School (a noise increase of 1.4 dBA L_{eq}). Construction-related noise levels and dBA increase experienced at these single-family off-site noise-sensitive uses would exceed the City's "conditionally acceptable" exterior noise standard for single-family homes, and the construction noise levels associated with the Proposed Project would also exceed the City's noise standard of 75 dBA at 50 feet from construction and industrial machinery, as stated in Section 112.05 of the LAMC. Because construction noise levels are likely to exceed existing ambient noise levels by more than 5 dBA for more than 10 days in a three-month period or by more than 10 dBA for more than one day, construction noise impacts would be significant without mitigation.

Construction Vibration

Construction activities would have the potential to impact the nearest off-site sensitive receptors to the Project Site, which includes the existing residential properties bordering the site along San Feliciano Drive and Mulholland Drive. In addition, the Louisville High School and convent located south of the site across Mulholland Drive may also be adversely affected by construction activities on the Project Site. The Federal Transit Administration has established vibration impact thresholds for sensitive buildings, residences, and institutional land uses. These thresholds include a threshold of 0.2 inches per second PPV at any non-engineered timer and masonry building at which building damage could occur.

The nearest off-site residential property is located along San Feliciano Drive, adjacent to the western boundary of the Project Site. As shown in Table V.H-12 of the Draft EIR, the vibration level that would be experienced by the residences in this complex would be approximately 0.124 inches per second PPV. In addition, the nearest off-site residential property to the Project Site located along Mulholland Drive is approximately 55 feet from the site's southwestern boundary. Based on this distance, Project construction-related vibration levels may reach approximately 0.027 inches per second PPV at this off-site residential property. Because the vibration levels experienced at both of these off-site properties would not exceed the FTA's recommended thresholds for building damage of 0.2 inches per second for non-engineered buildings, this impact would be less than significant.

As for the Louisville High School, the nearest classroom is located approximately 200 feet from the southern boundary of the Project Site. Consequently, the vibration level that would be experienced by the Louisville High School classroom would be approximately 0.004 inches per second PPV. The vibration levels at this location would not exceed the FTA's recommended thresholds for building damage of 0.2 inches per second for non-engineered buildings and this impact would be less than significant. In terms of human annoyance, the vibration levels experienced at off-site sensitive receptors could range from 60 VdB at Lousville High School to 90 VdB at the 4606 San Feliciano Drive residence. Pursuant to FTA guidance, the vibration impacts from construction of the Project would exceed the 80 VdB considered acceptable at this

sensitive receptor location for the single-family residences. However, any annoyance would be temporary and would not be evaluated against FTA standards that are generally applied to long-term operations. In addition, the construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would be required to comply with Section 41.40 of the LAMC, which prohibits exterior demolition and construction activities between the hours of 9:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. Monday through Friday, and between 6:00 P.M. and 8:00 A.M. on Saturday. As such, demolition and construction would not occur during recognized sleep hours.

Nevertheless, because sensitive single-family residential noise receptors may be in close proximity to active construction during early evening hours, mitigation measures to further reduce this less than significant impact have been incorporated.

Cumulative Impacts

As noise is a localized phenomenon, and drastically reduces in magnitude as distance from the source increases, only projects and growth in the nearby area could potentially combine with the Proposed Project to result in cumulative noise impacts. Development of the Proposed Project in combination with other cumulative development projects in the surrounding area would result in an increase in construction-related and traffic-related noise in this area of the City. However, each potential cumulative development project would be subject to LAMC Section 41.40, which limits the hours of allowable construction activities. In addition, each project would also be subject to Section 112.05 of the LAMC, which prohibits any powered equipment or powered hand tool within 500 feet from a residential zone from producing noise levels that exceed 75 dBA at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source. Noise levels are only allowed to exceed this noise limitation under conditions where compliance is technically infeasible. With conformance with LAMC Sections 41.40 and 112.05, the cumulative construction noise impact would be less than significant.

Future construction associated with cumulative development in the area could result in a cumulatively significant impact with respect to temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels. Construction noise is localized in nature and decreases substantially with distance. Consequently, in order to achieve a substantial cumulative increase in construction noise levels, more than one source emitting high levels of construction noise would need to be in close proximity to the Proposed Project. However, the closest proposed development project to the Project Site is located 1.3 miles to the north, adjacent to the US 101 (Ventura) Freeway. At this distance, construction noise generated at each site would not be cumulatively considerable. As with the Proposed Project, this cumulative development project would be required to limit construction during the permitted hours designated in Section 41.40 of the LAMC and, thus, would not generate construction noise during recognized sleep hours for residences or on days that residents are most sensitive to exterior noise. Mitigation Measures H-4 through H-12 would serve to reduce the noise levels associated with construction at the Project Site to a less than significant level; as a result, construction noise levels would not exceed the thresholds in the L.A. CEQA Threshold Guide. Therefore, the cumulative impact of the Proposed Project associated with a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels caused by the construction activities would be less than significant with mitigation.

Cumulative development in the City may result in the exposure of people to or the generation of excessive groundborne vibration. As mentioned above, the closest proposed project to the Project Site is located 1.3 miles to the north, and thus would not contribute to cumulative vibration impacts with the Proposed Project. Regardless, implementation of recommended Mitigation Measures H-11 and H-12 would serve to reduce the vibration levels associated with construction at the Project Site to the maximum extent feasible. Therefore, the cumulative impact contribution of the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

Cumulative mobile source noise impacts would occur primarily as a result of increased traffic on local roadways due to the Proposed Project and other projects within the study area. Therefore, cumulative traffic-generated noise impacts have been assessed based on the contribution of the Proposed Project to the future cumulative base traffic volumes in the Project vicinity. Cumulative development would increase local noise levels by a maximum of 0.2 dBA CNEL along several road segments in the area, inaudible increases to the human ear. Because none of the roadway segments would experience an increase in local noise levels by more than 5.0 dBA CNEL, the resulting cumulative impact would be less than significant.

