# IV. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

## 1. AESTHETICS

**a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is located within the Inner Corridor of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan area. Therefore, development of 37 single-family homes on the project site may have a significant adverse impact on a scenic vista. This issue is to be fully discussed in the EIR.

**b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is located within the Inner Corridor of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan area. Therefore, development of 37 single-family homes on the project site may have a significant adverse aesthetic impact to scenic resources within a City-designated corridor. This issue is to be fully discussed in the EIR.

**c) Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is located within the Inner Corridor of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan area. Therefore, development of 37 single-family homes on the project site may have a significant adverse impact on the existing visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings. This issue is to be fully discussed in the EIR.

**d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is located within the Inner Corridor of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan area. Therefore, development of 37 single-family homes on the project site may have a significant adverse aesthetic impact due to increased light and glare affecting day or nighttime views in the area. This issue is to be fully discussed in the EIR.

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** There are 27 related projects in the vicinity of the project site (see Table II-4). Development of the proposed project in conjunction with these related projects would result in an intensification of land uses in a suburban portion of the City. Many of the related projects would be visible from public and private properties. However, none of the related

projects is located within the Inner Corridor of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan and none would combine with the proposed project to affect cumulatively scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character or quality, or light and glare conditions of the Scenic Parkway. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

## 2. AGRICULTURE

**a) Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to result in the conversion of state-designated agricultural land from agricultural use to another non-agricultural use. The California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Protection, lists Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance under the general category of "Important Farmland." The Extent of Important Farmland Map Coverage maintained by the Division of Land Protection indicates that the project site is not included in the Important Farmland category.[1] The project site is located in a developed portion of Woodland Hills and does not include any state-designated agricultural lands. No impact on farmland or agricultural resources would occur.

**b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract. Neither the project site nor any adjacent properties are zoned for agricultural uses and there are no Williamson Act contracts in the area. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract.

**c) Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project results in the conversion of farmland to another, non-agricultural, use. Neither the project site nor any nearby properties are currently utilized for agricultural activities and, as discussed above (Section 2(a)), the site is not classified in any "Farmland" category designated by the State of California. No impact related to the conversion of Farmland would occur.

---

[1] *Source: State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Los Angeles County Important Farmland 1998, Map.*

**Cumulative Impacts**

**No Impact**. Development of the proposed project in combination with the related projects would not result in the conversion of State-designated agricultural land from agricultural use to a non-agricultural use. The Extent of Important Farmland Map Coverage maintained by the Division of Land Protection indicates that the project site and the surrounding area are not included in the Important Farmland category.[2] The project site and the related project sites are located in an urbanized area in the City and do not include any State-designated agricultural lands. Therefore, no cumulative impact would occur.

## 3. AIR QUALITY

### a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The project area is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). As such, it is also subject to the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) prepared by the SCAQMD in 2003. Projects that are considered to be consistent with AQMP growth projections should not interfere with attainment and should not contribute to the exceedance of an existing federal or state air quality standard because such growth is included in the projections utilized in the formulation of the AQMP. Therefore, projects, uses, and activities that are consistent with the applicable assumptions used in the development of the AQMP would not jeopardize attainment of the air quality levels identified in the AQMP, even if they exceed the SCAQMD's recommended thresholds at the project level. The AQMP control strategy is based on projections from local general plans and population growth projections identified by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) in the Growth Management Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG). The AQMP also assumes that general development projects will implement strategies (mitigation measures) to reduce emissions during construction and operation phases of development. For this reason, projects that are consistent with local general plans are considered consistent with air quality related regional plans, such as the AQMP. The AQMP is based on the designated land use for the project site contained in the Los Angeles City General Plan. To the extent that the proposed development is consistent with the General Plan, it is, by inference, also consistent with the AQMP.

The General Plan land use designation (per the Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills Community Plan, which is part of the City of Los Angeles General Plan) for the project site is Low Density Residential. Although the project applicant is requesting a change of zoning from R-1 (One-Family Dwelling) to RD-6 (Restricted Density Multiple Dwellings) the resulting

[2] *Ibid.*

project would have less density than permitted by the proposed zoning: the RD-6 zone requires 6,000 square feet of land area per unit (LAMC 12.09.1 B4). Lot 1 has 206,902 sq. ft. allowing 34 units maximum; 32 are proposed. Lot 2 has 62,954 sq. ft. allowing 10 units; 5 are proposed. The Community Plan category is Low Density Residential reflecting an anticipated population of 4-9 du/net acre with a midpoint of 6.5 units per acre (Refer to page III-2 of the Community Plan). Both the Summary of Land Use Table (End of Section III) and the General Plan Land Use Map show that Low Density category permits RD-6 uses. Therefore, the 37 units proposed on the subject property are consistent with the density anticipated in the General Plan and is less than permitted by the General Plan and proposed zoning of the property.

Based on the above, the proposed project is considered to be consistent with the AQMP, and would not jeopardize attainment of air quality standards. Such consistency implies that the project will not create any unanticipated regional air quality impacts because such impacts have already been incorporated within the framework of the regional air quality planning process. As a result, impacts under this category are considered to be less than significant. However, the EIR will provide additional analysis to assess the project's potential to result in air quality impacts, including any conflict with or obstruction of the applicable air quality plan, and any required mitigation measures.

**b) Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Demolition, grading and construction of the project site would result in the creation of a variety of air pollutant emissions, such as fugitive dust, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and sulfur dioxide. Such emissions may exceed the air quality standards established by the SCAQMD. During operation of the project, regional emissions would be generated by mobile and stationary sources. Mobile emissions (e.g., carbon monoxide) would occur as a result of project-related motor vehicles traveling to and from the project site. Stationary source emissions would occur indirectly as a result of space and water heating systems, and various appliances. The EIR will provide additional analysis to assess the project's potential to result in air quality impacts, including the quantification of air pollutant emissions created by the grading, construction and operational phases of the project, identification of applicable regulations, and any required mitigation measures.

**c) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative threshold for ozone precursors)?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Under procedures set forth in the SCAQMD CEQA Handbook, significance thresholds have been established for criteria pollutants for which the South Coast Air Basin is currently designated as non-attainment. These criteria pollutants are: Carbon Monoxide

(CO); Nitrogen Oxides ($NO_x$); Reactive Organic Compounds (ROC); and Particulate Matter – Fugitive Dust ($PM_{10}$). Demolition, grading and construction of the project site would result in the creation of a variety of air pollutant emissions, such as fugitive dust, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and sulfur dioxide. The EIR will provide additional analysis to assess the project's potential to result in air quality impacts, including the quantification of air pollutant emissions created by the grading and construction phases of the project, identification of applicable regulations, and any required mitigation measures.

**d) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The SCAQMD protocol utilizes localized CO concentrations to determine pollutant concentration potential. This criteria pollutant is the most likely to concentrate locally and cause health impacts, and is the only criteria pollutant for which an accepted methodology for calculating and assessing impacts of local concentrations has been developed. Activities such as demolition, grading and construction of the project site would have the potential to result in generation of CO emissions. CO emissions could be associated with truck traffic and equipment operation. The EIR will provide analyses to assess the project's emission levels associated with such activities, and the relationship of projected CO concentrations to applicable state and federal CO standards, including the identification of any required mitigation measures.

**e) Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project is the development of 37 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. Consequently, no impact would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Based on SCAQMD guidelines, cumulative air quality impacts are not analyzed in a manner similar to operational air quality impacts. Cumulative methods are different than the methodology used throughout the remainder of this Initial Study in which all-foreseeable future development within a given service boundary or geographical area is predicted and quantified. Instead, the SCAQMD's recommends that cumulative air quality analysis methods be based on performance standards and emission reduction targets necessary to attain the Federal and State air quality standards identified in the AQMP, which was established to attain future air quality standards. If an individual project is consistent with the AQMP performance standards, the project's cumulative impact should be considered less than significant. Based on the analysis provided earlier in the additional air quality analysis section, the proposed project is

consistent with the AQMP and consequently, would not result in a significant cumulative air quality impact.

