II. SUMMARY

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Location and Overview

The Canyon Hills project site includes approximately 887 acres of land and is located at 7000-8000 West La Tuna Canyon Road in the City of Los Angeles. The project site is located entirely within the Verdugo Mountains in the northeastern San Fernando Valley. The Verdugo Mountains are geographically defined by the San Fernando Valley to the west, the Los Angeles Basin to the south, the San Gabriel Valley to the east, and the communities of Sunland and Tujunga to the north.

The proposed project includes the development of 280 single-family homes, a three-acre equestrian park and the preservation of approximately 693 acres of open space. The proposed single-family homes would be clustered on approximately 194 acres of the 887-acre project site. Approximately 211 homes would be constructed on approximately 142 acres of land on the portion of the project site located north of Interstate 210 ("Development Area A") and approximately 69 homes would be constructed on approximately 52 acres of land on the portion of the project site located south of Interstate 210 ("Development Area B"). Approximately 693 acres (78 percent) of the project site, including a large swath of land west of the proposed homes, would be preserved as open space.

The proposed project would also include an equestrian park on approximately three acres of land adjacent to La Tuna Canyon Road in the southwestern portion of the project site, which would be available for public use. Additional open space and recreational facilities would be provided throughout the project site. The proposed private recreational facilities include tot lots, active play areas, passive open space areas, a vista point with picnic area and gazebo, and a pool with a jacuzzi, restroom building and barbeque area. See Section III (Project Description) of the Draft EIR, as revised in Section III (Corrections and Additions) of this Final EIR, for a more detailed description of the proposed project.

Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is largely bounded by undeveloped land and existing residential areas. The project site's northern boundary roughly coincides with the major ridgeline that divides La Tuna Canyon on the south from the communities of Sunland and Tujunga to the north. Most of the steeply descending north-facing slopes north of the project site are undeveloped. There are existing single-family homes and neighborhoods located adjacent to the northeastern portion of the project site. Some of the homes to the northeast overlook the project site.

Undeveloped hillsides comprise much of the land to the south of the project site, some of which have been permanently preserved as open space. In particular, the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy owns the 1,100-acre La Tuna Canyon Park located directly to the south of the project site. Wildwood Canyon Park, DeBell Golf Course and residential neighborhoods, and the City of Burbank are also located south of the project site. In addition, there is a small cluster of homes along La Tuna Canyon Road near the southwestern boundary of the project site north of La Tuna Canyon Road. The City of Glendale is located approximately 1.5 miles east of the project site.

West of the project site, residential development is concentrated along La Tuna Canyon Road. Further west, in the vicinity of Sunland Boulevard, there are commercial and industrial land uses. The commercial development primarily consists of small retail business along Sunland Boulevard. A dam and a debris basin are also located to the west of the project site.

The Hansen Dam Recreation Area is located at the western end of the Tujunga Wash, northwest of the project site. The Hansen Dam Recreation Area offers a variety of recreational opportunities, including biking, educational programs, fishing, hiking, horseback riding, and water sports. Just east of the project site, Haines Canyon Park and Verdugo Hills Golf Course provide additional recreational opportunities to nearby residents.

Project Objectives

The applicant's objectives for the proposed Canyon Hills project are:

- To provide a substantial amount of high-quality housing for local and area residents to meet existing and future needs of those desiring to live in the northeast San Fernando Valley and to help alleviate the substantial housing shortage in the City.

- To provide greater regional housing opportunities for homebuyers and assist in satisfying the housing needs for the region.

- To invigorate the local economy by providing employment and business opportunities associated with the construction, use, and occupancy of the proposed project.

- To permanently preserve over 75 percent of the project site as open space.

- To provide ample equestrian and other recreational amenities, as well as significant passive open space and landscaping areas.

- To establish a low-density residential community that avoids the crowded appearance of a typical subdivision.

- To provide a peaceful, attractive residential development within the context of the surrounding man-made and natural environment, and separate and shield the development to maximize environmental and land use compatibility with surrounding uses.

- To locate the residential development in proximity to existing infrastructure and services where possible.

- To provide safe, efficient and aesthetically attractive streets in the residential development with convenient connections to adjoining arterials and freeways, while minimizing traffic impacts on existing residential neighborhoods.

- To minimize impacts to important natural landforms and significant natural resources.

- To develop a residential project on the project site that is financially viable and thereby permits (1) the donation or dedication of most of the project site located outside the Development Areas to an appropriate public agency or nonprofit entity and (2) the development of public and private equestrian and other recreational amenities on the project site.

B. INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

This Final EIR will serve as the environmental document for all project approvals that may be subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). These requested actions and approvals are expected to include, but may not be limited to the list below.

The project applicant seeks approval of the following entitlements from the City of Los Angeles:

- Major Plan Review, which includes the following:

    - General Plan Amendments to change the land use designations in the Sunland-Tujunga Community Plan for portions of the project site from Minimum Residential, Very Low I Residential, Very Low II Residential and Open Space to Minimum Residential and Low Residential (see Figure IV.G-6).

    - Zone changes to change the zoning designations for the proposed Development Areas from A1-1 (Agricultural) and RE11-1 (Residential Estate) to RE9-1-H (Residential Estate), RE11-1-H (Residential Estate) and RE20-1-H (Residential Estate) (see Figure IV.G-7).

- Vesting Tentative Tract Map.

- Site Plan Review.

- Project Permit Compliance Review (San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan).
- Development Agreement.
- Oak Tree Removal/Relocation Permit.
- B-Permit for necessary street, sewer, storm drain and lighting improvements.
- Grading Permits.
- Building Permits.
- Any other necessary discretionary or ministerial permits and approvals required for the construction or operation of the proposed project.

In addition, the applicant may also be seeking the following certifications, agreements, and/or permits from other governmental agencies:

- Section 401 Water Quality Certification(s) from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement(s) from the California Department of Fish and Game.
- Section 404 Individual Permit(s) from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
- Encroachment Permit from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

C. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS SUMMARY

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

Geology and Soils

Impacts

The project site does not lie within a known active fault zone and no active or potentially active faults cross the project site. There is no onsite evidence of movement from any of the sympathetic faults that

have been encountered onsite within the last 1.6 million years. Therefore, ground rupture resulting from an earthquake fault would be unlikely on the project site.

There are eight areas of potential seismically-induced rock fall in the Development Areas. The proposed project could expose approximately 21 proposed homes to potential substantial adverse effects as the result of seismically-induced rock fall. However, incorporation of the mitigation measures listed below would reduce this potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level. Approximately 10 of the proposed homes may be subject to slope and/or foundation instability due to landslides. However, incorporation of the mitigation measures below would reduce this potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level. Grading associated with the proposed project may result in slope and/or foundation instability. The majority of the proposed cut slopes on the project site would expose highly weathered and/or highly jointed bedrock, which could be susceptible to surficial failure or deep-seated slope failures and would require stabilization measures. However, incorporation of the mitigation measures below would reduce this potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level.

Due to the limited area (i.e., the existing residential neighborhood northeast of Development Area A) affected by potential groundwater and the distance from Development Area A, seepage from waste disposal is not considered to be a significant impact.

Compliance with the Los Angeles Building Code (LABC) would ensure that: (1) potential differential settlement within the Development Areas would be addressed by providing appropriate foundations or remedial grading; (2) grading of fill slopes would meet the minimum safety factor and would be stable under seismic conditions; (3) compressible earth materials would be removed and replaced as compacted fill; and (4) seismic risks would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Compliance with the Grading Code and Federal Clean Water Act regulations would reduce the soil erosion and loss of topsoil associated with the proposed project to less-than-significant levels. Adherence to Grading and Fire Codes would reduce potential impacts due to excavation and blasting to a less-than-significant level.

The project site is not within an area considered subject to (1) liquefaction, (2) seismic settlement, (3) tsunamis, (3) seiches, (4) inundation by a dam or levee, (5) volcanic hazards, (6) subsidence, loss of mineral resources, (7) expansive earth materials or (8) mud or debris flows.

Mitigation Measures

A-1 The project developer shall incorporate setback zones from potential rock fall areas (as shown in Figure IV.A-1). In areas where structures may encroach within the setback area, rock fall containment devices shall be incorporated into the design. Examples of such

devices include debris fences or walls, rock bolting and netting, or rock fall containment basins.

A-2 The project developer shall grade buttresses of existing landslides and install subdrainage systems to reduce the build-up of subsurface water, thereby increasing the stability of the slopes. At a minimum, slopes prone to landsliding shall be provided with a minimum keyway width of one-half of the slope height (with a minimum width of 12 feet), and a buttress fill to provide a final slope gradient of 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) in accordance with the LABC.

A-3 The following mitigation shall be completed during grading using standard grading techniques in accordance with the LABC, which would reduce risks from landslides to an acceptable level. The project developer shall:

- Stabilize or remove Landslide 1 during grading.
- A cut slope into Landslide 2 will require stabilization of the slope and a partial removal of the landslide mass.
- Landslide 3 shall include a shear key for the outside edge of the roadway above.
- Landslides 5 and 6 shall be removed during grading.
- The outside edge of the lot above Landslide 10 will require a shear key to building pads above.
- Landslide 11 will require a partial excavation of the landslide mass to provide support for the adjacent fill slope.