With respect to stationary sources, the major stationary source of noise that would be introduced by cumulative development in the area would likely be HVAC equipment associated with the new developments. As discussed previously, the HVAC systems that are installed for new residential buildings would typically result in noise levels that average between 40 and 50 dBA L_{eq} at 50 feet from the equipment, while those for new commercial developments would generally produces noise levels of around 57 to 72 dBA CNEL at a distance of 50 feet. Depending on the distance these HVAC systems may be located from potential noise-sensitive uses at, or surrounding, these project sites, noise impacts at individual sites could be potentially significant. However, given that the only identified cumulative development site in the vicinity of the Proposed Project is located 1.3 miles away, and the fact that noise is a localized phenomenon, a significant increase in ambient noise from the operation of the HVAC systems associated with cumulative development in the vicinity would not occur. Thus, the cumulative stationary noise impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

H-4 – Construction and demolition activities shall be scheduled to avoid operating several pieces of equipment simultaneously, which causes high noise levels.

H-5 – The use of those pieces of construction equipment or construction methods with the greatest peak noise generation potential shall be minimized. Examples include the use of drills, jackhammers, and pile drivers.

H-6 – Noise construction activities whose specific location on the site may be flexible (e.g., operation of compressors and generators, cement mixing, general truck idling) shall be conducted as far as possible from the nearest noise-sensitive land uses, and natural and/or manmade barriers (e.g., intervening construction trailers) shall be used to screen propagation of noise from such activities towards these land uses to the maximum extent possible.

H-7 – Equipment warm-up areas, water tanks, and equipment storage areas shall be located a minimum of 150 feet from the adjacent, off-site residential buildings.

H-8 – All powered construction equipment shall be equipped with exhaust mufflers or other suitable noise reduction devices capable of achieving a sound attenuation of at least 3 dBA at 50 feet of distance.

H-9 – Temporary sound barriers, capable of achieving a sound attenuation of at least 12 dBA (e.g., construction sound wall with sound blankets) at 50 feet of distance, and capable of blocking the line-of-sight to the adjacent residences shall be installed.

H-10 – Two weeks prior to the commencement of construction at the Project Site, notification must be provided to the off-site residential uses located along Mulholland Drive and San Feliciano Drive, and to Louisville High School, disclosing the construction schedule, including the various

types of activities and equipment that would be occurring throughout the duration of the construction period.

H-11 – Construction staging areas and the operation of earthmoving equipment shall be located as far away from vibration-sensitive receptors as possible.

H-12 – Heavily loaded trucks used during construction shall be restricted to Mulholland Drive and Topanga Canyon Road, and shall be routed away from residential streets surrounding the Project Site.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1)).

Rationale for Finding

The Project's construction-related activities, although temporary, would potentially expose sensitive receptors or the surrounding area to noise levels in excess of the City's CEQA thresholds of significance. With incorporation of Mitigation Measures H-4 through H-12, impacts would be less than significant. Mitigation Measure H-9, for example, would install sound walls capable of reducing temporary construction noise levels at off-site receptors by at least 12 dBA. Mitigation Measure H-8 would ensure that powered construction equipment are properly outfitted with exhaust mufflers and other noise-reduction devices. Other mitigations would be maximum noise levels of 62.8-68.7 dBA L_{eq} (with noise increases of 1.3-4.8 dBA L_{eq}) at the nearest single-family residential sensitive noise receptors. These levels would then fall below the threshold levels of significance. Since the Proposed Project could lead to impacts associated with noise in excess of applicable standards, Mitigation Measures H-4 through H-12 shall be required to reduce those associated impacts to a less than significant level.

With respect to construction vibration impacts, implementation of Mitigation Measures H-11 and H-12 would serve to reduce the amount of vibration experienced at off-site noise-sensitive uses by requiring the location of construction staging and the operation of earthmoving equipment to be located as far away from vibration-sensitive receptors as possible, and for heavily loaded trucks to be routed away from the surrounding residential streets to the extent possible.

With the incorporation of these measures, construction noise and vibration impacts would be less than significant.

Reference

For a complete discussion of the Project's impacts associated with noise, see Section V.H, Noise, of the Draft EIR. See also Section 2, Responses to Comments, of the Final EIR.

VI. SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

The Project would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts. Therefore, no Statement of Overriding Considerations is necessary.

VII. ALTERNATIVES

CEQA requires that an EIR analyze a reasonable range of feasible alternatives that could substantially reduce or avoid the significant impacts of a project while also meeting the project's basic objectives. An EIR must identify ways to substantially reduce or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1). Accordingly, the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to a project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially reducing any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly. The alternative analysis included in the Draft EIR, therefore, identified a reasonable range of project alternatives focused on avoiding or substantially reducing the project's significant impacts.

Summary of Findings

Based upon the following analysis, the City finds, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section15096(g)(2), that no feasible alternative or mitigation measure will substantially lessen any significant effect of the project, reduce the significant unavoidable impacts of the project to a level that is less than significant, or avoid any significant effect the project would have on the environment.

Project Objectives

Section 15124(b) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines states that a project description shall contain "a statement of the objectives sought by the proposed project." In addition, Section 15124(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines further states that "the statement of objectives should include the underlying purpose of the project." The objectives of the Proposed Project are as follows:

- To create a new residential community of 19 single-family homes without displacing existing housing.
- To help alleviate the current housing shortage by providing infill residential development on underutilized land.
- To provide housing in close proximity to commercial areas and recreational areas.
- To design the on-site circulation system to help ensure safe ingress and egress to and from the Project Site for existing and future area residents, and other motorists.
- To design a project that is consistent with the predominant character of the style of the neighborhood and that connects with the surrounding suburban environment and reflects neighborhood and market needs.
- To design landscape features that provide natural character and texture within the neighborhood suburban environment; that enhance the visual character of the development.
- To allow development of the site while minimizing tree removal and landform alteration.

Alternatives Analyzed in the Draft EIR and Final EIR

CEQA requires that an EIR analyze a reasonable range of feasible alternatives that could substantially reduce or avoid the significant impacts of a project while also meeting a project's basic objectives. Each decision-making body of the City finds that given the potential impacts of the Project, the Final EIR considered a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project to provide informed decision-making in accordance with Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Based on the significant environmental impacts of the Project and the objectives established for the Project, the following alternatives to the Project were evaluated in the Final EIR:

- Alternative 1: No Project
- Alternative 2: Park Alternative

Alternative 1 - No Project

Description of Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the Project would not be implemented and the Project Site would remain in its existing condition. The No Project Alternative assumes the Related Project would move forward. No active use of the Project Site would occur under this alternative.