## 4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

**a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulation, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site has been largely disturbed by residential development and ornamental landscaping. Additionally, the project site is surrounded by residential development, an abandoned reservoir, a private school, and commercial uses. Because of the extent of onsite disturbance and surrounding development, there would be less potential for sensitive species to occur on the project site, compared to less disturbed sites of comparable area. However, the project site is in close proximity to large expanses of relatively undisturbed open space located to the south of Mulholland Drive, and the California Natural Diversity Data Base[3] lists three sensitive wildlife species, five sensitive plant species, and two sensitive plant communities for the Canoga Park USGS Topographic Quad Sheet, where the project site is located. Therefore, there is the potential that sensitive species and/or plant communities could occur on the project site. Consequently, project impacts are potentially significant and will be fully discussed in the Draft EIR.

Oak and black walnut trees are considered to be protected trees by the City of Los Angeles, and they occur on the project. Impacts to oak and black walnut trees are discussed in Section 4 (e), below.

**b) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

**Potentially Significant Impact**. A significant impact would occur where riparian habitat or any other sensitive natural community identified locally, regionally, or by the state and federal regulatory agencies cited were to be adversely modified without adequate mitigation. The project site has experienced modest development in the past and is located within a developed residential and commercial area of Woodland Hills. There is no riparian habitat but there is oak woodland on the project site, which is a sensitive habitat area. Therefore, the proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts to sensitive natural communities. This issue is to be fully discussed in the EIR.

[3] *http://www.dfg.ca.gov/whdab/html/quick_viewer_launch.html*

**c) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur where federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act would be modified or removed without adequate mitigation. Observations during an on-site investigation identified no surface water features or vegetation indicative of wetland areas (i.e., cattails and sedges) on the project site or adjacent properties.[4] Therefore, the project site would not be expected to support any riparian or wetland habitat, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (see Section 4(b), above) and no project impacts to riparian or wetland habitats would occur.

**d) Would the project 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?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would interfere or remove access to a migratory wildlife corridor or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. The project site is located in a developed portion of Hills and has been previously disturbed by residential development. No wildlife corridors are known to be located onsite and none would be expected, given the substantial extent of residential and institutional development surrounding the project site. Therefore, no project impacts to fish or wildlife corridors would be anticipated.

**e) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

The following analysis is based upon the Horticultural Tree Report prepared by Trees, etc., dated April 19, 2004, which is attached (see Appendix A) and incorporated here by reference.

**Potentially Significant Impact.** A project-related significant adverse effect could occur if the proposed project would cause an impact which is inconsistent with local regulations pertaining to biological resources. Local ordinances protecting biological resources are limited to the City of Los Angeles Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance. The Horticultural Tree Report evaluated 186 trees onsite and adjacent to the project site, of which 30 would be removed for development of the proposed project. The remaining trees located on the 6.19-acre project site would remain undisturbed. Of the 30 trees to be removed, 24 are ornamental trees that are common and in various stages of health and vigor. The remaining six trees to be removed are coast live oaks (*Quercus agrifloria*) (all over eight inches in diameter) located on the southwest portion of the project site. The City of Los Angeles Oak Tree Ordinance (153,478) states that any Oak Tree

[4] *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by EMG, November 13, 2003.*

measuring eight inches in diameter or more as measured from four and one-half feet above the ground level at the base of the tree must be protected. Consequently, project impacts are potentially significant and will be fully discussed in the Draft EIR.

**f) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?**

**No Impact**. A significant impact would occur where a project would be inconsistent with mapping or policies in any conservation plans of the types cited. The project site and its vicinity are not part of any draft or adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan. No project impacts to any adopted habitat or conservation plans would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Less than Significant Impact.** None of the related projects is located close enough to combine with the proposed project to create cumulative impacts to biological resources. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be expected to be less than significant.

## 5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

A Phase I Archaeological Survey prepared by W & S Consultants, November 30, 2004, and a South Central Coastal Information Center Records Search dated July 22, 2004 were compiled for the proposed project. Both are incorporated here by reference and attached to this Initial Study in Appendix B.

**a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?**

**No Impact.** Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines a historical resource as: (1) a resource listed in or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources; (2) a resource listed in a local register of historical resources or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting certain state guidelines; or (3) an object, building, structure, site, area, place, record or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military or cultural annals of California, provided that the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. A project-related significant adverse effect could occur if the proposed project would adversely affect an historical resource meeting one of these definitions.

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.[5] 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 project impacts to historical resources would occur.

**b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The proposed project site is located in a developed area and has experienced modest development. According to the Phase I Archaeological Survey prepared by W & S Consultants, November 30, 2004, an archival records search, a review of existing published and unpublished reference on local prehistory and history, and an on-foot, intensive survey of the project site did not result in the discovery of any evidence of archaeological resources of any kind on the project site. Therefore, development of the proposed project does not have the potential to result in adverse impacts to known cultural resources. However, portions of the study area were found to be covered with imported fill. The inability to inspect this portion of the site, combined with the close proximity of the well-known archaeological site CA-LAN-246, makes the project site archaeologically sensitive. While project impacts to archaeological resources are expected to be less than significant, listed below are several Conditions of Approval which may be required by the City of Los Angeles to prevent substantial adverse changes in the significance of any archaeological resources in the event that any are discovered during site preparation and project construction.

Conditions of Approval

5-1. A qualified archaeologist shall be retained by the project developer to monitor topsoil grading, to ensure that any buried archaeological deposit is not inadvertently disturbed without treatment.

5-2. In the event that subsurface archaeological resources/human remains are encountered during the course of grading and/or excavation, all development shall temporarily cease in these areas until the archaeological resources are properly assessed and subsequent recommendations are determined by a qualified archaeologist. In the event that human remains are discovered, there shall be no disposition of such human remains, other than in accordance with the procedures and requirements set forth in California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. These code provisions require notification of the County Coroner and the Native American Heritage

[5] *Letter correspondence, Thomas Shackford, Staff Researcher, South Coast Central Coastal Information Center, July 22, 2004 (Appendix C).*

Commission, who in turn must notify those persons believed to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American for appropriate disposition of the remains. Excavation or disturbance may continue in other areas of the project site that are not reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains or archaeological resources.

5-3. Copies of a subsequent archeological study or report, detailing the nature of any archaeological discovery, remedial actions taken, and disposition of any accessioned remains shall be submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton.

**c) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

A Paleontologic resource evaluation prepared by Paleo Environmental Associates, dated October 12, 2004, and a Paleontological records search at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County dated July 23, 2004 were compiled for the proposed project. Both are incorporated here by reference and attached to this Initial Study in Appendix C.

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** According to the Paleontologic Resource Evaluation, the project site is underlain (in ascending stratigraphic order) by two Cenozoic stratigraphic rock units; an unnamed later Miocene marine shale (which underlies the hill in the southeastern portion of the site) and Holocene younger alluvium (which underlies the remaining, lower flat-lying portion of the site). According to the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Vertebrate Paleontology Department, the potential for these rock units to yield fossil remains would be high within the marine shale, moderate within the alluvium at depth, and low within the alluvium near the surface. Thus, excavations during construction in the uppermost soil and younger alluvium layers are unlikely to uncover significant vertebrate fossils, however, any excavations of underlying older marine shale layers may well encounter important fossil vertebrate remains.[6] Because grading activities conducted within the marine shale could encounter paleontologic remains, several Conditions of Approval are listed below which should be required by the City of Los Angeles to prevent substantial adverse changes in the significance of paleontological resources in the event that any are discovered during site preparation and project construction. With implementation of these Conditions of Approval, project impacts to paleontological remains would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Conditions of Approval

5-4 Prior to construction, the services of a qualified vertebrate paleontologist approved by the Los Angeles County Vertebrate Paleontology Department (LACM) and the City of

[6] *Ibid.*

Los Angeles shall be retained to implement a mitigation program during earth-moving activities associated with development of the parcel.