A-4 The project developer shall replace most cut slopes, as required, with a stabilization fill slope or buttress fill slope with a maximum slope gradient of 2:1 (horizontal:vertical). Any slope that cannot be rebuilt as a 2:1 or flatter shall be rebuilt as a reinforced slope or lessened to a 2:1 gradient with retaining walls.

A-5 The project developer shall ensure that temporary back cut slopes associated with remedial grading of stabilization fills and buttress slopes shall not exceed a slope gradient of 1.5:1 (horizontal:vertical), and shall more typically maintain a slope gradient of 2:1. Fill widths at the top of the slopes shall maintain a minimum width of 15 feet. Buttress and stabilization fills shall be built with keyways with a minimum width of one-half the slope height (with a minimum width of 12 feet) and supplied with subdrainage to preclude buildup of water. Design, grading and construction of the cut slopes shall conform with the LABC.

The above mitigation measures would reduce the proposed project's impacts on geology and soils to a less-than-significant level. Although additional mitigation measures are not required under CEQA, the following additional mitigation measures are recommended to reduce further the proposed project's construction-related impacts on geology and soils:

A-6 Excavation and grading activities shall be scheduled during dry weather periods. If grading occurs during the rainy season (October 15 through April 1), diversion dikes to channel runoff around the site shall be constructed. Channels shall be lined with grass or pavement shall be roughened to reduce runoff velocity.

A-7 Appropriate erosion control and drainage devices to the satisfaction of the Building and Safety Department, Grading Division, shall be incorporated, such as interceptor terraces, berms, vee-channels, and inlet and outlet structures, as specified by Section 91.7013 of the LABC, including planting fast-growing annual and perennial grasses in areas where construction is not immediately planned, to shield and bind the soil.

A-8 All construction waste shall be disposed of properly. Appropriately labeled recycling bins shall be provided to recycle construction materials, including solvents, water-based paints, vehicle fluids, broken asphalt and concrete, wood and vegetation. Non-recyclable materials/wastes shall be taken to an appropriate landfill. Toxic wastes shall be discarded at a licensed regulated disposal site.

A-9 During construction, leaks, drips and spills shall be immediately cleaned up to prevent contaminated soil on paved surfaces that can be washed away into the storm drains.

A-10 During construction, pavement shall not be hosed down at material spills and dry cleanup methods shall be used whenever possible.

A-11 During construction, dumpsters shall be covered and maintained. Uncovered dumpsters shall be placed under a roof or cover with tarps or plastic sheeting.

A-12 During construction, gravel approaches shall be used where truck traffic is frequent to reduce soil compaction and limit the tracking of sediment into streets.

A-13 During construction, all vehicle/equipment maintenance, repair and washing shall be conducted away from storm drains. All major repairs shall be conducted offsite. Drip pans or drop clothes shall be used to catch drips and spills.

Air Quality

Impacts

Grading and excavation, dirt moving activities, construction equipment emissions, truck emissions and employee vehicles were considered in the calculation of emissions associated with the construction of the proposed project. The results of the calculations indicate that construction emissions of NOx and PM_{10} would be significant on the peak day and in the peak quarter without mitigation. In addition, fugitive dust emissions could have a significant impact on the sensitive receptors (i.e., single-family homes) to the north and northeast of Development Area A without mitigation. No known sources of odors would be released during construction of the proposed project.

The proposed project would not have a significant adverse impact on regional emissions of any criteria pollutant. Although there would be some odors associated with the proposed homes, the odors are not significant on a regional scale. On a local scale, the potential of the proposed project to cause or contribute to carbon monoxide (CO) hot spots was determined to be less than significant because the calculated CO concentrations would well below the national and State standards with the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures

B-1 Moisten soil not more than 15 minutes prior to moving soil and three times a day, or four times a day under windy conditions, in order to maintain soil moisture of 12 percent.

B-2 On the last day of active operations prior to a weekend or holiday or before beginning grading on another portion of the project site, apply water or a chemical stabilizer to maintain a stabilized surface. Maintain this surface crust as long as the disturbed soil remains uncovered.

B-3 Water excavated soil piles hourly or cover piles with temporary coverings.

B-4 Cease grading during periods when winds exceed 25 miles per hour.

B-5 Operate vehicles on unpaved roads at 15 mph or less.

B-6 Apply appropriate NO_x control technologies, such as use of lean-NO_x catalyst or diesel oxidation catalyst, to the extent feasible.

B-7 Blasting and crushing equipment shall be equipped with water spray devices in order to maintain soil moisture and prevent fugitive dust emissions.

B-8 Cease grading during periods when the SCAQMD calls a Stage 1 episode in SRA 8.

B-9 For all homes in the Development Areas located within 300 feet from the edge of Interstate 210, the project developer shall provide an information and disclosure statement to each prospective buyer and include such statement as part of the final sales literature, which statement shall include the following:

- The fact that the proposed home is located within 300 feet from the edge of Interstate 210.
- A statement that this subject has been addressed in the Final EIR for the project and that the Final EIR is on file with the City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning.
- A statement that additional information regarding the potential health effects from proximity to freeways and other high traffic areas may be obtained from the SCAQMD and the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment at the California Environmental Protection Agency.

The above recommended mitigation measures would reduce PM_{10} emissions by approximately 60 percent. The implementation of recommended Mitigation Measure B-6 would reduce NOx emissions from 10 to 25 percent. The specific reduction in NOx emissions is dependent on the quantity and types of appropriate NOx emission controls implemented with respect to the construction equipment. However, emissions of NOx and PM_{10} would remain significant after mitigation.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Impacts

The proposed project's storm drainage improvements have been designed to convey storm water runoff safely from the Development Areas without increasing flood and erosion hazards either on the project site or downstream. The proposed onsite storm drainage improvements have been designed to reduce the project site's developed condition peak storm water flow during a 50-year storm to no more than 90 percent of the undeveloped burned flow and would eliminate approximately 58,600 cubic yards of debris. Furthermore, the proposed project would not result in the substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts associated with onsite or offsite flooding, existing or planned storm water drainage systems, or the alteration of the existing drainage pattern.

Although the graded and natural areas of the project site would be subject to erosion and sedimentation, mitigation measures are recommended below that would reduce these potential impacts to a less-than-

significant level. In addition, the proposed project would not have a significant impact with respect to 100-year flood hazard areas, the failure of a dam or levee or inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow.

Implementation of the Best Management Practices (BMPs) in the proposed project's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and compliance with the discharge requirements of the General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit (GCASWP) would ensure that the project construction would not violate any water quality standards or discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Therefore, the proposed project's short-term construction-related water quality impacts are expected to be less than significant.

In order to prevent potential long-term operational impacts from storm water runoff, the proposed project would be designed in compliance with (1) Section 402(p) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and (2) Order No. 90-079 of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, which regulates the issuance of waste discharge requirements to Los Angeles County and Cities tributary to the County under National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CA0061654.

The storm drainage system for the proposed project would include Urban Runoff Mitigation Areas, which would be designed to provide "first flush" cleansing before the urban runoff is released back into the natural drainage courses. Compliance with Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Sections 64.70 et seq. would ensure that long-term operational aspects of the project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Therefore, the proposed project's long-term operational water quality impacts are expected to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

C-1 Drainage from the building sites shall be directed toward the street in non-erosive drainage devices.

C-2 Building pads shall have sufficient height above the curb to drain toward the street on a slope of two percent. Pad drainage may be conveyed to the street via side lot swales, as required.

C-3 Where the tributary area is deemed sufficient by the City Engineer and approved by the decision-maker, paved drainage terraces shall be provided along terraces, at the top of cuts, and behind retaining structures.

C-4 Mulch shall be used to the extent feasible in all landscape areas.

C-5 Existing trees and shrubs shall be preserved and protected, to the extent feasible.

C-6 Efficient irrigation systems that minimize runoff and evaporation, and maximize the water that would reach the plant roots, such as a dripline system, shall be installed.

C-7 Timed irrigation system shall be provided for water conservation.

C-8 Slopes shall be graded so that runoff of surface water is minimized.

C-9 Permanent drainage and debris control facilities shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. As proposed, such facilities shall include:

- Underground stormdrains with capacity for a 50-year frequency storm.
- Terrace drains provided in compliance with the requirements of the LAMC.
- Energy dissipators installed at any outlet structure where the velocity is considered erosive.
- Roof runoff collected in a rain gutter and downspout system and directed to approved areas via non-erodible conductors.

C-10 Semi-permeable pavement shall be utilized for hardscape areas.

C-11 The project shall adhere to applicable provisions of the LAMC, Flood Hazard Management Specific Plan (if applicable) and the recommendations of the City Engineer/Department of Building and Safety.