Impact Summary of Alternative

The No Project Alternative's impact would have no impacts on aesthetics, as the alternative would not create a change in the visual character of the Project Site or impact existing visual resources on-site. For the same reasons as the Project, the No Project Alternative would have no impact to agricultural and forestry resources. This Alternative would also have no impact with respect to air quality since as no demolition, grading, or construction would occur and no new vehicle trips would be generated under this Alternative. Alternative 1 would also have no impact with respect to biological resources as no tree removal or modification of the site would occur. Alternative 1 would have no impacts to significant historical, cultural or tribal resources since no demolition or other construction would occur. Alternative 1 would have no impact to geology or soils.

Further, this Alternative would not result in increased GHG emissions, as it would not increase electricity and natural gas consumption, vehicle miles traveled, water use, or solid waste generation. Alternative 1 would have no impact to hazards and hazardous materials, since there would be no demolition or construction and the alternative would not have the potential to encounter asbestos and lead-based paint or oil pipelines at the Project Site. Alternative 1 would not involve any impacts to hydrology and water quality since no new development would occur. Alternative 1 would result in no impacts to land use and planning, as the alternative is consistent with existing zoning and land use plans. Alternative 1 would have no impact to mineral resources, as the Project Site is not located within a designated oil drilling area or a designed Mineral Resource Zone. Alternative 1 would have no impact with respect to noise, as no new sources of noise or vibration would be created because no demolition or construction would occur. Alternative 1 would have no impact to population and housing, as there would be no development would add population, housing, or employment to the Project Site. Alternative 1 would have no impact on public services, as no demand for public services would occur. Alternative 1 would result in no impacts to transportation and traffic, as no traffic would be generated. Alternative 1 would result in no impact with respect to utilities, as it would not lead to service demands related to wastewater, water, solid waste, electricity, or natural gas.

Finding

Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3)).

Rationale for Finding

No new development would occur under the No Project Alternative and the Project Site would remain largely vacant and unutilized. As such, Alternative 1 would not meet the underlying purpose of the Project or the project objectives. While the No Project Alternative would not result in any of the Project's significant but mitigated impacts, it would not satisfy any of the Project's objectives. Specifically, the No Project Alternative would not meet existing market demand for housing units within the Woodland Hills community area, on an in-fill site without displacing residents, and in proximity to commercial and recreational uses. In addition, regarding the City's planning goals and policies, the City has designated and zoned the property for low-density residential development and includes goals and policies for the minimization of grading and preservation of trees. The Project would provide a new residential subdivision designed in conformance with these policies. The No Project Alternative would not provide any new residential development to support citywide housing goals.

Accordingly, each decision making body of the City rejects the No Project as infeasible.

Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 1, see Section VII, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Alternative 2 – Park Alternative

Description of Alternative

Alternative 2 envisions the 6.2-acre Project Site being acquired by a public agency and developed as a public park. According to the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, there is some possibility that the Conservancy, the Department of Recreation and Parks, or the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA) could take over ownership and/or management of all but the northeastern one acre of the adjacent DWP's 5.91-acre Girard reservoir property. If one of these agencies were also to acquire the Project Site, which abuts almost 50 percent of the Girard Reservoir perimeter, a public park of approximately 11 acres could be created by combining the two properties. It is noted that the Park Alternative does not meet the Project Applicant's objectives. However, it was included in the Draft EIR in response to requests from the community for its assessment.

Because of the scenic value of the oak woodland adjacent to the Mulholland Drive Scenic Parkway, such a park would most likely not be developed for active recreation, but rather would be utilized as a wildlife refuge and for such passive recreational activities as hiking and bird watching. This alternative assumes that the extent of improvements on the Project Site's portion of the park would be limited to the demolition of the existing house, sheds, kennels and hardscape features, the removal of the surrounding chain-link fencing, the removal of non-native landscaping, and the subsequent restoration of the native habitat. While no new structures would be built on the park property, it is reasonable to assume that some landform alteration would occur on-site to provide access and parking. This alternative assumes that a graded and paved parking area would be located in the southwestern corner of the Project Site where the terrain is most level. Access would then be provided by a driveway on San Feliciano Drive. Like other small parks in the general vicinity, it is assumed that this park would be unstaffed, unlocked, and open from dawn to dusk.

Impact Summary of Alternative

Alternative 2's impacts related to aesthetics would be less than significant, as Alternative 2 would not involve the construction of structures visible within the protected viewshed of the Mulholland Drive Scenic Parkway and no scenic resources (such as protected trees) would be removed. Also, Alternative 2 would not cause any significant impacts associated with nighttime lighting. Alternative 2 would have no impact to agricultural and forestry resources, as the Project Site does not contain any agricultural or forestry uses. Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would not cause any significant impacts related to localized or regional air quality. Alternative 2 would also have a less-than-significant impact with respect to biological resources, as only non-native trees and shrubs would be removed. Alternative 2 would not cause any significant impacts to cultural, tribal or historical resources, and conditions of approval and regulatory measures would address any unknown resources encountered during construction. Alternative 2 would not result in significant geology/soils impacts as only minimal grading would be performed. With respect to GHG emissions, construction and operation of Alternative 2 would produce a less-than-significant impact.

Alternative 2 would not result in significant hazards/hazardous materials impacts. Alternative 2 would result in less than significant impacts to water hydrology and water quality since runoff from the Site does not discharge directly to a surface waterbody and all applicable regulations concerning water quality would be satisfied. Further, Alternative 2 would be consistent with applicable land use policies for the same reasons as the Project and be more compatible than the Project with the Mulholland Drive Scenic Parkway Specific Plan's intended purpose of preserving the aesthetic qualities of the scenic parkway.

Alternative 2's noise impacts attributable to construction and operation would be less than significant, and substantially less than those of the Project. Alternative 2 would not cause a significant impact with respect to population or housing growth as no residents or housing units would be present on-site. Alternative 2's impacts to public services would be less than significant with respect to fire protection, police protection, schools, parks and recreation, and libraries since Alternative 2 would not generate any demand for such services, and would help to meet area demand for parks and recreational facilities. Alternative 2 would generate substantially fewer daily vehicle trips than the Project. Alternative 2 would not generate a wastewater treatment demand and water usage, solid waste generation, and energy consumption associated with Alternative 2 would be substantially reduced as compared to the Project and less than significant.

In sum, Alternative 2 would avoid all of the Project's significant but mitigated impacts.

Finding

Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3)).