5-5 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.

5-6 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.

5-7 All fossil specimens recovered from the parcel 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.

5-8 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 SVP and museum repository requirements.

**d) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A project-related significant adverse effect could occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the proposed project would disturb previously interred human remains. While there is no evidence that human remains are located on the project site, there is still a remote possibility that the construction phase of the proposed project could encounter human remains, which in turn could result in potentially significant impacts. However, implementation of the Conditions of Approval listed above in 5(b) would reduce impacts to human remains to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with other nearby related projects (see Table II-4) would result in an increase of existing localized land uses in an already urbanized area of the City of Los Angeles. With mitigation the proposed project's impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with regard to historic, archaeological, and paleontological, as well as human remains. While it is unknown as to whether any of the related projects would, on their own, result in significant impacts upon cultural resources, those projects within the city of Los Angeles can be expected to implement comparable mitigation measures as the proposed project. The Cities of Calabasas and Hidden Hills as well as the County of Los Angeles also have stringent requirements for mitigating impacts to cultural resources. Therefore, cumulative cultural resource impacts related to the development of the proposed project would be expected to be reduced to less than significant levels.

## 6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

**a) Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**

The following analysis is based upon the Geologic and Soils Engineering Exploration, Proposed 37 Unit Residential Development, Tentative Tract 61553, Portion of Lot 1083, Tract 1000, 22255 Mulholland Drive, Woodland Hills, California for DS Ventures, LLC, March 22, 2005 prepared by The J. Byer Group, Inc., September 24, 2003, respectively. A copy of this report can be found in Appendix D.

**(i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project site is located within

a state-designated Alquist-Priolo Zone or other designated fault zone, and appropriate building practices are not employed.

According to the Geologic and Soils Engineering Exploration report, there are no known active faults with 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.[7] 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 onsite rupture of a known earthquake fault would be less than significant.

**(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a proposed 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.

As with all properties in the seismically active Southern California region, the project site is susceptible to ground shaking during seismic events produced by local faults. While it is likely that the project site will be shaken by future earthquakes produced in southern California, modern, well-constructed buildings are designed to resist ground shaking through the use of shear panels and reinforcement.

While the understanding of seismic activity grows over time, and additional faults are discovered, the site currently is not included in a City-designated Fault Rupture Study Zones or State-designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones (see Section VI (a) i, above). Potential impacts from seismic ground shaking are present throughout Southern California and would not be higher at the project site than for most of the City of Los Angeles or elsewhere in the region. Also, the City of Los Angeles Building Code, revised since the 1994 Northridge Earthquake, contains construction requirements to assure habitable structures are built to a level of acceptable seismic risk. With the project's construction in accordance with the code requirements, the risks from seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

**(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project is located in an area identified as having a high risk of liquefaction and mitigation measures required within such designated areas are not incorporated into the project. 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

[7] *Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zones and Fault Rupture Study Areas in the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles City Planning Department, Citywide Division, September 1, 1996.*

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 inter-fingering nature of the clayey and sandy alluvium. The highest liquefaction potential is located near the center of the project 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 constructions. Other than compliance with the Building Code and the City's specific requirements, no further mitigation would be necessary.

**(iv) Landslides?**

**No Impact.** A project-related significant adverse effect may occur if a project is located in a hillside area with soil conditions that would suggest high potential for sliding. The project site is not in a landslide inventory area.[8] Therefore, no impact from seismically induced landslides would be expected.

**b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project 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 37 detached condominiums. 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

[8] *City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering, Navigate LA, website: http://navigatela.lacity.org/index01.htm, July 28, 2004.*

grading and building permit requirements and the application of Best Management Practices, no significant impacts would occur related to erosion or loss of topsoil.

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

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project is built in an unstable area without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for project buildings, thus posing a hazard to life and property. Potential impacts with regard to liquefaction and landslide potential are evaluated in Sections 6(a) iii and iv, above. Construction must comply with the conditions of approval listed in Section 6(a) ii and iii, including building foundation requirements appropriate to site conditions. A less-than-significant impact is anticipated for the proposed project.

**d) Would the project be located on expansive soil, as identified in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the proposed 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 (fbs). 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.

**e) Would the project 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?**

**No Impact.** This question would apply to the proposed project only if it were located in an area not served by an existing sewer system. The proposed project site is located in a developed area of the City of Los Angeles, which is served by a wastewater collection, conveyance and treatment

system operated by the City of Los Angeles. No septic tanks or alternative disposal systems are necessary, nor are they proposed. No impact would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with development of the related projects identified in Table II-4 would result in the intensification of residential and commercial development in a seismically-active region. Even though a mixture of clayey and sandy alluvium soils underlay the project site, development would be required to comply with the City of Los Angeles Building Code and cumulative development would, therefore, be less than significant. Due to compliance with the California Building Code as well as identified conditions of approval, the proposed project's geotechnical impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant.

## 7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

**a) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a proposed project involves use or disposal of hazardous materials as part of its routine operations and would have the potential to generate toxic or otherwise hazardous emissions that could adversely affect sensitive receptors. Uses sensitive to hazardous emissions (i.e., sensitive receptors) in the area consist of the single-family residential uses located to the north, south, west and east of the project site and the Louisville High School and Convent to the south of the project site. Other than typical cleaning solvents used for residential purposes, no hazardous materials would be used, transported, or disposed of in conjunction with the routine day-to-day operations of the proposed project. No impact would occur.

**b) Would the project create significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project utilizes substantial quantities of hazardous materials as part of its routine operations and could potentially pose a hazard to nearby sensitive receptors under accident or upset conditions. A high-pressure gas line currently runs adjacent to the project site on the northwest side of Mulholland Drive. This gas line is partially exposed. Construction of the proposed project could pose a potential for accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials related to this pipeline. This impact would be considered potentially significant, and this issue will be fully analyzed in the EIR.

**c) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** A project-related significant adverse effect may occur if a project site is located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school site and has the potential to emit hazardous emissions. The nearest school, Louisville High School, is approximately 206 feet to the south of the project site. As stated in 7 (b), above, construction of the proposed project could pose a potential for accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials related to the high-pressure gas pipeline. This impact would be considered potentially significant, and this issue will be fully analyzed in the EIR.

**d) Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

The following analysis is based upon the Preliminary Environmental Site Assessment- Phase I Residential Property 22241 and 22255 Mulholland Drive Los Angeles, CA 91364 prepared by California Environmental Geologists & Engineers Inc. ("California Enviornmental"), August 2003. A copy of this report can be found in Appendix E.

**No Impact.** California Government Code Section 65962.5 requires various state agencies to compile lists of hazardous waste disposal facilities, unauthorized releases from underground storage tanks, contaminated drinking water wells and solid waste facilities from which there is known migration of hazardous waste and submit such information to the Secretary for Environmental Protection on at least an annual basis. A significant impact may occur if a project site is included on any of the above lists and poses an environmental hazard to surrounding sensitive uses.

*Regulatory Database Review*

California Environmental reviewed the EDR Radius Map (regulatory database) report prepared by Environmental Data Resources, Incorporated (EDR), dated July 28, 2003. A summary of the federal and state agency database findings presented in the Phase I ESA is presented in Table IV-1. In addition, California Environmental also reviewed the 26 unmappable "Orphan" sites in the database report, cross-referencing addresses and site names. Unmappable sites are environmental risk sites that cannot be plotted with confidence, but can be located by zip code or city name. In general, such sites cannot be geo-coded because of inaccurate or missing location information in the record provided by the agency. Identified unmappable sites within the specified search radii are included in Table IV-1 below.