C-12 The project developer and/or homeowners' association(s) shall work with the City to make residents aware of used motor oil recycling facilities and household hazardous waste drop-off centers in the area. Availability of centers can reduce the amount of toxic contaminants found in urban runoff.

C-13 Signage shall be installed on all project storm drain inlets to read: "NO DUMPING OF WASTE-DRAINS TO OCEAN," or other similar signage consistent with forthcoming City policies.

C-14 Reducing pesticide and fertilizer use at the source can remove these pollutants from urban runoff. The project developer and/or homeowners' association(s) shall adopt Integrated Pest Management (IPM) programs for use on their own public grounds in addition to promoting their use to project residents.

C-15 "Pooper-scooper" regulations shall be included in CC&Rs to require proper disposal of animal waste and to prevent additional nutrient loading of storm drains.

C-16 Newly-excavated sites tend to contribute significant amounts of sediments and toxic materials to the drainage systems. The following steps shall be taken to minimize this process:

- Where feasible, phase construction to limit activity during the wettest months of the year (i.e., December, January and February).
- Stabilize exposed surfaces immediately after construction is complete, and ensure that permanent stabilization is successful, through implementation of the following:
  - Minimization of stripped areas;
  - Use of straw bale filters and sand bagging;
  - Temporary seeding and mulching of all stripped areas;
  - Conservation cultivation practices on steep slopes;
  - Traffic control on construction sites;
  - Berms and crushed stone on construction roads;
  - Reduction of effective slope length in critical areas with benches or terraces; and
  - Slopes shall be planted with protective vegetation and a suitable watering system (in conformance with City requirements) installed as soon as practical after completion of grading.
- Use of accepted materials storage procedures, spill prevention and other "housekeeping" practices to prevent runoff contamination by toxic chemicals such as paints, solvents, pesticides, metals from building materials, or fuels.

C-17 Cleaning of wastes and debris from all project area debris retention and water detention basins shall be completed by the homeowners' association(s) on a quarterly basis (or more frequently if reasonably required). Special importance shall be given to the cleaning of debris retention and water detention basins prior to the first rainstorm of the year, in order to reduce "first flush" effects on the area watershed and to prevent unnecessary sediment and waste load transport.

C-18 The project developer shall be responsible for obtaining the necessary NPDES Construction Permit for the project site from the Regional Water Resources Control Board, Wastewater Division. The project developer shall obtain a Notice of Intent (NOI) for compliance with the State's NPDES General Construction Permit prior to issuance of a grading permit. The Construction Permit NOI shall include a SWPPP to address construction sediment and erosion control. The project developer would also be required to address long-term monitoring and the implementation of BMPs to the "maximum extent

practicable". Maximum extent practicable means to the maximum extent possible, taking into account the latest available technology and economic feasibility.

C-19 Temporary erosion control measures, such as landscaping, berms, etc., shall be implemented following grading to minimize sedimentation impacts to onsite drainages. Available measures include introduction of rapid developing, soil-anchoring groundcover (of native plant species), and strategic placement of runoff-detaining structures. These runoff-detaining structures and all remaining construction sediment and debris shall be removed at the time of project completion.

Although mitigation measures are not required under CEQA, the above measures would further reduce the project's less-than-significant hydrology and water quality impacts.

Biological Resources

Flora and Fauna

Impacts

Based on the site plan for the proposed project, approximately 304.77 acres of the project site would be disturbed and potentially impact biological resources. The 304.77 acres consist of (1) approximately 211.0 acres affected by grading and not revegetated, (2) approximately 46.43 acres subject to brush clearance, and (3) 47.34 acres that would be subject to partial impacts associated with brush thinning within the fuel modification zone (provided that, as discussed below, the vegetation loss is limited to 50 percent within the brush-thinning zone). An additional 23.32 acres would be subject to remedial grading impacts, but would be revegetated with native species following remedial grading and would be preserved as natural open space.

Implementation of the proposed project would permanently impact 259.18 acres of mixed chaparral. Mixed chaparral is not listed as a Rare Natural Community by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Therefore, impacts to mixed chaparral is considered adverse, but is not considered significant.

The project would impact 1.85 acres of Venturan coastal sage scrub. Coastal sage scrub is listed as a Rare Natural Community by CDFG (s.2.1). However, the coastal sage scrub on the project site supports no special-status plant species and very limited special-status animal species. Because only very small amounts of coastal sage scrub would be affected by the proposed project, the impact is not considered significant.

The proposed project would impact 2.02 acres of deerweed scrub. Deerweed does not provide significant habitat and loss of 2.02 acres of deerweed from an artificial slope would not be considered significant.

The proposed project would not impact any mulefat scrub associated with drainages on the project site.

The proposed project would impact 12.10 acres of chamise chaparral. Chamise chaparral is not listed as a Rare Natural Community by CDFG. The loss of 12.10 acres of chamise chaparral is not considered significant.

The proposed project would impact 2.64 acres of southern mixed riparian forest. In addition to permanent impacts, approximately 1.21 acres would be subject to temporary impacts, but would be revegetated following completion of construction. Southern mixed riparian forest is listed as a Rare Natural Community by CDFG. Impacts to the southern mixed riparian forest would be considered significant prior to mitigation.

The proposed project would impact 1.5 acres of chamise chaparral-coastal sage scrub ecotone and temporarily impact 1.79 acres that would be revegetated following completion of remedial grading. Chamise chaparral-coastal sage scrub ecotone is not listed as a Rare Natural Community by CDFG. Therefore, the loss of 1.5 acres of chamise chaparral-coastal sage scrub ecotone would therefore not be considered significant.

The proposed project would impact 0.59 acre of southern coast live oak riparian forest. In addition, 0.15 acre would be affected during remedial grading, but would be revegetated following completion of grading. Southern coast live oak riparian forest is listed as a Rare Natural Community by CDFG. Impacts to southern coast live oak riparian forest would be considered significant prior to mitigation.

The proposed project would impact 0.31 acres of southern willow scrub. Southern willow scrub is listed as a Rare Natural Community by CDFG and impacts to southern willow scrub would be considered significant prior to mitigation.

The proposed project would impact 0.31 acres of Disturbed or Ruderal Areas. These areas exhibit very low habitat function. Impacts to disturbed or ruderal areas are not considered significant.

Construction of the proposed project would impact approximately 2.06 acres of the approximately 6.46 acres of Army Corps jurisdiction at the project site, none of which is jurisdictional wetlands. The loss of 2.06 acres of non-wetland waters of the U.S. would be considered significant prior to mitigation.

The proposed project would impact approximately 2.45 acres of the total 9.12 acres of onsite CDFG jurisdiction, of which 0.74 acre consists of vegetated riparian habitat, including southern mixed riparian forest (0.68 acre), southern coast live oak riparian forest (0.04 acre) and southern willow scrub (0.02

acre). The approximately 2.45 acres of CDFG jurisdiction includes the approximately 2.06 acres of Army Corps jurisdiction. The loss of 1.71 acres of CDFG jurisdictional area and 0.74 acre of associated riparian habitat would be considered significant prior to mitigation.

The proposed project would also impact 2.8 acres of riparian habitat designated as Rare Natural Communities by CDFG, but which are not subject to CDFG jurisdiction, including southern mixed riparian forest (1.96 acres), southern coast live oak riparian forest (0.55 acre) and southern willow scrub (0.29 acre).

Implementation of the proposed project would not significantly impact any of the three special-status plant species found on the project site (i.e., Ocellated Humboldt lily, Plummer's mariposa lily or the California walnut).

Neither the California gnatcatcher nor least Bell's vireo were detected on the project site and implementation of the project would not affect these species. No State- or federally-listed species were identified in the Study Area.

Due to preservation of the potential nesting and perching sites and substantial foraging areas, there would be no adverse or significant impacts to the Cooper's hawk. However, if construction should occur during the breeding season for raptors, there is a potential for significant impacts to an active nest. With implementation of the recommended mitigation, this potential impact would be reduced below a level of significance.

Sufficient habitat would be preserved on the project site for the small number of ashy rufous-crowned sparrow observed on the project site, so that no adverse or significant impacts to this species would occur.

The San Diego coast horned lizard is expected to occur on the project site. Because of the preservation of 652 acres of native habitat on the project site, potential impacts to this species would not result in adverse or significant impacts.

The silvery legless lizard is expected to occur on the project site in limited numbers. Because of the preservation of 652 acres of native habitat on the project site, potential impacts to this species associated with implementation of the project would not be considered adverse or significant.

The orange-throated whiptail is not expected to occur on the project site because the project site is out of the historic range of this species.

Project construction has the potential to disturbed active nests of raptor or migratory bird species. However, with implementation of recommended mitigation, this potential impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

The proposed project would result in the potential loss of wildlife, habitat, ground-nesting sites and aquatic resources from opening up vegetated areas to equestrian or other onsite recreational uses. However, because of the dense chaparral and steep topography, access to surrounding open space from new trails would be precluded. Therefore, indirect impacts from new recreational activities would not be considered adverse or significant.