Rationale for Finding

Alternative 2 would not fully satisfy the Project objectives, although it would preserve the site's natural character and texture within the neighborhood suburban environment and would not result in tree removal or landform alteration. Specifically, the Park Alternative would not meet existing market demand for housing units within the Woodland Hills community area, on an in-fill site without displacing residents, and in proximity to commercial and recreational uses. In addition, regarding the City's planning goals and policies, the City has designated and zoned the property

for low-density residential development. The Project would provide a new residential subdivision designed in conformance with this designation and zoning. The Park Alternative would not provide any new residential development to support citywide housing goals.

Accordingly, each decision making body of the City rejects the Park Alternative as infeasible.

Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 2, see Section VII, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that an analysis of alternatives to a project shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR. The CEQA Guidelines also state that should it be determined that the No Project Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative, the EIR shall identify another Environmentally Superior Alternative among the remaining alternatives. An environmentally superior alternative is an alternative to a project that would reduce and/or eliminate the significant, unavoidable environmental impacts associated with the project without creating other significant impacts and without substantially reducing and/or eliminating the environmental benefits attributable to the project.

Alternative 1 (No Project Alternative) would have the fewest environmental impacts and would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts. However, the CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6 states that if the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the lead agency must consider another environmentally superior alternative from the remaining list of alternatives considered.

Alternative 2 (Park Alternative) was selected as the Environmentally Superior Alternative because it involves less environmental disruption than the Project (less grading, less construction-related air quality and noise impacts, less intrusive visual quality impacts, fewer impacts to biological resources, fewer land use impacts and less potential for pipeline-related hazards). The Park Alternative, however, has been rejected because it fails to fully meet the Project objectives, there has been no commitment from the Department of Water and Power to release the 5.91-acre Girard Reservoir property for park purposes, and there has been no offer from any public agency or private organization to purchase the Project Site for park purposes.

Therefore, the Proposed Project can be considered the environmentally superior alternative because: (1) it allows for the logical development of the Project Site, utilizing the same property rights as other sites with the same zoning and in the same vicinity; (2) it minimizes grading and impacts to biological resources, including protected trees; (3) it preserves nearly one-half of the Project Site as natural open space; and (4) it would not create any significant and unavoidable environmental impacts.

Alternatives Rejected as Being Infeasible

Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible, and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. According to the CEQA Guidelines, among the factors that may be used to eliminate an alternative from detailed consideration are the alternative's failure to meet project objectives, the alternative's infeasibility, or the alternative's inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. Alternatives can be rejected by the City for

specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, which make infeasible the project alternatives identified in the final EIR. Alternatives to the project that have been considered and rejected as infeasible include the following:

Reduced Density Project: In the Draft EIR for the Original Project, a 37-unit single-family condominium development, three alternatives were evaluated: (1) no project, (2) a reduced density 29-unit detached single-family home development, and (3) a park alternative. The current Proposed Project consists of a 19-unit detached single-family home development, which is substantially reduced from the reduced density alternative that was evaluated in the 2007 Draft EIR. For this reason, as well as concerns regarding the potential economic viability of a smaller development and the lack of significant and unavoidable environmental impacts resulting from the Proposed Project, a further reduced density alternative is not included in this Draft EIR. Also, as is noted in Section VI (General Impact Categories) of the Draft EIR, the Proposed Project would not result in any unavoidable significant impacts. The significant impacts of the Project in the areas of aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, and noise would be reduced to less than significant levels via the implementation of mitigation measures. Because any economically feasible development of the Project Site would likely also result in adverse impacts associated with these same environmental issue areas, as it would also require similar construction techniques and grading to infill the site to create accessible and flat pads for development, the only alternative that would be certain to reduce such impacts is one that does not include development of the site.

Non-Residential Project: Given that the Project Site is surrounded primarily by single-family residential uses and is currently zoned and designated for such uses in the General Plan, no alternative development including commercial, retail, or other non-residential uses was considered.

Alternative Off-Site Location: An alternative that would develop the Project on a different site was rejected as infeasible. Under such an alternative, the Project would be constructed on a site other than the Project Site. This alternative was deemed infeasible as the Project Applicant does not own or control another site of comparable size. Accordingly, any alternative site location would not meet the Project objectives.

VIII. OTHER CEQA FINDINGS

Summary of Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

Pursuant to Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, the City finds that the Project would not result in significant and unavoidable environmental impacts.

Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes

Pursuant to section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines, the City considered the potential significant irreversible environmental changes that could result from the Project. The Project would consume limited, slowly renewable and non-renewable resources. This consumption would occur during the Project's construction and would continue throughout its operational lifetime. Development of the Project would require a commitment of resources that would include: (1) building materials; (2) fuel and operational materials/resources; and (3) the transportation of goods and people to and from the Project Site.

Demolition of the building on the Project Site would result in production of waste material. However, the Project would recycle and salvage demolition and construction debris, including asphalt, wood, drywall, metals, and other miscellaneous and composite materials. Proper separation of demolition debris would assist environmental clean-up and allow for proper disposal of hazardous materials that may be found within existing buildings. Further, the City passed an ordinance in 2010 that requires all mixed Construction and Demolition ("C&D") waste generated within the City to be taken to certified C&D waste processors. Some of the City's C&D facilities that reuse or recycle C&D waste have already reached a 100 percent recycling rate.

The Project's construction would require consumption of resources that cannot be replenished or which may renew slowly as to be considered non-renewable, including certain types of lumber and other forest products, aggregate materials used in concrete and asphalt, metals, petrochemical construction materials, and water. Fossil fuels, such as gasoline and oil, would also be consumed in the use of construction vehicles and equipment. The commitment of resources required for the type and level of proposed development would limit the availability of these resources for future generations for other uses during operation of the Project. However, this resource consumption would be consistent with growth and anticipated change in the Los Angeles Region.

With respect to operation, the Project would be developed in a populated urban area. Additionally, the Project would incorporate sustainable design features to reduce the Project's environmental impacts via compliance with the City's Green Building Code.

As a result of the Project's compliance with the applicable conservation and sustainable measures, no significant irreversible environmental changes would result from the Project.

Growth-Inducing Impacts

Pursuant to Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, the City considered the Project's potential growth-inducing impacts. Generally, a Project may foster or encourage population growth in a geographic area if it meets any of the following criteria: (i) economic expansion or growth (e.g., changes in revenue base, employment expansion, etc.); (ii) removal of an impediment to growth (e.g., establishment of an essential public service or the provision of new access to an area); (iii) establishment of a precedent-setting action (e.g., an innovation, a change in zoning, or general plan amendment approval); or (iv) development of or encroachment on an isolated adjacent area of open space (being distinct from an "infill" type of encroachment).