**Table IV-1**
**Regulatory Database Results**

| Regulatory Database | Approx Minimum Search Distance | Property Listed | No. of Area Sites Listed |
|---|---|---|---|
| Federal RCRIS-SQG | ¼ mile | No | 5 |
| Federal ERNS list | ¼ mile | No | 1 |
| Federal FINDS | ½ mile | No | 5 |
| State UST | ¼ mile | No | 1 |
| State CLEANERS | ¼ mile | No | 2 |
| CA SLIC | ½ mile | No | 1 |
| California Hazardous Waste Information System (HAZNET) | ½ mile | No | 25 |
| LA County HMS | ¼ mile | No | 14 |
| LA County Site Mitigation List | ½ mile | No | 1 |
| WMUDS/SWAT | ½ mile | No | 3 |
| Cortese | 0.2 mile | No | 1 |
| CHMIRS | 0.2 mile | No | 2 |
| CA WDS | XXX | No | 2 |
| *Source: Preliminary Environmental Site Assessment Phase I Residential Property 22241 and 22255 Mulholland Drive, Los Angeles, CA 91364 prepared by California Environmental, August 2003* | | | |

Based on review of the regulatory database report, and by cross-referencing name, address, and zip code, California Environmental concluded that the project site is not a listed site. In addition, the project site is not listed on the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Hazardous Waste and Substances List (CORTESE). Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

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

**No Impact.** A significant project-related impact may occur if a project were placed within a public airport land use plan area, or within two miles of a public airport, and subject to a safety hazard. The nearest airports are the Van Nuys and Burbank Airports which are located within approximately 10.65 to 20.5 miles to the northeast of the project site respectively. Furthermore, the project site is not in the vicinity of an airport land use plan.[9] Therefore, no impact would occur.

**f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

**No Impact.** This question would apply to the proposed project only if it were in the vicinity of a private airstrip and would subject area residents and workers to a safety hazard. The proposed project is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact would occur.

[9] *City of Los Angeles Department of Planning, Zone Information and Map Access System, website: http://zimas.lacity.org/, July 28, 2004.*

**g) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project were to interfere with roadway operations used in conjunction with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan or would generate sufficient traffic to create traffic congestion that would interfere with the execution of such a plan. Short-term construction activities of the proposed project could result in temporary lane closures; but would not substantially impede public access or travel upon public rights-of-way and would not interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan (e.g., no existing street patterns would be changed). In addition, project impacts to area traffic would have no significant impacts on nearby roadways or intersection operations that might result in the interference with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan (See Section 15, below). No impact would occur.

**h) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project is located in proximity to wildland areas and poses a potential fire hazard, which could affect persons or structures in the area in the event of a fire. The proposed project site is located in a mountain fire district and a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ).[10] VHFHSZs are areas designated by the City of Los Angeles Fire Department pursuant to Government Code 51178 that were identified and recommended to local agencies by the Director of Forestry and Fire Protection 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 Fire Code.[11]

The project site consists mostly of level or gently sloping terrain and has good access from both Mulholland Drive and San Feliciano Drive. Additionally, the project site is surrounded by suburban development and is not immediately adjacent to wildlands. Therefore, there are no severe site limitations that would restrict access for fire fighting equipment. Furthermore, water mains are available adjacent to the site. Also, while the project site is located beyond the recommended 1.5 mile response distance from the nearest fire station, the requirement to provide automatic fire sprinkler systems would mitigate this concern (see Section XII (a)). Taken together, these considerations suggest that the project would not expose people or structures to a greater than average risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. Therefore, impacts with respect to wildfires would be less than significant.

---

[10] *City of Los Angeles Department of Planning, Zone Information and Map Access System, website: http://zimas.lacity.org/, July 20, 2004.*

[11] *Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: Brush Fire Hazard Areas and Select Wildfire Hazard Areas, Los Angeles City Planning Department, Citywide Division, September 1, 1996.*

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with development of related projects (see Table II-4) in the area would result in the development of residential and commercial uses. None of the related projects are industrial or involve other related uses that typically use, store, transport or treat hazardous materials. Rather, the related projects 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 would be expected to be less than significant. Only one related project (#24) is similarly located in close proximity to wildland areas that may combine with the proposed project to create cumulative wildfire hazards. All the other related projects are located in more developed areas and would not be expected to be subject to wildland fires. Both the proposed project and related project #24 would mitigate their individual impacts by compliance with standard Fire Department requirements; therefore, no significant cumulative impacts would be anticipated.

## 8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

**a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project discharges water which does not meet the quality standards of agencies which regulate surface water quality and water discharge into storm water drainage systems. Significant impacts would also occur if a project does not comply with all applicable regulations with regard to surface water quality as governed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). These regulations include compliance with the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements to reduce potential water quality impacts.

Environmental impacts may result from the development of the proposed project. However, the potential impacts would be mitigated to a level of less than significant through incorporation of stormwater pollution control measures. Ordinance No. 172,176 and Ordinance No. 173,494 specify Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control, which requires the application of Best Management Practices (BMPs). Chapter IX, Division 70 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code addresses grading, excavations, and fills. Applicants must meet the requirements of the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) as approved by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. Thus, with incorporation of BMPs, the proposed project would result in a less than significant water quality impact.

**b) Would the project 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 (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells**

**would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?**

**No Impact.** 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 proposed project does not involve any ground water extraction for wells or dewatering for subterranean construction. Therefore, the proposed project would not deplete groundwater supplies, and no impact would occur.

**c) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project results in a substantial alteration of drainage patterns that would result in a substantial increase in erosion or siltation during construction or operation of the project. The project site is located in a primarily suburbanized area, and no stream or river courses are located in the immediate project vicinity. Currently, the existing unimproved project site drains northeasterly into the abandoned Department of Water and Power Girard Reservoir, which carries off-site drainage into the San Feliciano storm drain. The proposed project would result in an improved site that would convey runoff via streets into the storm drains that border the tract to the west and along Feliciano. Thus, the runoff from the project site would end up in the same storm drain system, and no erosion or siltation impact associated with the alteration of existing drainage patterns would occur.

**d) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project results in increased runoff volumes during construction or operation of the project that would result in flooding conditions affecting the project site or nearby properties. Currently, the existing unimproved project site drains northeasterly into the abandoned Department of Water and Power Girard Reservoir, which carries off-site drainage into the San Feliciano storm drain. The proposed project would result in an improved site that would convey runoff via streets into the storm drains that border the tract to the west and along Feliciano. Thus, the runoff from the project site would end up in the same storm drain system, and no flooding impact associated with the alteration of existing drainage patterns would occur.

**e) Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project would increase the volume of storm water runoff to a level that exceeded the capacity of the storm drain system serving a project site. A project-related significant adverse effect would also occur if a project would substantially increase the probability that polluted runoff would reach the storm drain system. Runoff from the project site would be collected via streets and would be directed to the San Feliciano storm drain. Development of the proposed project would result in 35.6 percent coverage of the site by impervious surfaces (e.g., structures and paved surfaces). With additional impervious surfaces, there would be a 5.2 cubic feet per second (cfs) net increase in runoff with development of the site. As these impervious surfaces would be exposed to the elements, minimal amounts of polluted runoff could also be created. However, the San Feliciano storm drain would accept the incremental increase in runoff. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially increase stormwater runoff from the project site above existing levels or provide additional sources of polluted runoff to the storm drain system. This impact would be considered less than significant.

**f) Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project includes potential sources of water pollutants that would have the potential to substantially degrade water quality. Other than the sources discussed above under 7(e), the proposed project would not include other potential sources of contaminants which could potentially degrade water quality. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially degrade water quality, and a less-than-significant impact would occur.

**g) Would the project 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?**

**No Impact.** This question would apply to the proposed project only if it were placing housing in a 100-year flood zone. The proposed project would involve the development of housing, but the project site is not in an area designated as a 100-year flood hazard area.[12] Further, according to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) 0601370041C, the project site is located within Zone C, which includes areas of minimal flooding. Therefore, no impact would occur.