There would be no potential for soil compaction or increased erosion outside of the area subject to grading and fuel modification. Therefore, there would be no adverse or significant impacts associated with increased soil compaction, erosion, or loss of vegetative productivity.

Within or immediately adjacent to developed areas, wildlife can also be disturbed by streetlights and noise, and may be killed by vehicles, cats, dogs, or humans. However, the proposed project includes numerous features designed to minimize indirect impacts on native plants and vegetation communities, including the preservation of most of the project site as natural open space. These features would ensure that indirect impacts remain below a level of significance.

Mitigation Measures

D.1-1 The project developer shall create a water quality basin in the lower reach of Drainage 4 that covers approximately 2.5 acres. The basin shall be planted with a mosaic of wetland/riparian habitats that will provide both biogeochemical (water quality) and habitat functions. The proposed habitats shall include southern coast live oak riparian forest at the upper elevations, southern mixed riparian in the middle elevations and wet meadow or emergent marsh in the wettest (lowest) areas.

D.1-2 The project developer shall preserve and enhance approximately 2.5 acres within La Tuna Canyon Wash that exhibit moderate to high levels of infestation by sticky eupatory (*Ageratina adenophora*) and African umbrella sedge (both are recognized as invasive exotic species). The enhancement program shall include eradication of sticky eupatory and African umbrella sedge from the onsite reach through a five-year program. The five-year program shall also include replanting with native understory species in areas where the dense understory formed by sticky eupatory has been removed.

D.1-3 The mitigation and monitoring plan with respect to Mitigation Measures D.1-1 and D.1-2, above shall be subject to the approval of the Army Corps, CDFG and the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

D.1-4 The project developer shall provide 2.8 acres of native riparian plantings within the proposed onsite detention basins and water quality basins and other appropriate areas.

D.1-5 The project developer shall revegetate 1.21 acres of southern mixed riparian forest and 0.15 acre of southern coast live oak riparian forest.

D.1-6 If construction occurs during the nesting season for migratory birds (March 15-August 15), then prior to construction activities, the project developer shall have a qualified biologist survey the project site for the presence of any occupied raptor nests. If such a nest is found, it shall be protected until nesting activity has ended to ensure compliance with Section 3503.5 of the California Fish and Game Code.

D.1-7 If grading or clearing of vegetation is scheduled to take place during the nesting season for migratory or resident birds (March 15-August 15), a qualified biologist will survey areas to be graded no more than three days prior to the start of work. If active nests of migratory or resident birds are located, measures to ensure protection of the nesting migratory or resident bird will be determined by the monitoring biologist and will depend on factors such as the bird species and the construction schedule. These measures may include, but are not limited to:

(1) If a non-raptorial avian nest is identified that has either eggs or nestlings, the shrub or tree containing the nest will be clearly marked with flagging tape or caution ribbon to identify the presence of an active nest. No mechanized work will be allowed within 25 feet of the nest until the fledglings have departed the nest or until the biologist has determined that the nesting attempt has failed and been abandoned by the adult birds.

(2) If a raptor nest is identified that has either eggs or nestlings, the shrub or tree containing the nest will be clearly marked with flagging tape or caution ribbon to identify the presence of an active nest. No mechanized work will be allowed within 200 feet of the nest until the fledglings have departed the nest or until the biologist has determined that the nesting attempt has failed and been abandoned by the adult birds.

D.1-8 All prospective homebuyers will be clearly advised of the implications of living adjacent to natural open space areas. The educational materials will be written to foster an appreciation of native ecosystems, and will identify appropriate measures that homeowners should take to minimize conflicts between wildlife, domestic animals, and humans, including:

(1) Responsibilities and benefits associated with living near a wildland area (e.g., residents will be required to avoid planting invasive plant species, and will receive benefits related to maintaining the natural beauty of nearby open space areas).

(2) Warnings of dangers and nuisances posed by wildlife that may forage at the development edge (e.g., dangers that mountain lions pose to humans and potential loss of pets to naturally occurring predators).

D.1-9 The homeowners' association(s) shall monitor the landscaped areas over a five-year period following the completion of landscaping in a Development Area and remove, as necessary, unwanted non-native invasive species that become established, ensuring that, over time, native habitats are established.

D.1-10 In order to minimize the movement of displaced animals into residential areas during clearing and grubbing of areas to be graded, such clearing and grubbing activities will start at the existing urban edge and move toward open space.

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, the project would not result in any significant impacts to biological or jurisdictional resources, with the exception of the impact to native coast live oaks, which is discussed below.

Native Trees

Impacts

The proposed project would impact up to 235 of the estimated 1,247 coast live oaks on the project site (as discussed in Response 149-105, the number of impacted oaks has increased from 232 to 235), which would constitute a significant impact prior to mitigation. However, the impacted coast live oaks would be replaced as set forth in the tree mitigation plan described below. With implementation of the recommended mitigation, the long-term impact to coast live oaks would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. However, over the short-term (i.e., 10 to 20 years), it is anticipated that impacts to coast live oaks would remain significant with implementation of mitigation measures.

The proposed project would impact up to 27 of the 133 western sycamores on the project site. However, the City has no regulations that protect western sycamores, nor is the western sycamore identified as a candidate, sensitive or special-status species. Therefore, the loss of up to 27 western sycamores would not constitute a significant impact. Nonetheless, the proposed tree mitigation plan includes the preservation and replacement of western sycamores on the project site.

Avoidance and Minimization During Project Design

The proposed project has been designed to cluster development within the eastern one-third of the approximately 887-acre project site, adjacent to existing residential development, and to minimize fill placement within the canyons within the project site. Several iterations of site design reduced fill within canyons and increased avoidance of protected trees, streambeds and wetlands. The site design

was increasingly sensitive to existing topography and, as evidenced in the proposed project design, grading for roads and home lots was designed to minimize cut, which in turn minimizes the need to place fill in adjacent canyons. Project planners estimate that total earthwork volumes have been reduced by as much as 75 percent relative to early site designs, which proposed traditional cut and fill grading over a majority of the project site. Clustering of home lots and site-sensitive road design have minimized impacts to natural open spaces, streambeds and riparian habitats, coast live oaks and western sycamores.

An estimated 1,017 coast live oaks and 106 western sycamores would be preserved versus proposed impacts to 235 coast live oaks (as discussed in Response 149-105, the number of impacted oaks has increased from 232 to 235) and 27 western sycamores. Furthermore, the preserved oaks would be located in near-pristine chaparral, riparian and coastal sage scrub communities, landscapes that enhance their value as wildlife habitat. These facts represent evidence of an initial effort at mitigating project impacts through the minimization and avoidance of impacts to oak trees and native plant communities.

Site-Sensitive Landscape Design

The proposed project design integrates the development and common planting areas into the natural landscape, thereby lessening the visual impact a 280-home residential development might otherwise have on the surrounding community. As discussed below, the conceptual tree planting program incorporates a diversity of sizes of replacement oaks and sycamores, 15-gallons, 24-inch boxes, 36-inch boxes, and larger into a landscape palette that would include other chaparral, coastal sage scrub, and Mediterranean-type plants most suited to the arid Southern California climate. Accompanying plantings may include, among others, toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*), scrub oak (*Quercus berberidifolia*), sage (*Saliva* spp.), sagebrush (*Artemisia* spp.), succulents (*Agave* and *Yucca*), and California lilac (*Ceanothus* spp.). Of course, these plantings will be designed in accordance with the Los Angeles Fire Department's regulations.

The placement of the replacement coast live oaks into a landscape that incorporates the similar climate-adapted Southern California heritage landscape will serve to enhance the long-term survival of all the coast live oak plantings and will also enhance the wildlife values of those oaks. Well-designed and appropriate irrigation and irrigation scheduling will also enhance the establishment of coast live oaks, as well as the supporting plants, thereby ensuring resiliency during droughts and maximum fire retardation.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures are recommended to minimize impacts to native trees. However, the ultimate decision to implement any or all mitigation measures described below will be made by the project arborist in consultation with the project engineer.

D.2-1 The project's arborist shall identify the tree's Optimal Protection Zone (OPZ) in the field and staking of this zone in a half-circle adjacent to the development edge (Appendix D to the Tree Inventory and Impact Analysis provides the formulas necessary to calculate the OPZ of a coast live oak or western sycamore).

D.2-2 The project's arborist shall ensure that protective fencing is installed around the perimeter of the tree's OPZ or at the edge of the limit of the 20-Foot Wide Disturbance Area (as defined in Section VI.D.2 (Native Trees)), whichever is closer to the trunk (see Figure IV.D-19 illustration). The protective fencing shall be temporary and shall be removed upon the completion of ground-disturbing activities. The fence shall be a chain link fence with posts placed no greater than 10 feet on center. The project arborist shall identify all trees requiring temporary fencing and shall verify that the fences are in place prior to commencement of grading operations within 50 feet of the OPZ of any tree not scheduled for removal or not identified as "impacted" in the permit issued by the City. Exceptions to the fencing requirement may be made where preserved tree locations make unintended impacts sufficiently unlikely due to the presence of steep terrain or other physical barrier.