Although the Project would provide new residential uses, it would not necessitate the extension of roads or other infrastructure beyond that needed to serve the Project's own needs. The Project would be developed in an urban area. Street access and utilities are fully built-out in the area.

The Project responds to the unmet housing demand in both the Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills Community Plan Area and the City of Los Angeles as a whole. Specifically, the Project would help achieve a portion of the household growth forecast for the City while also being consistent with regional policies to reduce sprawl, efficiently utilize existing infrastructure, reduce regional congestion, and improve air quality through the reduction of vehicle miles traveled. Thus, while the Project does propose additional housing units, it would not substantially induce housing growth beyond forecasted levels.

The roadways and other infrastructure associated with the Project would not induce growth because they would only serve the Project. Infrastructure extensions would not be expanding into a new area as a result of the Project as the Project Site is completely surrounded by existing urban development.

Lastly, the Project Site, although largely undeveloped, is surrounded by existing urban development. Thus, development of the Project would not develop or encroach on an isolated adjacent area of open space, as distinguished from an "infill" type of encroachment.

For all those reasons, the Project would not result in a direct significant growth-inducing impact in the Project area.

IX. OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

- 1. The City, acting through the Department of City Planning, is the "Lead Agency" for the project evaluated in the EIR. The City finds that the EIR was prepared in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The City finds that it has independently reviewed and analyzed the EIR for the project, that the Draft EIR which was circulated for public review reflected its independent judgment and that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City.
- 2. The EIR evaluated the following potential project and cumulative environmental impacts: aesthetics, air quality, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, public services, transportation and traffic, utilities and service systems, energy, tribal cultural resources, alternatives, and other CEQA considerations. Additionally, the EIR considered, in separate sections, Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes and Growth Inducing Impacts. The significant environmental impacts of the project and the alternatives were identified in the EIR.
- 3. The City finds that the EIR provides objective information to assist the decision makers and the public at large in their consideration of the environmental consequences of the project. The public review periods provided all interested jurisdictions, agencies, private organizations, and individuals the opportunity to submit comments regarding the Draft EIR. The Final EIR was prepared after the review periods and responds to comments made during the public review periods.
- 4. The Department of City Planning evaluated comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the Draft EIR. In accordance with CEQA, the Department of City Planning prepared written responses describing the disposition of significant environmental issues raised. The Final EIR provides adequate, good faith and reasoned responses to the comments. The Department of City Planning reviewed the comments received and responses thereto and has determined that neither the comments received nor the responses to such comments add significant new information regarding environmental impacts to the Draft EIR. The Lead Agency has based its actions on full appraisal of all viewpoints, including all comments received up to the date of adoption of these findings, concerning the environmental impacts identified and analyzed in the EIR.
- 5. The Final EIR documents changes to the Draft EIR. Having reviewed the information contained in the Draft EIR, the Final EIR, and the administrative record, as well as the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines regarding recirculation of Draft EIRs, the City finds that there is no new significant impact, substantial increase in the severity of a previously disclosed impact, significant new information in the record of proceedings or other criteria under CEQA that would require additional recirculation of the Draft EIR, or that would require preparation of a supplemental or subsequent EIR. Specifically, the City finds that:
- 6. The Responses to Comments contained in the Final EIR fully considered and responded to comments claiming that the project would have significant impacts or more severe impacts not disclosed in the Draft EIR and include substantial evidence that none of these comments provided substantial evidence that the project would result in changed circumstances,

significant new information, considerably different mitigation measures, or new or more severe significant impacts than were discussed in the Draft EIR.

- The City has thoroughly reviewed the public comments received regarding the project and the Final EIR as it relates to the project to determine whether under the requirements of CEQA, any of the public comments provide substantial evidence that would require recirculation of the EIR prior to its adoption and has determined that recirculation of the EIR is not required.
- None of the information submitted after publication of the Final EIR, including testimony at the public hearings on the project, constitutes significant new information or otherwise requires preparation of a supplemental or subsequent EIR. The City does not find this information and testimony to be credible evidence of a significant impact, a substantial increase in the severity of an impact disclosed in the Final EIR, or a feasible mitigation measure or alternative not included in the Final EIR.
- The mitigation measures identified for the project were included in the Draft EIR and Final EIR. As revised, the final mitigation measures for the project are described in the Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP). Each of the mitigation measures identified in the MMP is incorporated into the project. The City finds that the impacts of the project have been mitigated to the extent feasible by the mitigation measures identified in the MMP.
- 7. CEQA requires the Lead Agency approving a project to adopt a MMP or the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation. The mitigation measures included in the EIR as certified by the City and revised in the MMP as adopted by the City serve that function. The MMP includes all of the mitigation measures and project design features adopted by the City in connection with the approval of the project and has been designed to ensure compliance with such measures during implementation of the project. In accordance with CEQA, the MMP provides the means to ensure that the mitigation measures are fully enforceable. In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, the City hereby adopts the MMP.
- 8. In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, the City hereby adopts each of the mitigation measures expressly set forth herein as conditions of approval for the project.
- 9. The custodian of the documents or other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City decision is based is the City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning.
- 10. The City finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the EIR, which is incorporated herein by this reference, or is in the record of proceedings in the matter.
- 11. The City is certifying an EIR for, and is approving and adopting findings for, the entirety of the actions described in these Findings and in the EIR as comprising the project.
- 12. The EIR is a project EIR for purposes of environmental analysis of the project. A project EIR examines the environmental effects of a specific project. The EIR serves as the primary environmental compliance document for entitlement decisions regarding the project by the City and the other regulatory jurisdictions.

FINDINGS OF FACT (SUBDIVISION MAP ACT)

In connection with the approval of Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 67505, the Advisory Agency of the City of Los Angeles, pursuant to Sections 66473.1, 66474.60, .61 and .63 of the State of California Government Code (the Subdivision Map Act), makes the prescribed findings as follows:

(a) THE PROPOSED MAP IS CONSISTENT WITH APPLICABLE GENERAL AND SPECIFIC PLANS.

Section 66411 of the Subdivision Map Act (Map Act) establishes that local agencies regulate and control the design of subdivisions. Chapter 2, Article I, of the Map Act establishes the general provisions for tentative, final, and parcel maps. The subdivision, and merger, of land is regulated pursuant to Article 7 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC). The LAMC implements the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan, through zoning regulations, including Specific Plans.