[12] *Los Angeles City Planning Department Environmental and Public Facilities Maps, 100 Year and 500 year Flood Plains, September 1, 1996.*

**h) Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located within a 100-year flood zone, which would impede or redirect flood flows. As mentioned in 8(g), the project site is not in an area designated as a 100-year flood hazard area.[13] The proposed project is located in a suburbanized area and would not have the potential to impede or redirect floodwater flows. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**i) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project exposed people or structures to a significant risk of loss or death caused by a seiche (a surface wave created when a body of water is shaken) or inundation (caused by a water storage facility failure). The project does not lie in a potential inundation area or a potentially affected-by-tsunami area.[14] The Girard Reservoir is located northeast and adjacent to the project site, however, the reservoir has been drained since 1989.[15] Therefore, flooding of the project site as a result of a break in the reservoir is unlikely. Flooding from other sources is also not expected (refer to Section 8 (g) and (h)). Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

**j) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project site is sufficiently close to the ocean or other water body to be potentially at risk of the effects of seismically-induced tidal phenomena (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 proposed project site is not located close to an ocean, as the Pacific Ocean lies approximately 8 miles south of the project site on the southern side of the Santa Monica Mountains. With respect to the potential impact from a mudflow, the project site is located in a hilly area, however, the project 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 project site is not subject to a risk of flooding from inundation by seiche or tsunami

---

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] *Los Angeles City Planning Department Environmental and Public Facilities Maps, Inundation and Tsunami Hazard Areas, September 1, 1996.*

[15] *Preliminary Environmental Site Assessment Phase I Residential Property 22241 and 22255 Mulholland Drive Los Angeles, CA 91364.*

or subject to significant risk involving mudflow. This impact would be considered less than significant.

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with development of related projects (see Table II-4) in the area would increase the amount of impervious area and runoff; however, landform and drainage alteration would be limited as the cumulative projects would be directing drainage via improved streets to the same storm drainage systems that currently collect drainage from these sites. In addition, none of the related projects are located in close proximity to the project site and would, therefore, not have the potential to combine with the proposed project to create cumulative hydrology impacts. As runoff from the proposed project flows into the San Feliciano storm drain system and would contribute incremental runoff to this system, development of the proposed project would not be considered cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant.

## 9. LAND USE AND PLANNING

**a) Would the project physically divide an established community?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a proposed project were sufficiently large enough or otherwise configured in such a way as to create a physical barrier within an established community (a typical example would be a project which involved a continuous right-of-way such as a roadway which would divide a community and impede access between parts of the community). The proposed development would not expand or modify the existing project site boundaries. Furthermore, no streets or sidewalks would be permanently closed as a result of the development. No separation of uses or disruption of access between land use types would occur as a result of the project. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the established community, and no impact is anticipated from project implementation.

**b) Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is located within the Inner Corridor of the Mulholland Scenic Corridor Specific Plan area. There is the potential that the project would not be consistent with the provisions of the Specific Plan. Consequently a discussion of the project's compatibility with the Specific Plan is required and will be provided in the EIR.

**c) Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?**

**No Impact.** A project-related significant adverse effect could occur if the project site were located within an area governed by a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No such plans presently exist which govern any portion of the project site. Furthermore, the project site is located in a suburban community. Therefore the proposed project would not conflict with such plans.

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with development of related projects (see Table II-4) in the area would result in the conversion of vacant land and low-density uses or the conversion of existing land use (e.g., from commercial to residential). It could be possible that cumulative impacts on land use compatibility might occur with respect to one or more of the related projects due to specific issues associated with these projects or their locations. These cumulative issues will be discussed in the EIR.

## 10. MINERAL RESOURCES

**a) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project is located in an area used or available for extraction of a regionally-important mineral resource and the project converted an existing or potential future regionally-important mineral extraction use to another use or if the project affected access to a site used or potentially available for regionally-important mineral resource extraction. No oil extraction or mineral extraction activities have historically occurred or are presently conducted on the project site.[16] No adverse project impacts would occur.

**b) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project is located in an area used or available for extraction of a locally-important mineral resource extraction and the project converted an existing or potential future locally-important mineral extraction use to another use or if the project affected access to a site used or potentially available for locally-important mineral resource

[16] *Preliminary Environmental Site Assessment Phase I Residential Property 22241 and 22255 Mulholland Drive Los Angeles, CA 91364.*

extraction. The City of Los Angeles has not designated a locally-significant resource on the site; thus no locally-designated resources would be affected.[17] No impact would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts**

**No Impact.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with development of related projects (see Table II-4) in the area would result in the development and redevelopment of sites that are not designated as mineral resource recovery sites by the City of Los Angeles. Due to an absence of oil and mineral extraction activities currently and historically at the project site as well as no City-designation of the project site as a locally-significant mineral resource, no cumulative mineral resource impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project.

**11. NOISE**

**a) Would the project result in 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?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed project may generate short-term intermittent noise levels that could exceed standards set forth in the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Ordinance No. 144,331) and therefore are potentially significant. This issue is to be fully discussed in the Draft EIR.

**b) Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The primary vibration sources associated with the development of the Project may include the use of heavy machinery and trucks during the construction of foundations. Pile divers for example, create a high-intensity, repetitious noise that is disturbing and can result in ground vibrations. However, due to the proximity of residential uses to the project site (i.e., western boundary), and the school south of the site, it is possible construction activity could result in vibration above the normally acceptable threshold of 0.4 inches per second. Impacts are, therefore, considered to be potentially significant. This issue is to be discussed in the Draft EIR.

**c) Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Any permanent changes in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity as a result of the proposed project would be due to project occupancy. Once the project

[17] *Los Angeles City Planning Department Environmental and Public Facilities Maps, Areas Containing Significant Mineral Deposits, September 1, 1996.*

is occupied, it is expected that noise generated by the proposed project would be similar to that generated by existing residential uses in the vicinity. Project development, while contributing to an overall increase in ambient noise levels in the project area, would result in land uses that are consistent with the General Plan land use designation for the project site. In addition the proposed project would have to result in the doubling of traffic to create a perceptible (three decibels) noise increase in ambient noise levels. Based on the project's traffic report, the project would result in a trip generation of 354 vehicles per day. This will not be enough to result in an increase of three decibels in ambient noise levels at the project level. Therefore, project-related operational noise impacts are expected to be less than significant.

**d) Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** As indicated under items 10(a) and (b) above, construction activities associated with the proposed project would result in temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project area above levels existing without the proposed project. This issue is to be discussed in the Draft EIR.

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

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the project would introduce substantial new sources of noise or substantially add to existing sources of noise within or in the vicinity of the project site during construction of the project. The proposed project site is not located within an airport land use plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

**No Impact.** This question would apply to a project only if it were in the vicinity of a private airstrip and would subject area residents and workers to a safety hazard. The project site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. No such facilities are located in the vicinity of the project site. No impact would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts**

The continued development throughout the City of Los Angeles may result in intermittent, short term noise impacts throughout the region. Construction activities may result in potentially significant short-term noise impacts on sensitive land uses in the vicinity of the individual project sites. The duration of these localized impacts would be limited to the construction phases of the

individual projects. All construction activities taking place within the City would be subject to the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance.

However, construction of the proposed project is not expected to result in a cumulatively considerable impact in terms of substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site. The nearest active construction site is an existing project located approximately 150 feet to the north of the proposed project site. Because this project is nearing completion, it is anticipated that no other projects would be located in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site that would have the potential to affect the same surrounding uses at the same time as does the proposed project. The same condition would apply to the exposure of people to or the generation of excessive groundborne vibration in the vicinity of the project site during project construction. Because no other construction projects are located in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site that would have the potential to affect the same surrounding uses at the same time as does the proposed project, the contribution of the proposed project to any cumulative construction-related groundborne vibration impacts would not be considerable.

## 12. POPULATION AND HOUSING

**a) Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a proposed project were to result in new development such as homes, businesses, roads, or infrastructure, with the effect of substantially inducing growth that would otherwise not have occurred as rapidly or in as great a magnitude. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the development of 37 new single-family detached condominiums, which would include construction of private, gated roads and extension of existing utility lines throughout a planned community, but would not result in the development of any new businesses, public roads, or new infrastructure that would lend to additional future development in the area.