D.2-3 The project's arborist shall ensure the placement of four inches of wood-chip mulch over the ground surface within the OPZ where that zone extends beyond the protective fencing and into the 20-Foot Wide Disturbance Area. This measure may be necessary to limit the compacting effect of heavy equipment on topsoil within the root zone of protected trees.[1] Where appropriate, the four-inch mulch layer shall be placed under the supervision of the project arborist and shall be placed upon first encroachment of grading equipment into the OPZ. Exceptions to the mulching requirement may be made where preserved tree locations make unintended impacts sufficiently unlikely due to the presence of steep terrain or other physical barrier.

D.2-4 Should any protected tree's branches overlap the outer edge of the 20-Foot Wide Disturbance Area and require pruning in order to allow grading to proceed, the pruning shall be performed or supervised by the project arborist or a certified arborist.

D.2-5 The project arborist shall follow or accompany the survey crews prior to the commencement of grading in order to confirm impacts to trees scheduled to be impacted and to confirm avoidance of trees scheduled for preservation. Should any adjustments to the total impact figures be necessary, the project arborist shall notify the project proponent and the project developer, which shall notify the City of the revision.

---

[1] *Matheny, Nelda and James R. Clark, Trees and Development, International Society of Arboriculture, 1998.*

The 20 trees located beneath the footprint of the two proposed bridge crossings of La Tuna Canyon have each been categorized as impacted. These trees may be impacted by the construction of the two proposed bridge crossings. However, minimization of impacts to these trees may be possible depending on the precise method of bridge construction, which has not been determined yet.

Determination of Minimum Replacement Standards

The City's ordinance regarding the "Preservation of Oak Trees" at Section 46.02(c)1 of the LAMC requires that a permittee replace an oak approved for removal or relocation "within the same property boundaries by at least two trees." Section 46.02(c)1 continues:

> *Each replacement tree shall be at least a 15-gallon, or larger, specimen in size, measuring one inch or more in diameter one foot above the base, and be not less than seven feet in height measured from the base. The size and number of replacement trees shall approximate the value of the tree to be replaced.*

The replacement standards provided in this Section suggest that they were not intended to address mitigation for larger properties with wildland oaks in natural settings. While the mitigation program described below satisfies this replacement standard, the simple, straightforward replacement of a targeted tree by two or more 15-gallon or larger trees is generally best suited to scenarios where the impacted oaks are easily viewable by or accessible to the public and aesthetic concerns are paramount. In this case, the replacement of a lost tree's aesthetic contribution by provision of some number of container stock is achievable, especially over time. But this is not the issue with respect to the wildland oaks at the project site. The positions of the oaks and sycamores in deep canyons and remote hillsides make them less of a community benefit and almost exclusively a wildlife resource. This wildlife resource cannot be replaced by the planting of container stock in a park or urban setting. Rather, the replacement of the entire habitat must be undertaken by the restoration of the lost community, in this case oak woodland, riparian forest, and mixed chaparral plant communities.

Consequently, the in-kind replacement of the wildland oaks at the project site is best satisfied through the establishment of varied sizes of replacement oaks, ranging from acorns to large boxed specimens, in association with planting of other native plant species known to naturally coexist with coast live oak or sycamores, on hillsides, in open space areas, and in fuel modification areas adjacent to natural open spaces. Large boxed specimens, in 24-inch to 60-inch boxes, are appropriate where immediate visual statements of the landscape heritage are appropriate, such as at entry points and in common areas throughout a development. Smaller-sized container stock, including seedlings, one-gallon, and five-gallon stock, is appropriate in less visually critical areas, such as slope plantings, detention basin plantings, and private residential lots. Direct seeding of acorns is most appropriate in either non-irrigated or limited access sites where habitat enhancement is the key concern. Most, if not all, of these plantings would be associated with other native plant restoration efforts.

The goal of the mitigation program proposed herein is creation of a landscape that maximizes the compensation for lost habitat values while fully addressing the need to provide a community landscape that reflects the natural heritage of the Verdugo Mountains. This program would be superior to one that simply responded to arbitrary replacement ratios without concern for an overall landscape theme and wildlife benefit.

Mitigation Plan

The conceptual tree planting program, summarized in Table IV.D-16 in Section IV.D.2 (Native Trees), provides for planting of 1,770 coast live oak trees, 181 western sycamores, and thousands of other container stock associated with oak woodlands, chaparral, coastal sage scrub and riparian forests.

D.2-6 The project developer shall implement the final tree planting program for the project, which shall be based on the conceptual tree planting program summarized in Table IV.D-16 in the Draft EIR and the Addendum to the Tree Inventory and Impact Analysis included in Appendix E to the Final EIR, as modified to conform to the specifications for the Development Areas in the approved vesting tentative tract map. The final tree planting program shall be approved by an independent certified arborist and shall include species, sizes, quantities, planting locations and planting specifications, as well as criteria for success and guidelines for monitoring and tree assessments. The plantings would occur within entry points, common areas, road right-of-ways, perimeters of detention basins, common slopes, flood control facilities, fuel modification slopes and private residential lots. Consistent with the conceptual tree planning program, the final tree planning program shall include (1) with respect to all replacement plantings, a minimum replacement ratio of 7.6:1 for impacted coast live oaks and 6.7:1 for impacted western sycamores, (2) with respect to 15-gallon and larger replacement stock, a minimum replacement ratio of 4.6:1 for impacted coast live oaks and 4.1:1 for impacted western sycamores, and (3) a 10-percent planting overage to allow for potential losses of replacement trees.

It is estimated that the proposed conceptual tree planting program would provide approximately $189,800 of tree stock, ranging from acorns to 60-inch boxes. This figure includes $182,310 in tree stock of 15-gallon or greater in size and approximates the value of the trees to be replaced. In contrast, the discussion below describes the value of the trees to be replaced as $182,298 under the Fair Market Value method. This tree planting would be only a part of the overall landscape palette, which, as described above, would also include plantings of native plantings and climate-adapted plantings. The costs for these non-tree plantings are not provided in Table IV.D-16.

D.2-7 All tree plantings shall be subject to a five-year monitoring effort by an independent certified arborist. This monitoring effort shall consider growth, health, and condition of

subject trees in order to evaluate the project's success. This monitoring effort might result in recommendation of remedial actions should any of the tree plantings exhibit poor or declining health. These actions may include more frequent monitoring, installation of protective devices, pruning for larger specimens, integrated pest management (IPM) for pest or disease infestation and other professionally accepted methods to improve the health and vigor of a tree. Fencing and other protective measures could be required for trees less than four (4) feet tall (including acorn plantings) planted in areas where soil compaction, foot traffic, and equine or other recreational uses may occur. These measures shall remain in place until the trees are large enough to be self-protecting. Any coast live oak that fails during the monitoring period shall be replaced with a tree of the same species and equivalent trunk diameter.

Over the long-term (i.e., 10 to 20 years), implementation of the conceptual tree planning program would be sufficient to mitigate the proposed project's impact on coast live oaks to a less-than-significant level. However, over the short-term, it is anticipated that, even with the implementation of the conceptual tree planting program, the impact on coast live oaks would remain significant.

Wildlife Movement

Impacts

The proposed project would not significantly impact either regional or local wildlife movement. For the most part, regional movement between the Verdugo Mountains and other large blocks of habitat has been severely restricted by existing patterns of intervening urban development and Interstate 210 in particular. One potential regional movement corridor has been identified from the San Gabriel Mountains through Tujunga Wash to the Verdugo Mountains. However, the connectivity between the Tujunga Wash and the Verdugo Mountains is "tenuous at best" and has more accurately been described as a "Missing Link" rather than an actual link.

The proposed development on the project site would not affect the Tujunga Wash/Missing Link connection with the Verdugo Mountains, either directly or indirectly. Nevertheless, animals that successfully traverse the Tujunga Wash/ Missing Link connection and reach the project site could then reach the main body of the Verdugo Mountains south of La Tuna Canyon Road through the Drainage 14 movement path (or the large swath of open space surrounding Drainage 14) and La Tuna Canyon Wash, both of which are located on the project site. Neither Drainage 14, the open space in the western portion of Development Area B, nor La Tuna Canyon Wash would be affected by the proposed project, as those features would be retained in open space. As such, the ability (albeit tenuous) of the Tujunga Wash/Missing Link connection to provide for regional movement would not be affected by the proposed project.

No evidence of wildlife movement was detected on the north side of Interstate 210 between Tujunga Wash and the northwest corner of the project site. In the unlikely event that an animal was able to reach the northern subarea of the project site from Tujunga Wash, no regional movement could occur to the north, east or west due to existing residential and commercial development. Accordingly, the project site does not contribute to an east-west regional movement corridor.

In addition, four local movement areas or corridors have been identified on the project site: (1) La Tuna Canyon Wash along the southern boundary of the project site; (2) Drainage 4 along the eastern boundary of the project site; (3) Drainage 14 at the western boundary of the project site; and (4) Verdugo Crestline Drive along the northern boundary of the project site.