Specifically, Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 17.06-B requires that the tract map be prepared by or under the direction of a licensed surveyor or registered civil engineer. The Vesting Tentative Tract Map was prepared by a Registered Professional Engineer and contains the required components, dimensions, areas, notes, legal description, ownership, applicant, and site address information as required by the LAMC. The Vesting Tract Map has been filed to merge and resubdivide an approximately 6.2-acre (269,857 square-foot) site into 19 lots for single-family residences.

In addition to LAMC Section 17.05-B, Section 17.05-C requires that the vesting tentative tract map be designed in compliance with the zoning applicable to the project site. The General Plan, Specific Plans, and Zoning Code regulate, but are not limited to, the maximum permitted density, height, and the subdivision of land. The project site is located within the adopted Canoga Park – Winnetka Woodland Hills – West Hills Community Plan Community Plan area and is classified with the Low Residential land use designation with the corresponding zone of RE9, RS, R1, RU, RD6, and RD5. The project site is also located in the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan. The Specific Plan does not have direct provisions relating to requirements for subdivision maps, although it does contain goals and provisions addressing subdivision design and improvements, as discussed below. The project site contains 6.2 acres and is zoned R1-1, requiring minimum lot sizes of 5,000 square feet.

The requested merger and resubdivision of the site into 19 lots would also include development of up to 19 residential structures, on lots ranging from approximately 8,000 to 25,600 square feet in size. This project is consistent with the General Plan and demonstrates compliance with Sections 17.06 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code as well as with the intent and purpose of the General Plan, with regard to density and use.

Therefore, the proposed map demonstrates compliance with LAMC Sections 17.05-C and 17.06-B and is consistent with the applicable General Plan and Specific Plans.

(b) THE DESIGN AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION IS CONSISTENT WITH APPLICABLE GENERAL AND SPECIFIC PLANS.

For purposes of a subdivision, design and improvement is defined by Section 66418 of the Subdivision Map Act and LAMC Section 17.02. Section 66418 of the Subdivision Map Act defines the term "design" as follows: "Design" means: (1) street alignments, grades and widths; (2) drainage and sanitary facilities and utilities, including alignments and grades thereof; (3) location and size of all required easements and rights-of-way; (4) fire roads and firebreaks; (5) lot size and configuration; (6) traffic access; (7) grading; (8) land to be dedicated for park or recreational purposes; and (9) such other specific physical requirements in the plan and configuration of the entire subdivision as may be necessary to ensure consistency with, or implementation of, the general plan or any applicable specific plan. Further, Section 66427 of the Subdivision Map Act expressly states that the "Design and location of buildings are not part of the map review process for condominium, community apartment or stock cooperative projects."

Section 17.05-C of the Los Angeles Municipal Code enumerates design standards for Subdivisions and requires that each Tentative Map be designed in conformance with the Street Design Standards and in conformance to the General Plan. Section 17.05-C, third paragraph, further establishes that density calculations include the areas for residential use and areas designated for public uses, except for land set aside for street purposes ("net area"). LAMC Section 17.06-B and 17.15 lists the map requirements for a tentative tract map and vesting tentative tract map. The map provides the required components of a tentative tract map.

The Tract Map subdivision design includes the merger and resubdivision of a 6.2-acre site into 19 lots and for single-family residences.

The design and layout of the map is consistent with the design standards established by the Subdivision Map Act and Division of Land Regulations of the Los Angeles Municipal Code. Several public agencies (including the Bureau of Engineering, Bureau of Sanitation, Bureau of Street Lighting, Department of Building and Safety, Grading Division and Zoning Division, Bureau of Street Lighting, Fire Department, Department of Building and Safety, Department of Transportation, and Department of Recreation and Parks) have reviewed the map and found the subdivision design satisfactory, and have imposed improvement requirements and/or conditions of approval. Bureau of Engineering requires improvements to San Feliciano Drive and Mulholland Drive in accordance with the City's Street Standards and the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan. Sewers are available and have been inspected and deemed adequate in accommodating the proposed project's sewerage needs. Fire and traffic access, as well as site grading, have been reviewed and deemed appropriate. Additional traffic safety measures for adjacent roadways and have been included for traffic and pedestrian safety.

The subdivision will be required to comply with all regulations pertaining to grading, building permits, and street improvement permit requirements. Conditions of Approval for the design and improvement of the subdivision are required to be performed prior to the recordation of the tentative map, building permit, grading permit, or certificate of occupancy.

Further, the Community Plan's Low Residential Land Use Designation and R1-1 zone allow for residential development subject to a minimum lot area of 5,000 square feet and a minimum lot width of 50 feet. The Tract Map provides lot areas and lot widths greater than the minimum.

The Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan also includes applicable goals and provisions for the design and improvement of subdivisions, including standards for the protection of native trees, the minimization of grading, and the minimization of driveway and private street access into the Mulholland Drive right-of-way. In addition, the Specific Plan Design Review Board may advise the Advisory Agency on the layout and design of subdivisions. Specific considerations have been

taken into the design of the tract map to avoid the removal of trees from the site, and to minimize grading and driveways.

The site contains 199 existing trees (including 166 protected trees), and 28 trees (including 15 protected trees) would be removed in order to develop the project. This includes a Tract Map design which takes primary access from a private street off of San Feliciano Drive at a location where there would be minimal impacts to existing trees, positioning the building pads in areas to minimize tree removal, and the preservation of the most prominent tree groupings on the site, specifically along Mulholland Drive at the intersection with Mulholland Highway. Currently, the site contains 3.7 acres of coast live oak woodland vegetation communities, and under the Tract Map design, 3.5 acres would remain intact. Furthermore, a majority of the trees to be removed have been rated as unhealthy or dead trees, and trees that will be removed are required to be replaced at a minimum 2:1 ratio on-site with 36"-box trees.

The Tract Map would also require grading of the site, including 3,040 cubic yards (c.y.) of cut and 7,240 c.y. of fill, resulting in a net of 4,200 c.y. of soil import. Due to previous site disturbance and fill on the site, the proposed grading, fill, and recompaction of soils is necessary to create stable and safe geological conditions for the private street and development of the site. Soil movement has been balanced in consideration of other Specific Plan objectives, such as those for the preservation of trees and vegetation. In addition, the Grading Division of the Department of Building and Safety has reviewed and approved the Tract Map's proposed grading for conformance with City standards and the Specific Plan.