As part of its comprehensive planning process for the Southern California region, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has divided its jurisdiction into 13 subregions. The project site is located within the City of Los Angeles Subregion ("Subregion"), which includes all areas within the boundaries of the City of Los Angeles. For 2005, the Subregion has an estimated 4,032,474 population and 1,330,724 households (SCAG RTP Growth Forecast, 2004). By the year 2010, SCAG forecasts an increase to 4,176,079 persons (a 3.6 percent increase) and 1,393,635 households (a 4.7 percent increase) within the Subregion. By 2030, SCAG forecasts an increase to 4,413,425 persons (a 9.4 percent increase) and 1,663,002 households (a 5.0 percent increase) within the Subregion.

The project site in also considered part of the Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills and West Hills Community Planning Area ("Planning Area"). For 2003, the Planning Area had an estimated total population of 169,692 persons and 62,042 housing units.

Utilizing a factor of 2.905 persons per household (CDF Estimates, 2002), the project can be expected to generate a total resident population of 108 persons with development of all 37 single-family detached condominiums. This represents an increase of 0.000027 percent from the 2005 estimated Subregion population, and an increase of 0.00064 percent from the 2003 estimated Planning Area total resident population. This would not represent substantial population growth within the Subregion nor the Planning Area and represents a less-than-significant impact In addition, due to the strong demand for housing in the area, the increase in housing supply would actually be considered a beneficial impact.

**b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

**No Impact.** The project site is currently developed with one unoccupied single-family residence. This residence will be demolished. The removal of this residence would not constitute the displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing. Therefore, no project impact would occur.

**c) Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

**No Impact.** A project-related significant adverse affect could occur if the project would result in displacement of existing occupied housing units. There currently is one vacant residence on the project site. Therefore, no project impact would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with related projects (see Table II-4) in the area would result in development of 3,400 housing units, which represents a 0.00245-percent population increase from the SCAG 2005 population estimates for the Los Angles City Subregion. As this population growth remains within future SCAG projections for the City of Los Angeles Subregion, such cumulative growth would be less than significant. Due to an incremental project-related population increase (0.000027 percent) within the Subregion as well as the current need for housing within this area (identified as the Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills and West Hills Community Planning Area), the proposed project's population and housing impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant.

## 13. PUBLIC SERVICES

**a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government 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 objective for any of the following public services:**

**Fire protection?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) provides fire protection services to the project area. A significant impact may occur if the LAFD could not adequately serve a project based upon response time, access, or fire hydrant/water availability. The LAFD considers fire protection services for a project adequate if a project site is within the maximum response distance for the land use proposed. Pursuant to Section 57.09.07A of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, the maximum response distance between residential land uses and a LAFD fire station that houses an engine or truck company is 1.5 miles.[18] If this distance is exceeded, all structures located in the applicable residential area would be required to install automatic fire sprinkler systems. Thus, since the project site is approximately 2.2 miles driving distance from Fire Station No. 84, located at 5340 Canoga Avenue in Woodland Hills, the proposed development would be required to install sprinkler systems.

The required fire flow for the proposed low-density single-family residential development would be approximately 2,000 gallons per minute (gpm). In any instance, a minimum residual water pressure of 20 pounds per square inch is to remain in the water system while the required gpm is flowing. Fire flow requirements and water pressure to meet fire flow and residual requirements are unknown at this time. However, prior to approval, the proposed project would submit a request to LADWP to determine whether the pressure in the project area is sufficient. If they are not, then upgrades to the existing infrastructure would be necessary. Overall, the proposed project would not generate the need, or cause the construction of new or expanded fire protection facilities. Further, the project would be constructed according to California Fire Code requirements regarding length and width of roads and accesses as well as distance to and between fire hydrants. Impacts associated with fire protection services would be considered less than significant.

**Police protection?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) provides law enforcement services to the project area. A significant impact may occur if a project creates the

[18] Los Angeles Fire Department, Station No. 84, website: http://www.lafd.org/fs84.htm, June 22, 2005.

need for new or physically altered police facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objective. The project site is located in the West Valley Area police service area and would be served by the West Valley Community Police Station, located at 19020 Vanowen Street in Reseda. The West Valley Area covers approximately 52 square miles and is served by approximately 350 sworn police officers. West Valley's 350 sworn officers patrol over 750 street miles and serve a population of almost 300,000 residents, in the areas of Reseda, West Hills, Woodland Hills, Encino, Tarzana, Sherman Oaks (part), Northridge (part), Winnetka, and Canoga Park.[19] Thus, the officer to resident ratio for the West Valley Area is one officer per 860 residents, and the proposed project's addition of 108 residents would not materially increase this officer to resident ratio in the West Valley Area. Overall, the proposed project would not generate the need, or cause the construction of new or expanded law enforcement facilities. Impacts associated with law enforcement services would be considered less than significant.

**Schools?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) provides school service for the project area. A significant impact may occur if a project includes substantial population growth, which could generate demand for school facilities that exceeds the capacity of the school district responsible for serving the project site. The development of 37 single-family detached condominiums would increase the number of residents and, in turn, the number of school-aged children, that would require school services and could result in decreased school capacity or overcrowding of schools in the project area. However, as established in the State of California Government Code Section 65595, to mitigate school overcrowding within the LAUSD service area, developers are required to pay $3.55 per square foot of new residential development. The required fee applies to all new development within the City of Los Angeles, including the proposed project, and is considered sufficient mitigation for any impacts.

**Other public facilities?**

[19] Los Angeles Police Department, West Valley Community Police Station, website: http://www.lapdonline.org/community/op_valley_bureau/west_valley/west_valley_home_frame.htm, June 22, 2005.

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The Los Angeles Public Library system provides library services to the project area. A significant impact may occur if a project generates a demand for other public services (such as libraries) that exceeds the capacity available. The development of 37 single-family detached condominiums would result in an incremental increase in the number of residents that would require minimal additional library services, but would not require the construction of new library facilities. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with development of related projects (see Table II-4) in the area would result in the development of residential and commercial uses. Cumulative impacts on fire protection, law enforcement, school, and other public services might occur due to cumulatively increased residents and uses that would require these services, and such cumulative development could be significant. However, as the proposed project would result in an incremental 108 persons to the project area, development of the proposed project would not be considered cumulatively considerable related to demand for the aforementioned public services.

## 14. RECREATION

**a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Approximately 108 new permanent residents would be generated as a result of the proposed project that would utilize the park and recreational facilities in the project area. According to the Community Plan, the existing parks satisfy the needs of the current residents, but the community is still deficient in the number of neighborhood parks. However, the proposed project, with its incremental population contribution, is not likely to substantially increase the rate of deterioration of park and recreational facilities in the area. Furthermore, the project developer would be required by the City of Los Angeles to pay into the City parks and recreation fund via payment of Quimby fees. Payment of such fees would constitute mitigation for potential impacts. Therefore, impacts upon maintenance of park and recreational facilities are considered less than significant.

**b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

**No Impact.** No new recreation facilities are proposed as part of the project. Thus, no impact related to construction or expansion of such facilities would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with development of related projects (see Table II-4) in the area would result in the development of residential and commercial uses. Permanent population increase due to the development of 3,400 dwelling units would result in the need for new or expanded park and recreational facilities. However, cumulative development, like the proposed development, would be required by the City of Los Angeles to pay into the respective city parks and recreation fund via payment of Quimby fees, and payment of these fees would mitigate potential recreation impacts associated with cumulative development. Further, as the proposed project would result in an incremental 108 persons to the project area, development of the proposed project would not be considered cumulatively considerable related to demand for park and recreational facilities.