Construction of Development Area B would not require either placement of fill or installation of culverts within La Tuna Canyon Wash. The proposed project does include the construction of two span bridges over La Tuna Canyon Wash, which, among other things, would permit the continued undisturbed passage of wildlife through this reach of the drainage. Thus, there would be no impact to wildlife movement to this movement path, so that local wildlife movement would be unaffected by construction of the proposed project. To the extent that La Tuna Canyon Wash serves as a segment in the potential Tujunga Wash-Missing Link-Drainage 14-La Tuna Canyon Wash corridor, such function would also be unaffected by the proposed project.

There would be no changes to the existing culverts beneath La Tuna Canyon Road that currently connect La Tuna Canyon Wash with the canyons to the south in La Tuna Canyon Park. Construction within Development Area B would in not restrict the ability of animals to cross La Tuna Canyon Road or move through the existing culverts under La Tuna Canyon Road.

Drainage 4 is used only for local movement in between the area of existing development east of the project site and proposed Development Area A. To the extent that regional movement occurs on the project site, it occurs only on the south side of Interstate 210 along Drainage 14 (or the open space area surrounding Drainage 14) and in La Tuna Canyon Wash (or along or across La Tuna Canyon Road). Development of the site would not affect Drainage 14, La Tuna Canyon Wash or La Tuna Canyon Road. Drainage 4 would be subject to partial grading for roadway construction, slope stabilization and construction of a multi-purpose wetland/water quality basin at the southern end of the drainage, before the drainage reaches the culvert inlet that allows discharge to pass beneath the Interstate 210. One bridge would be constructed across Drainage 4 to allow a road crossing necessary for traffic circulation through this part of the site. The proposed bridge/roadway would be located immediately upstream of the constructed multi-purpose wetland/water quality basin and neither the road crossing nor the constructed wetland basin would affect the ability of coyotes and raccoons (the only other species identified as using this Drainage) to use this local movement path. Instead, they retain its function as a local movement path (and potentially enhance its function as a local movement path).

Drainage 14 would be preserved within the open-space portion of the project site, over 2,000 feet from the edge of the proposed development. There would be no impacts to local wildlife movement along this movement path and the ability of this feature to function as a segment of the potential Tujunga Wash-Missing Link-Drainage 14-La Tuna Canyon regional corridor would not be affected by construction within the Development Areas.

The western portion of Verdugo Crestline Drive would remain in its current state, while the eastern portion may be paved as part of an emergency access road, generally along the existing alignment. Coyotes and gray foxes, both of which were detected using this local movement path, would easily adapt to this change in the character of Verdugo Crestline Drive. The project design preserves the existing roadway and therefore would not significantly affect the ability of these species to use this portion of the project site. Movement paths in the vicinity of Verdugo Crestline Drive, along the northern edge of the Development Area A and outside the boundaries of the project site, would also be preserved. In addition, to the extent that local movement occurs along or in the vicinity of the Southern California Edison (SCE) Transmission Line right-of-way (ROW), it would continue to occur in the post-project condition.

The proposed project would not result in impacts to regional or local movement corridors, including Tujunga Wash, the Missing Link connection, and the four onsite movement corridors (i.e., La Tuna Canyon Wash, Drainage 14, Drainage 4 and Verdugo Crestline Drive). No movement patterns were detected from the northwest to southeast (or southeast to northwest) on either side of Interstate 210 by large mammals, presumably because such movement is severely restricted by the alternating deep canyon and protruding ridgelines that are covered with dense chaparral. As such, construction within either Development Area A or B would not disrupt movement because such movement is very uncommon (if it occurs at all).

No mountain lions or American badgers were detected on the project site, and no bobcats or mule deer were detected in the Development Areas. Signs of gray fox and coyote were detected on the project site. In any event, development of the proposed project would not affect any of the potential regional or local movement corridors that these species could potentially use, as discussed above. Therefore, it is not expected that the proposed project would impact the ability of any of these species to move regionally or locally through the project site.

Mitigation Measures

D.3-1 The project developer shall install lower intensity lighting for the bridges that cross La Tuna Canyon Wash and Drainage 4.

D.3-2 The project homeowners' association(s) shall maintain openings in walls at key locations within the Development Areas to enhance local movement paths.

The proposed project's impacts on wildlife movement would be less than significant without mitigation. Although not required by CEQA, the implementation of the above recommended mitigation measures would further reduce the proposed project's impacts.

Noise

Impacts

Construction Noise

There would be a significant temporary noise impact on existing nearby homes during each of the construction phases during the time when construction equipment is operating in close proximity. Although unlikely, if blasting does occur, it is expected to generate noise levels within safe limits. In addition, there would not be a significant noise impact on any noise-sensitive areas from the slight construction-related truck volume increase on La Tuna Canyon Road.

Operational Noise

The proposed project would not have a significant noise impact with respect to proposed project operations, including noise from onsite and offsite vehicular traffic and mechanical equipment because the maximum increase in noise levels measured at existing nearby noise-sensitive areas would not exceed 1 dBA, which is well below the 3 dBA threshold.

Impacts on Proposed Homes

In addition to operational and construction noise impacts, the impact of the noise generated by Interstate 210 on the proposed homes was also analyzed. Without sound walls, several proposed homes would experience noise impacts due to sound levels higher than 67 dBA. However, with the recommended sound walls shown on Figure IV.E-2 in Section IV.D (Noise), all but three of the proposed homes would meet the Caltrans sound criterion of 67 dBA. The recommended mitigation measures would reduce that noise impact on those three proposed homes to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measures

Construction Noise

E-1 Construction activities, including job-site deliveries, shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., provided that such construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. to the extent such construction activities are conducted within 500 feet of any existing residential buildings.

E-2 In accordance with Section 41.40(c) of the LAMC, construction activities, including job-site

deliveries, shall not be conducted within 500 feet of any existing residential buildings before 8:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on Saturday or any national holiday or at any time on Sunday.

E-3 Prohibit use of adjoining residential streets by construction personnel and construction-related vehicles for parking.

E-4 An area should be designated as far from residential areas as feasible for the delivery of materials and equipment to site.

E-5 Stage deliveries to occur from mid-morning to mid-afternoon, where feasible, to take advantage of times when residential zones are less susceptible to annoyance from outside noise.

E-6 Coordinate deliveries to reduce the potential of trucks waiting to unload for protracted periods of time.

E-7 All construction equipment shall be equipped with the manufacturers' recommended noise muffling devices, such as mufflers and engine covers. These devices should be kept in good working condition throughout the construction process.

E-8 To the extent feasible, hydraulic equipment instead of pneumatic impact tools and electric powered equipment instead of diesel powered equipment shall be used for exterior construction work.

E-9 Maintaining equipment in an idling mode shall be minimized. All equipment not in use shall be turned off.

E-10 For smaller equipment (such as, air-compressors and small pumps), line-powered equipment shall be used to the extent feasible.

E-11 The project developer shall appoint a construction coordinator to interface with the general contractor and neighboring communities, local neighborhood councils and local equestrian organizations. The construction coordinator shall be accessible to resolve problems related to the effects of project construction on the surrounding community, to the extent feasible. The construction coordinator shall also provide information to the surrounding community regarding scheduling of specific construction activities (e.g., grading and blasting) and construction phasing.

The above noise control measures would minimize the significant impact at the nearby homes during the construction of the proposed project. Due to the quiet ambient conditions in these residential areas, the above mitigation measures are unlikely to reduce construction noise to a level of insignificance at

these sensitive noise receptors. With implementation of these mitigation measures, construction noise impacts with respect to these homes would remain significant. The goal of this noise mitigation plan is to provide the most effective and practical techniques for controlling construction noise emissions.

Operational Noise Impacts on Proposed Homes

E-12 In order to meet the Caltrans standard regarding freeway noise, one of the following two options shall be implemented:

- Sound walls shall be constructed at the locations and heights shown in Figure IV.E-2, as revised in Figure 3-S in Appendix F to the Final EIR.
- The elevations or locations of the homes shall be altered and/or intervening berms or landform features shall be integrated into the project design.

E-13 The project design and construction will incorporate all applicable building codes that relate to building sound insulation, including appropriate use of double-glazed windows, etc.

The above mitigation measures would reduce noise impacts on proposed homes to a less-than-significant level.

Artificial Light and Glare

Impacts

Interstate 210

While lighting from Development Area A would be visible, based on the ameliorating effects of the existing sky glow, the distance of the freeway from the visible homes, the relatively short duration that Development Area A would be visible and the limited visibility from inside vehicles, the low-level of proposed street lighting, the proposed CC&R restrictions on exterior lighting, it is not expected that Development Area A would create a substantial new source of light or glare that would adversely affect nighttime views from Interstate 210. Therefore, the night lighting impacts from the proposed Development Areas to occupants of vehicles on Interstate 210 are anticipated to be less than significant.

La Tuna Canyon Road

Interstate 210 forms a line-of-sight barrier that effectively blocks virtually all views of proposed Development Area A from the portion of La Tuna Canyon Road adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the introduction of new sources of light within proposed Development Area A would have little effect on occupants in vehicles traveling on La Tuna Canyon Road.