In regard to driveways, the Tract Map has been designed to meet City driveway and private street standards, and includes one entrance from Mulholland Drive (serving four lots), one entrance from San Feliciano Drive (serving three lots), and one private street from San Feliciano Drive (to serve the remaining 12 lots). The central private street was designed as an efficient solution to provide access to the greatest number of lots in the subdivision within the flatter and less treedense portion of the lot. The private street also serves as a central access to these lots and therefore also reduces curb cuts from the adjacent right-of-way. In lieu of extending the private street south into the site into the higher and steeper portion of the site, which would have increased grading and the potential for tree removal, a single entrance was provided along Mulholland Drive to serve the four southernmost residential lots. Similarly, a single entrance was provided for the easternmost lots on San Feliciano Drive, which were clustered and situated to minimize tree removal.

The design and improvement of the Tract Map is intended to balance the various goals of the General Plan and Specific Plan, especially as they relate to street and driveway design, grading, and protection of tree. Therefore, as conditioned, the design and improvement of the proposed subdivision would be consistent with the intent and purpose of the applicable General Plan and Specific Plan.

(c) THE SITE IS PHYSICALLY SUITABLE FOR THE PROPOSED TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT.

The project site is primarily undeveloped and is currently surrounded with a chain link fence. On the project site there is a vacant two-story single-family residence with a shed and kennel. The project site is physically suitable for the proposed type of development. The elevation within the site varies as the site is located on the northern foothills of the Santa Monica Mountains. The southern portion of the site is at a slightly higher elevation than the northern portion of the site, where the elevation slightly decreases moving south to north. The project site is not located in the Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone, earthquake induced landslide, fault-rupture hazard zone, methane zone, or flood zone. However, the project site is located in the City of Los Angeles Hillside Area

and State of California liquefaction zone. According to the memo from the Department of Building and Safety, Grading Division, dated November 21, 2017, it is recommended that a mat foundation be used for lots 5 through 19 in order to mitigate the earthquake induced settlements. The memo also states that the requirements of the 2017 City of Los Angeles Building Code have been satisfied and that the soil and grading of the project site are acceptable once the conditions outlined in the memo are incorporated.

The site is also within a Fire Hazard Severity Zone designated by the City of Los Angeles Fire Department. According to a memo from the Fire Department, dated January 17, 2017, the project site is suitable for the proposed type of development, pending the compliance of all the conditions stated in the memo. Furthermore, the project will be required to meet all developmental regulations pertaining to fire hazard regulations as part of the California Building Code and Municipal Codes.

The subject site does not contain any known hazards (i.e., toxic waste, oil wells etc.). In addition, the environmental analysis conducted for the project found that the tract map and development of the project would not result in any significant impacts in terms of geological or seismic impacts, hazards and hazardous materials, and fire safety. The tract has been approved contingent upon the satisfaction of the Department of Building and Safety, Grading Division and Fire Department prior to the recordation of the map and issuance of any permits. Therefore, the project site is physically suitable for the proposed type of development.

(d) THE SITE IS PHYSICALLY SUITABLE FOR THE PROPOSED DENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT.

The General Plan identifies, through its Community and Specific Plans, geographic locations where planned and anticipated densities are permitted. Zoning standards for density are applied to sites throughout the city and are allocated based on the type of land use, physical suitability, and future population growth expected to occur. The adopted Community Plan designates the subject site for Low Residential land uses, which allows for single-family residential uses. The corresponding R1 Zone and Height District 1 applying to the subject site permits a residential density of one dwelling unit per 5,000 square feet of lot area. The site contains 269,857 square feet of land prior to dedication and proposes lot sizes ranging from approximately 8,000 to 25,600 square feet in area. Therefore, the project's proposed density is consistent with the general provisions and area requirements of the Planning and Zoning Code.

Surrounding uses include single-family residences, the former Girard Reservoir and the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Pumping Station, Louisville High School, a twostory shopping center, and a two-story commercial office building, and surface parking. The Project's density is appropriately scaled and situated given the uses in the surrounding area. The subject site is located in the Hillside Area of the City and has slightly varying elevation levels throughout the irregular shape of the lot. The site is in a developed area with adequate infrastructure. The area is easily accessible via improved streets and highways. The environmental review conducted by the Department of City Planning (Case No. ENV-2005-2301-EIR), establishes that the physical characteristics of the site and the proposed density of development are generally consistent with existing development and single-family residential character of the surrounding community.

Furthermore, any potential single-family residence will be subject to the standards of the Municipal Code and the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan. The maximum floor area to be developed on each lot will be determined by the Baseline Hillside Ordinance. The final height, massing, floor area, and design of each individual residence will be reviewed through a public hearing process by the Mulholland Specific Plan Design Review Board and the Director of City Planning for

conformance with the standards of the Specific Plan, including guidance relating to neighborhood compatibility. Through this process, building heights and residential floor area may potentially be further reduced.

Therefore, the project site is physically suitable for the proposed density of development.

(e) THE DESIGN OF THE SUBDIVISION AND THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS ARE NOT LIKELY TO CAUSE SUBSTANTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE OR SUBSTANTIALLY AND AVOIDABLY INJURE FISH OR WILDLIFE OR THEIR HABITAT.

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the project identifies no substantial environmental damage or adverse impacts on fish or wildlife resources. The project site, as well as the surrounding area, are developed with a mix of uses, including single-family residences, a school, and commercial/office buildings. However, the project site contains 3.7 acres of coast live oak woodland vegetation communities, including some that is mixed with ornamental trees and vegetation. Under the Tract Map improvements, approximately 3.5 of the 3.7 acres containing most of the site's oak canopy would remain intact. Specifically, of the 199 trees (including 166 protected trees) located on-site, 28 trees (including 15 coast live oaks) are expected to be removed, and would be required to be replaced at a 2:1 ratio on-site with 36"-box trees, consistent with the City's protected tree ordinance and the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan.

Additional mitigation measures for tree preservation are included in the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the project (Exhibit B), which is included as a Tract Map condition of approval. These includes measures such as: fencing off the driplines of all trees within 50 feet of the construction or grading areas, utilizing only hand digging (non-mechanical) methods near the protected drip lines, a prohibition of installing utilities, irrigation lines, landscaping, or grade changes within the protected oak driplines, and protection of trees with special mulch.