## 15. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

The following analysis is based on the Traffic Analysis for Proposed Residential Development at 22255 Mulholland Drive, Woodland Hills, City of Los Angeles, dated November 2004 by Crain & Associates, which is included in Appendix F, and incorporated by reference.

**a) Would the project cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number or vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** According to the Traffic Report, implementation of the proposed project would generate approximately 354 new vehicle trips per day, including an increase of 28 trips during the AM peak hour and 37 trips during the PM peak hour. The study intersections in the traffic report are:

- Dumetz Road and San Feliciano Drive
- Dumetz Road and Topanga Canyon Boulevard
- Mulholland Drive and San Feliciano Drive
- Mulholland Drive and Mulholland Highway
- Mulholland Drive and Topanga Canyon Boulevard

These intersections are near the project site and are those likely to be most directly impacted by project traffic. An increase in the Critical Movement Analysis (CMA) value (i.e. Volume/Capacity ratio), due to project-related traffic, of 0.010 or more when the final "with project" LOS is E or F; a CMA increase of 0.020 or more when the final LOS is D; or an increase of 0.040 or more at LOS C, would constitute a significant impact on the traffic load and capacity of the street system. As shown in Table IV-2 below, no intersection in either future condition

would experience a CMA increase of more than 0.01 and, therefore, project traffic impacts would be less than significant.

**Table IV-2**
**Future (2007) Traffic Conditions With Project (Gated Access and Without Gated Access)**

| No. | Intersection | Peak Hour | With Project (Gated Access) | | | With Project (Without Gated Access) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | CMA | LOS | Impact | CMA | LOS | Impact |
| 1 | Dumetz Rd. & San Feliciano Dr. | AM | 0.605 | B | 0.004 | 0.605 | B | 0.004 |
| | | PM | 0.489 | A | 0.006 | 0.489 | A | 0.006 |
| 2 | Dumetz Rd. & Topanga Canyon Blvd. | AM | 0.869 | D | 0.004 | 0.869 | D | 0.004 |
| | | PM | 0.936 | E | 0.004 | 0.936 | E | 0.004 |
| 3 | Mulholland Dr. & San Feliciano Dr. | AM | 0.788 | C | 0.001 | 0.783 | C | -0.004 |
| | | PM | 0.702 | C | 0.004 | 0.693 | B | -0.005 |
| 4 | Mulholland Dr. & Mulholland Hwy. | AM | 0.849 | D | 0.001 | 0.853 | D | 0.005 |
| | | PM | 0.755 | C | 0.001 | 0.763 | C | 0.009 |
| 5 | Mulholland Dr. & Topanga Canyon Blvd. | AM | 0.819 | D | 0.004 | 0.819 | D | 0.004 |
| | | PM | 0.837 | D | 0.003 | 0.837 | D | 0.003 |

*Source: Traffic Analysis For Proposed Residential Development at 22255 Mulholland Drive, Woodland Hills, City of Los Angeles, dated November 2004 by Crain & Associates.*

**b) Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact**. The Congestion Management Program (CMP) was enacted by the State Legislature following the passage of Proposition 111 in 1990 with the intent of providing the analytical basis for transportation decisions through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) process. A countywide approach has been established by Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA), the local CMP agency, designating a highway network that includes all state highways and principal arterials within the County and monitoring the network's LOS to implement the statutory requirements of the CMP. The monitoring of the CMP network is one of the responsibilities of local jurisdictions. If LOS standards deteriorate, then local jurisdictions must prepare a deficiency plan to be in conformance with the countywide plan. For purposes of the CMP analysis, a significant traffic impact occurs when the proposed project increases traffic demand on a CMP facility by two percent of capacity, causing or worsening LOS F.

The local CMP requires that all CMP intersections be analyzed where a project would likely add 50 or more trips during the peak-hours. The nearest arterial CMP monitoring station is located on Topanga Canyon Boulevard at Ventura Boulevard, approximately one and a half miles from the project site. A review of the project trip distribution and net project traffic additions to the study vicinity shows that the proposed project will not add 50 or more trips to this CMP intersection. At

most, it is estimated that there would be 21 project trips during the AM peak hour and 28 project trips during the PM peak hour traversing this intersection. As these volumes are below the threshold of 50 trips, no further CMP intersection analysis is warranted.

According to the local CMP, any freeway segment where a project is expected to add 150 or more trips in any direction during the peak hours is also to be analyzed. For the proposed project, the maximum number of directional trips would be 23 total inbound trips during the PM peak hour. As the peak-hour trips expected to use the freeway network for project site access are less than the freeway threshold of 150 directional trips, no significant project impact to any CMP monitoring location is forecast and no additional freeway analysis is necessary.

**c) Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

**No Impact.** This question would apply to the proposed project only if it were an aviation-related use. The proposed project does not include any aviation-related uses. The proposed project would have no airport impact.

**d) Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The proposed project would include a curvilinear private roadway within a planned community development, but this roadway, although curved, would not contain any sharp curves. Two new intersections would be created as a result of project implementation, however, posted street signs regarding right-of-way and speed limit would reduce hazards associated with the proposed intersections to a less-than-significant level.

**e) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Vehicular access to the project area will be provided by the construction of a curvilinear private roadway which connects San Feliciano Drive at the northern part of the site with Mulholland Drive northeast of Mulholland Highway. Thus, with a primary access off of Muholland Drive as well as a secondary access off of San Feliciano provided to the planned community development, 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.

**f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The project would comply with the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Parking Regulation which requires single-family residences similar to those proposed for the project to provide two parking spaces per dwelling unit. These parking spaces will be designed as part of the private garages included for each dwelling unit. Vehicular

access to the project area will be provided by the construction of a curvilinear private roadway which connects San Feliciano Drive at the northern part of the site with Mulholland Drive northeast of Mulholland Highway. Each home will have a garage with access to the driveway. In addition, 19 guest parking spaces, at 0.50 guest parking space per unit, would be provided on site. Consequently, impacts related to parking capacity will be less than significant.

**g) Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** 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 proposed project is not expected to conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Therefore, there would be no impact to adopted policies or existing alternative transportation facilities.

**Cumulative Impacts**

Development of the proposed project in conjunction with development of related projects (see Table II-4) in the area would result in the development of residential and commercial uses. It could be possible that significant impacts related to transportation and traffic might occur with respect to one or more of the related projects due to additional traffic and increased parking demand, and such cumulative development could be significant. As the proposed project would contribute 37 dwelling units at most to the project area, the proposed project's transportation and traffic impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant.

## 16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

**a) Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the project exceeds wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. This question would typically apply to properties served by private sewage disposal systems, such as septic tanks. Section 13260 of the California Water Code states that persons discharging or proposing to discharge waste that could affect the quality of the waters of the State, other than into a community sewers system, shall file a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) containing information which may be required by the appropriate Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The RWQCB then authorizes a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit that ensures compliance with wastewater treatment and discharge requirements.

The Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) enforces wastewater treatment and discharge requirements for properties in the proposed project area.

The proposed project would convey wastewater via municipal sewage infrastructure maintained by the Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation to the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP). The HTP is a public facility, and, therefore, is subject to the State's wastewater treatment requirements. As such, wastewater from the project site is treated according to the wastewater treatment requirements enforced by the LARWQCB, and no impact would occur.

**(b) Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the project would increase water consumption or wastewater generation to such a degree that the capacity of facilities currently serving the project site would be exceeded.

The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) ensures the reliability and quality of its water supply through an extensive distribution system that includes more than 7,100 miles of pipes, more than 100 storage tanks and reservoirs within the City, and eight storage reservoirs along the Los Angeles Aqueducts.[20] Much of the water flows north to south, entering Los Angeles along the Los Angeles Aqueduct Filtration Plant (LAAFP) in Sylmar, which is owned and operated by LADWP. Water entering the LAAFP undergoes treatment and disinfection before being distributed throughout the LADWP's Water Service Area.[21] The LAAFP has a capacity to treat approximately 600 million gallons per day (mgd) and is currently operating at 75 percent of its capacity. Therefore, the LAAFP has the ability to treat an additional 150 mgd of water per day.