There are a number of factors that reduce the lighting impact of proposed Development Area B as viewed by vehicle occupants, including the existing sky glow, the distance of La Tuna Canyon Road from the visible homes, the relatively short duration that proposed Development Area B would be visible, the low-level of proposed street lighting, the proposed CC&R restrictions on exterior lighting, and the limited visibility from inside vehicles. However, the lighting associated with proposed Development Area B would introduce a substantial new light source into an area that currently experiences a low level of illumination and has a rural character. The resulting effect would be the significant compromise of the rural nighttime ambiance of La Tuna Canyon Road in the vicinity of proposed Development Area B. Therefore, the proposed project would have a significant lighting impact in relation to nighttime views of proposed Development Area B from vehicles traveling on La Tuna Canyon Road. Although the recommended mitigation would reduce the lighting impact of proposed Development Area B on La Tuna Canyon Road to the extent feasible, this impact would remain significant after implementation of such mitigation.

Existing Residential Community

Development Area A would include substantial new sources of light that would adversely affect nighttime views in the project area from established residential areas along Tranquil Drive, Reverie Drive, Inspiration Way, Glen O Peace and Verdugo Crestline Drive. This adverse impact would be somewhat reduced by the numerous design features discussed above that substantially reduce lighting and its visibility from offsite locations. In addition, project lighting would only be visible from a relatively small number of homes and public viewing areas in the existing residential areas. However, on balance, it is concluded that the impact of new lighting within proposed Development Area A on the adjacent residential community would be significant. Although the recommended mitigation would reduce the lighting impact of proposed Development Area A on the adjacent residential community to the extent feasible, this impact would remain significant after implementation of mitigation.

Wildlife

The proposed project includes preservation of approximately 693 acres of open space, which would provide substantial remaining habitat for those light-sensitive wildlife species to withdraw to unaffected portions of the project site. Therefore, no impacts on wildlife species due to lighting would occur.

Mitigation Measures

F-1 The CC&Rs for the project shall prohibit the use of all exterior uplighting fixtures for building facades and trees, establish design limits on the amount of landscape lighting per foot, permit only downlighting for all exterior-building mounted fixtures, and prohibit "glowing" fixtures that would be visible from existing communities or public roads.

F-2 The CC&Rs shall specify that night lighting on private property located on any lot located within 100 feet from the edge of Interstate 210 shall be permitted, provided it is low-height, low illumination safety lighting that is shielded and directed onto the property.

F-3 For internal street lighting, the minimum maintained average illuminance level shall be reduced from 0.4 fc to 0.2 fc by reducing the wattage of the street lighting fixtures while maintaining the IES recommended uniformity ratio of 6:1 minimum to average fc.

F-4 Roadway light fixtures shall be full cut-off, well-shielded fixtures that will allow no direct beam illumination into the night sky or into adjacent open space areas.

F-5 Exterior buildings finishes shall be non-reflective and use natural subdued tones.

F-6 All roofs visible from the Interstate 210 and/or La Tuna Canyon Road shall be surfaced with non-reflective materials.

Notwithstanding, with the implementation of the mitigation measures above, the change in the semi-rural character along La Tuna Canyon Road caused by the increase in night illumination would constitute a significant impact on views from that road. Similarly, even with the implementation of the mitigation measures above, the change in nighttime lighting for existing homes along Tranquil Drive, Reverie Drive, Inspiration Way, Glen O Peace and Verdugo Crestline Drive would also constitute a significant impact.

Land Use

Impacts

Community Division

The project site is currently undeveloped, there are no community services or public services on the project site and there are no existing roadways through the project site that could be used by the adjacent existing residential community. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically divide any established community.

Consistency with Land Use Plans, Policies and Regulations

All proposed development in the project site would be located in the Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace-Shadow Hills-East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan ("Sunland-Tujunga Community Plan") area. All areas of the project site that are in the Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon Community Plan ("Sun Valley Community Plan") area would be preserved as open space. The proposed project includes amendments to the land use designations and zoning for a portion of the project site located in the

Sunland-Tujunga Community Plan area (see Figure IV.G-6)). The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable policies in the Sunland-Tujunga Community Plan. As discussed in Section IV.G (Land Use), the proposed project would also be consistent with the proposed zoning for the project site.

The adopted San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan was analyzed for consistency with the proposed project. As discussed in Section IV.G (Land Use), the proposed project is consistent with the Specific Plan.

An oak tree permit would be required for the removal and replacement of up to 235 oak trees (as discussed in Response 149-105, the number of impacted oaks has increased from 232 to 235) in accordance with Section 46.00 et seq. of the LAMC (as discussed in Section IV.D.2 (Native Trees) of the Draft EIR).

For the reasons discussed above, the proposed project's land use impacts would be less than significant, and therefore no mitigation measures are recommended.

Population and Housing

Impacts

The direct growth in population and housing on the project site is not expected to be substantial because (1) the proposed project includes the preservation of approximately 693 acres (78 percent) of the project site as permanent open space, (2) the construction of 280 homes to be occupied by approximately 831 people is considered to be relatively small, and (3) the projected population associated with the proposed project would be consistent with area-wide population and housing forecasts. Therefore, impacts associated with direct population and housing growth would be less than significant.

Although the proposed project would extend roadways and other infrastructure (e.g., water facilities, sewer facilities, electricity transmission lines, natural gas lines, etc.) to and within the project site, it would not induce growth because the roadways and other infrastructure would only service future project homes and residents.

In addition, the project site does not currently contain any housing or people. Therefore, no impacts would occur resulting from the displacement of housing or people.

For these reasons, the proposed project's impacts on population and housing would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are recommended.

Transportation/Traffic

Impacts

Construction Traffic

The potential transportation/traffic impacts associated with the proposed construction would be approximately 17 percent of those evaluated in the traffic study for the proposed project. Since the operational traffic impacts associated with the proposed project have already been determined to be less than significant (with mitigation), the substantially lower construction transportation/traffic impacts would also be less than significant.

Site Access

Separate access and internal circulation schemes would be provided for each of the proposed Development Areas. Primary access to proposed Development Area A would be provided via the proposed construction of the north leg of an existing intersection of the Interstate 210 westbound on/off ramps and La Tuna Canyon Road. Access to proposed Development Area B would be provided via two proposed intersections to La Tuna Canyon Road west of the Interstate 210 interchange. Onsite circulation in both proposed Development Areas would be provided via internal roadways.

Emergency Access

Secondary emergency access to proposed Development Area A would be provided via Inspiration Way. Implementation of the Inspiration Way emergency access route, in addition to the Interstate 210 westbound on/off ramps and La Tuna Canyon Road access, would provide adequate emergency access to proposed Development Area A.

Emergency access to proposed Development Area B would be provided via the two proposed intersections to La Tuna Canyon Road west of the Interstate 210 interchange.

Intersection Analysis

The proposed project is expected to create a significant traffic impact at only one of the nine study intersections during the AM and/or PM peak hours:

- No. 4: Development Area A Access/Interstate 210 Westbound Ramps and La Tuna Canyon Road — AM peak hour v/c ratio increase of 0.087 [0.700 to 0.787 (LOS C)]

Incremental, but not significant, impacts would occur at the remaining eight study intersections due to development of the proposed project.

La Tuna Canyon Road

To supplement the intersection analysis, an additional review of the proposed project's potential traffic impacts was prepared for the two-lane segment of La Tuna Canyon Road west of proposed Development Area B. The two-lane segment of La Tuna Canyon Road is anticipated to continue to operate at LOS A during both the AM and PM peak hours with the addition of the project-related traffic. Therefore, no mitigation measures are recommended.

Safety Review

Based on traffic accident data from 1990 through 2000, the section rate for La Tuna Canyon Road between Sunland Boulevard and Interstate 210 Westbound Ramps is estimated to be 0.769 accidents per million vehicle-miles of travel, which is less than half the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works average accident rate of 1.82 accidents per million vehicle-miles of travel for mountain roads with a design speed greater than 35 miles per hour. During that 11-year period, accident rates did not increase in relation to the increase in traffic volumes on La Tuna Canyon Road. The small increase in traffic on La Tuna Canyon Road due to the proposed project is not anticipated to significantly increase the accident rates along the roadway.

Research of accident history along La Tuna Canyon Road also indicates that several fatal and serious accidents occurred near Elben Avenue between 1979 and 1996 when drivers lost control of their vehicles due to flood conditions. However, in 1997, the City modified and reconstructed portions of La Tuna Canyon Road to address safety issues related to pavement drainage and the Los Angeles City Council banned heavy trucks weighing in excess of 6,000 pounds along La Tuna Canyon Road from Sunland Boulevard to Interstate 210. Since those measures were implemented, no fatal accidents have occurred on this section of La Tuna Canyon Road.