In addition, as is discussed in the Draft EIR for the Tract Map (in Section V.D, Biological Resources at page V.D-19), although mammals and reptiles may currently cross over Mulholland Drive between the Project Site and the relatively natural habitat areas on the school and park property to the south of Mulholland Drive, the Project Site does not function as part of a true wildlife corridor since wildlife dispersal across the Project Site is currently compromised by vehicle traffic on Mulholland Drive. In addition, the Project Site does not act to connect two significant or large core habitat areas; rather, the Project Site is a relatively small habitat island mostly surrounded by suburban development.

Construction impacts relating to birds and wildlife are discussed in the Draft EIR (Section V.D, pages V.D-17 through V.D-19) and mitigation measures are identified to reduce such impacts to below a level of significance. Nonetheless, it is acknowledged that any development activity on the Project Site has the potential to disturb birds and wildlife that currently utilize the property. It is also acknowledged that such impacts would largely be temporary rather than permanent, as the biota on-site would support recolonization of the Site by wildlife following the completion of construction activities and the implementation of the required landscaping plan and tree replacement.

The subdivision design and improvements are consistent with the existing development of the area. There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans which presently govern any portion of the project site or vicinity. The environmental review for the Project identifies no significant and unavoidable environmental impacts and no substantial impacts on fish or wildlife resources. Therefore, the design of the subdivision would not cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.

(f) THE DESIGN OF THE SUBDIVISION AND THE TYPE OF IMPROVEMENTS ARE NOT LIKELY TO CAUSE SERIOUS PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEMS.

The proposed subdivision and subsequent improvements are subject to the provisions of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (e.g., the Fire Code, Planning and Zoning Code, Health and Safety Code) and the Building Code. Other health and safety related requirements as mandated by law would apply where applicable to ensure the public health and welfare (e.g., asbestos abatement, seismic safety, flood hazard management).

The project is not located over a hazardous materials site, flood hazard area and is not located on unsuitable soil conditions. The project would not place any occupants or residents near a hazardous materials site or involve the use or transport of hazardous materials or substances. However, the project is located in State of California liquefaction zone. According to the memo from the Department of Building and Safety – Grading Division, dated November 21, 2017, the Department of Building and Safety has proposed the use of mat foundations for lots 5 through 19 of the project site as a mitigation measure and acknowledges that the requirements of the 2017 City of Los Angeles Building Code have been satisfied. Additionally, the memo has imposed conditions to ensure that the soil foundation of the project site is suitable and would not cause serious public health problems for the project.

In addition, the Bureau of Sanitation, Wastewater Collection System Division issued a letter dated April 24, 2018, stating that they reviewed the existing sewer and storm drain lines serving the tract, and determined that there will be no potential problems to these City structures or potential maintenance problems. The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) fully analyzed the impacts of both construction and operation of the project on the existing public utility and sewer systems, facilities and services and determined that impacts are less than significant. The development is required to be connected to the City's sanitary sewer system, where the sewage will be directed to the Hyperion Treatment Plant, which has been upgraded to meet Statewide ocean discharge standards. The proposed subdivision does not violate the existing California Water Code because the subdivision will be connected to the effluent from the Hyperion Treatment Plant. No adverse impacts to the public health or safety would occur as a result of the design and improvement of the site. Therefore, the design of the subdivision and the proposed improvements are not likely to cause serious public health problems.

(g) THE DESIGN OF THE SUBDIVISION AND THE TYPE OF IMPROVEMENTS WILL NOT CONFLICT WITH EASEMENTS ACQUIRED BY THE PUBLIC AT LARGE FOR ACCESS THROUGH OR USE OF PROPERTY WITHIN THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION.

There are no recorded instruments identifying easements encumbering the project site for the purpose of providing public access. The site is surrounded by private properties that adjoin improved public streets and sidewalks designed and improved for the specific purpose of providing public access throughout the area. In addition, the Bureau of Engineering did not indicate in their report dated May 25, 2016 that the proposed improvements would conflict with any easements. The project site is enclosed by a fence and does not adjoin or provide access to a public resource, natural habitat, public park, or any officially recognized public recreation area. Needed public access for roads and utilities will be acquired by the City prior to recordation of the proposed tract. Therefore, the design of the subdivision and the proposed improvements would not conflict with easements acquired by the public at large for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision.

(h) THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION WILL PROVIDE, TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE, FOR FUTURE PASSIVE OR NATURAL HEATING OR COOLING OPPORTUNITIES IN THE SUBDIVISION. (REF. SECTION 66473.1)

In assessing the feasibility of passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities in the proposed subdivision design, the applicant has prepared and submitted materials which consider the local climate, contours, configuration of the parcels to be subdivided and other design and improvement requirements.

Providing for passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities will not result in reducing allowable densities or the percentage of a lot which may be occupied by a building or structure under applicable planning and zoning in effect at the time the tentative map was filed. The lot layout of the subdivision has taken into consideration the maximizing of the north/south orientation. The topography of the site has been considered in the maximization of passive or natural heating and cooling opportunities.

In addition, prior to obtaining a building permit, the subdivider shall consider building construction techniques, such as overhanging eaves, location of windows, insulation, exhaust fans; planting of trees for shade purposes and the height of the buildings on the site in relation to adjacent development.

These findings shall apply to both the tentative and final maps for Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 67505.

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP Advisory Agency

Deblie Lawrence

Debbie Lawrence Deputy Advisory Agency

DL:MZ:ja

Note: If you wish to file an appeal, it must be filed within 10 calendar days from the decision date as noted in this letter. For an appeal to be valid to the City Planning Commission, it must be accepted as complete by the City Planning Department and appeal fees paid, <u>prior to expiration of the above 10-day time limit</u>. Such appeal <u>must</u> be submitted on Master Appeal Form No. CP-7769 at the Department's Public Offices, located at:

Figueroa Plaza 201 N. Figueroa St., 4th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90012 213 482-7077 Marvin Braude San Fernando Valley Development Service Center 6262 Van Nuys Blvd., Room 251 Van Nuys, CA 91401 818 374-5050 West Los Angeles Development Service Center 1828 Sawtelle Blvd., 2nd Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025 310 231-2901

Forms are also available on-line at http://planning.lacity.org.

If you seek judicial review of any decision of the City pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5, the petition for writ of mandate pursuant to that section must be filed no later than the 90th day following the date on which the City's decision became final pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6. There may be other time limits which also affect your ability to seek judicial review. If you have any questions, please call Development Services Center staff at (213) 482-7077, (818) 374-5050, or (310) 231-2901.