As discussed in 16(d) below, the proposed project would consume approximately 10,656 gallons of water daily (or 0.011 mgd). Consequently, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to measurably reduce the LAAFP's capacity. Therefore, no new or expanded water treatment facilities would be required. Consequently, with respect to water treatment facilities, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact.

With respect to water infrastructure, the residential development would entail extension of existing utilities that serve surrounding residential uses. If water main or infrastructure upgrades are required, the project developer would pay for such upgrades and a temporary disruption in

[20] *City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Central and Eastern Los Angeles Water Quality Annual Report, 2003.*
[21] *Ibid.*

service may occur, with proper notification to LADWP customers. In the event that water main and other infrastructure upgrades are required, it is not expected to create a significant impact to the physical environment because any disruption of service would be short-term in nature, replacement of the water mains would be within public rights-of-way, and any foreseeable infrastructure improvements would be limited to the immediate project vicinity. Therefore, impacts resulting from water infrastructure improvements would be considered less than significant.

The Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation provides sewer service to the project area. Sewage from the project site is conveyed via sewer infrastructure to the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP). Since 1987, the HTP has had capacity for full secondary treatment.[22] Currently the HTP treats an average daily flow of 362 mgd and has capacity to treat an average daily flow of 450 mgd.[23] As discussed under 16(e) below, the proposed project would generate 8,880 gallons (0.0089 mgd) of wastewater daily. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to measurably reduce the HTP's capacity. Therefore, no new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities would be required. Consequently, with respect to wastewater treatment facilities, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact.

With respect to wastewater infrastructure, the residential development would entail extension of existing utilities that serve surrounding residential uses. The local sewer line should be able to accommodate the incremental additional flow from the proposed project. As such, no new or expanded wastewater infrastructure would be required to serve the project, and a less-than-significant impact would occur.

**c) Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the volume of stormwater runoff were to increase to a level exceeding the capacity of the storm drain system serving the project site. As discussed under 7(e), the proposed project would result in additional impervious surfaces and, thus, an additional 5.2 cubic feet per second (cfs) net increase in runoff. However, the San Feliciano storm drain would accept the incremental increase in runoff. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially increase storm water runoff going to the storm water drainage system from the project site above existing levels. As storm water from the project site

[22] *City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation, Hyperion Treatment Plant, website: http://www.lacity.org/SAN/htp.htm.*

[23] *City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation, Major Activities, website: http://www.lacity.org/san/sanmact.htm.*

would not exceed the capacity of existing storm water drainage systems or require new or expanded storm water facilities, this impact would be considered less than significant.

**d) Would the project have significant water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project were to increase water consumption to such a degree that new water source would need to be identified, or that existing resources would be consumed at a pace greater than planned for by purveyors, distributors, and service providers. The LADWP is responsible for providing water services to the project site. The LADWP can generally supply water to developments within its service area, except under extraordinary circumstances. The City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework anticipates that the future water supply will be sufficient to meet existing and planned growth in the City to the year 2010. Generally speaking, to the extent a project is consistent with the underlying zoning and General Plan land use designations, its water demands have already been accounted for in the LADWP's Water Management Plan.

State Water Code Sections 10910 through 10915 state that any project with over 500 residential units, commercial businesses over 500,000 square feet of space and employing over 1,000 people or industrial businesses over 250,000 square feet and employing over 1,000 people are required to request a water availability assessment. Based on the size of the proposed project, a water availability assessment is not required. Nevertheless, utilizing 288 gallons/unit daily consumption rate[24], the proposed project's anticipated water demands are estimated to be 10,656 gpd or 0.011 mgd. Therefore, sufficient domestic water supply should be supplied to the proposed project. Nevertheless, LADWP recommends that water should be conserved at all times. The proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact upon water supplies.

**e) Would the project 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?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project were to increase wastewater generation to such a degree that the capacity of facilities currently serving the project area would be exceeded. Utilizing 240 gallons/unit daily generation rate, the proposed project is anticipated to generate approximately 8,880 gpd (or 0.0089 mgd) of wastewater. As discussed under 15(b), the current remaining capacity of the HTP is 88 mgd. Therefore, the HTP would have adequate capacity to treat the 0.0089 mgd of wastewater generated by the proposed project, in addition to existing commitments, resulting in a less-than-significant impact.

[24] *Source: Charles C. Holloway, Supervisor of Environmental Assessment, City of Los Angeles, Department of Water and Power, November 19, 2004*

**f) Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project were to increase solid waste generation to a degree that existing and projected landfill capacity would be insufficient to accommodate the additional solid waste. The project developer would contract with a private hauler of their choice for disposal of the commercial and residential waste.

Over 90 percent of the construction and residential solid waste generated in the City of Los Angeles is disposed of at the Sunshine Canyon Landfill in Sun Valley. The permitted daily intake (or capacity) of the landfill is 11,000 tons per day. As the landfill has an average daily intake of 5,781 tons per day, the remaining permitted daily intake is 5,219 tons per day. The estimated date of closure for the landfill is 2029.

Utilizing a daily solid waste generation rate of 12.23 pounds per unit, the proposed project would generate approximately 453 pounds or 0.23 tons of solid waste per day during operation. All solid-waste-generating activities within the City of Los Angeles, including the proposed project, would continue to be subject to the requirements set forth in California Assembly Bill (AB) 939, which requires each city and county to divert 50 percent of its solid waste from landfill disposal through source reduction, recycling, and composting. Thus, the proposed project would divert 50 percent of its solid waste generated and dispose of 226 pounds or 0.11 tons of solid waste per day in the Sunshine Canyon Landfill. With a remaining daily intake of 5,219 tons per day, the landfill would have adequate capacity to accommodate the operational solid waste generated by the proposed project. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact associated with operation solid waste generation would occur.

**g) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project would generate solid waste that was not disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations. Solid waste generated at the project site by the proposed project would be disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations related to solid waste, including AB 939. In addition, as analyzed under 15(d), the remaining daily intake of the Sunshine Canyon Landfill would be able to accommodate the solid waste generated by the proposed project, and no exemptions with respect to solid waste disposal would be needed nor are they required. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with development of related projects (see Table II-4) in the area would result in the development of residential and commercial uses. It could be possible that significant impacts related to utilities

and service systems might occur with respect to one or more of the related projects due to additional demand and generation, and such cumulative development could be significant.

Cumulative development would result in an additional water supply demand of 1.01 mgd, an additional wastewater generation of 0.84 mgd, and an additional solid waste generation of 29.11 tons per day. As this cumulative water demand, wastewater generation, and solid waste generation would not exceed the existing capacities of the LAAFP (150 mgd remaining daily capacity), HTP (88 mgd remaining daily capacity), or Sunshine Canyon Landfill (5,219 tons per day remaining daily capacity, respectively, impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant.

## 17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

**a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur only if a project would have an identified potentially significant impact for any of the above issues. The proposed project is located in a relatively developed area of the Santa Monica Mountains within the City of Los Angeles and, with incorporation of the conditions of approval mentioned in this Initial Study, would have no significant impacts with respect to cultural resources, but would have potentially significant impacts with regard to biological resources. Thus, biological resources will be analyzed within the EIR.

**b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project, in conjunction with other related projects in the area of the project site would result in impacts that are less than significant when viewed separately, but would be significant when viewed together. The past, current, and probable future projects in the Planning Area, as discussed under the "Cumulative Impacts" subheadings throughout this Initial Study, coupled with the proposed project could potentially cause a cumulative impact. Thus, cumulative impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, hazards, land use, and noise will be analyzed within the EIR.

**c) Does the project have environmental effects, which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project has the potential to result in significant impacts, as discussed in the preceding sections. As noted in the environmental analysis presented above, the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts related to air quality, hazards, and noise. Thus, the proposed project would have the potential to result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, and these issues will be analyzed within the EIR.