Congestion Management Plan (CMP) Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA)

As required by the CMP, a TIA was prepared to determine the potential impacts on designated monitoring locations on the CMP highway system. As determined in the TIA, the proposed project would not exceed the trip threshold at any CMP intersection or mainline freeway monitoring location.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure is recommended to reduce the impact at the intersection of Development Area A Access/Interstate 210 Westbound Ramps and La Tuna Canyon Road to a less-than-significant level.

I-1 Fund the design and installation of a traffic signal compatible with Automated Traffic Surveillance and Control/Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATSAC/ATCS) for the

intersection of Development Area A Access/Interstate 210 Westbound Ramps and La Tuna Canyon Road. The above transportation improvement, including all necessary dedications, widening and signal installation, shall be guaranteed before the issuance of any building permit through the B-Permit process of the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering (BOE) and encroachment permit of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Prior to setting the bond amount of the B-Permit, the BOE shall require that the developer's engineer or contractor to contact City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation's (LADOT) B-Permit Coordinator at (213) 580-5322 to arrange a pre-design meeting to finalize the design for the required transportation improvements. The traffic signal shall be constructed and completed, before the issuance of any certificate of occupancy, to the satisfaction of LADOT, the BOE and Caltrans.

This measure would fully mitigate the project-related significant impact at this intersection. The v/c ratio in the AM peak hour is expected to improve from 0.787 (LOS C) to 0.630 (LOS B), and in the PM peak hour from 0.661 (LOS B) to 0.529 (LOS A). However, the following additional mitigation measures are recommended to reduce further the proposed project's potential traffic impacts:

I-2 With respect to the section of La Tuna Canyon Road adjacent to the project site, (1) the project developer shall dedicate along the entire project frontage on La Tuna Canyon Road to bring the right-of-way up to the standard required by the General Plan, (2) the project developer shall construct improvements on La Tuna Canyon Road so as to provide two lanes in each direction with left-turn channelization at the access points for Development Area A and Development Area B and (3) except as required to provide left-turn channelization as described above, no additional roadway widening along the proposed project's La Tuna Canyon Road frontage shall be required.

I-3 The project developer shall contact the Bureau of Engineering, Department of Public Works to ensure compliance with the requirements of the LAMC related to the equestrian park.

I-4 The driveway to Development Area A on La Tuna Canyon Road shall be aligned as the north leg of the signalized intersection at Development Area A Access/Interstate 210 Westbound Ramps and La Tuna Canyon Road.

I-5 To avoid the encroachment of vehicles onto the public right-of-way, a minimum of 40 feet of reservoir space shall be provided at each driveway. This distance shall be measured from the property line to the first parking stall and/or gate.

I-6 The driveways for Development Area B shall be located away from any blind curve along La Tuna Canyon Road. Queuing and merging areas shall be provided for ingress and

egress vehicles, respectively. The driveways serving Development Area B shall be consistent with the requirement(s) of LADOT and other City departments.

I-7 As backing into or out of arterial highways or collector streets is not permitted, the path and location of all trucks and vehicles with horse trailers shall be indicated on the parking area and driveway plan submitted by the project developer to LADOT prior to the issuance of building permits.

I-8 Final LADOT approval shall be obtained prior to the issuance of any building permits. This shall be accomplished by submitting a detailed site/driveway plan, at a scale of at least 1 inch = 40 feet, to LADOT's Valley Development Review Section at 6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Suite 320, Van Nuys. This site/driveway plan shall be submitted as soon as possible, prior to the submittal of building plans to the Department of Building and Safety.

Public Services

Fire Protection

Impacts

Project construction would not be expected to increase demand for fire fighting and emergency services to the extent that there would be a need for new or expanded fire facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives of the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD). Therefore, construction-related impacts to fire protection and medical emergency services would be less than significant.

With respect to project operation, the response distance between the project site and the primary response fire station is not within Fire Code specifications pertaining to engine and truck companies. Therefore, impacts with respect to distance criteria are considered to be potentially significant. However, the recommended mitigation below requires that all project structures be constructed with automatic fire sprinkler systems in order to compensate for the additional response distance.

With respect to emergency evacuation, residents evacuating from proposed Development Area A would have the option to enter Interstate 210 immediately upon exiting or head easterly on La Tuna Canyon Road toward Tujunga Canyon Boulevard or westerly toward Sunland Boulevard. In addition, the second emergency access route through either Verdugo Crestline Drive or Inspiration Way would relieve potential congestion and provide alternative ingress and egress to the extent that access to La Tuna Canyon Road is not possible. Development Area B would provide emergency access from two points along La Tuna Canyon Road via an internal loop road. Although impacts with respect to

emergency evacuation would be less than significant, the recommended mitigation would ensure that emergency access to the project site would be sufficient.

In addition, no impacts with respect to fire flows are expected to occur because adequate fire flows will be provided to the project site (see Section IV.L.1 (Water) of the Draft EIR regarding construction impacts resulting from the installation of water lines).

Although the project site is within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ), the LAFD's standard conditions with respect to providing fire hydrants and emergency access have been included as recommended mitigation measures below and would ensure that adequate fire protection facilities would be provided and no significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures

J.1-1 An automatic fire sprinkler system shall be provided in each structure in accordance with Section 57.09.07 of the LAMC.

With the implementation of Mitigation Measure J.1-1, the proposed project would not have a significant impact on fire protection services. However, the following additional mitigation measures are recommended to reduce further the proposed project's potential fire protection impacts:

J.1-2 At least two different ingress/egress roads shall be provided for each Development Area that will accommodate major fire apparatus and provide for major evacuation during emergency situations.

J.1-3 Private streets and entry gates shall be built to City standards to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and the LAFD.

J.1-4 Construction of public or private roadways in the development shall not exceed 15 percent in grade.

J.1-5 Private development shall conform to the standard street dimensions shown on City Department of Public Works Standard Plan D-22549 regarding travel-way width (i.e., curb-to-curb).

J.1-6 Standard cut-corners shall be used on all turns.

J.1-7 The width of private roadways for general access use and fire lanes shall not be less than 20 feet clear to the sky.

J.1-8 Fire lanes, where provided, and dead ending streets shall terminate in a cul-de-sac or other approved turning area. No dead ending street or fire lane shall be greater than 700 feet in

length or secondary access shall be provided.

J.1-9 All access roads, including fire lanes, shall be maintained in an unobstructed manner, removal of obstructions shall be at the owner's expense. The entrance to all fire lanes or private driveways shall be posted with a sign no less than three square feet in area in accordance with Section 57.09.05 of the LAMC.

J.1-10 Fire lane width shall not be less than 20 feet. When a fire lane must accommodate the operation of LAFD aerial ladder apparatus or where fire hydrants are installed, those portions shall not be less than 28 feet in width.

J.1-11 Private roadways for general access use shall have a minimum width of 20 feet.

J.1-12 Where access for a given development requires accommodation of LAFD apparatus, minimum outside radius of the paved surface shall be 35 feet. An additional six feet of clear space must be maintained beyond the outside radius to a vertical point 13 feet six inches above the paved surface of the roadway.

J.1-13 No building or portion of a building shall be constructed more than 150 feet from the edge of a roadway of an improved street, access road or designated fire lane.

J.1-14 To reduce the potential for confusion, slow response, and other attendant difficulties that may arise during an emergency evacuation situation, which could hamper evacuation activities on La Tuna Canyon Road, the project developer shall prepare and distribute to each homeowner a copy of an evacuation plan prepared specifically for the proposed project. The plan shall be submitted to the LAPD and LAFD for review prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy. Upon establishment, it shall become the responsibility of the homeowners' association(s) to distribute the evacuation plan to new homeowners. The major features of the plan shall address the following issues:

- A program of clear and explicit procedures, responsibilities and courses of action to be followed in the event of an emergency.
- A program for the coordination of evacuation efforts with the Los Angeles Police and Fire Departments.
- A map showing alternative evacuation routes.

J.1-15 The number and location of adequate offsite public and onsite private fire hydrants shall be provided as determined by the LAFD's review of the vesting tentative tract map.

J.1-16 All landscaping shall use indigenous fire-resistant plants and materials, based on the LAFD's

list of such plants.

J.1-17 All homes shall have noncombustible roofs (non-wood).

J.1-18 The brush in the area adjacent to the development shall be cleared or thinned periodically by the homeowners' association(s) under supervision of the LAFD in order to reduce the risk of brush fires spreading to the homes.

J.1-19 The vesting tentative tract map, indicating access roads and turning areas, shall be submitted for LAFD approval.

J.1-20 Adequate fire hydrants shall be provided.

J.1-21 Definitive plans and specifications shall be submitted to the LAFD and requirements for necessary permits satisfied prior to commencement of construction.

Police Protection

Impacts

During construction, the project site may be susceptible to the occasional trespasser, thief or vandal. Because the proposed project is in an early stage of planning, specific strategies for preventing construction site problems have not yet been developed. Therefore, mitigation measures are recommended to ensure that no significant problems arise during the construction period.

Implementation of proposed project would result in an increased number of residents and visitors within the project site and the surrounding area, and therefore an increase in the number of requests for assistance calls for the police services from new homes would be expected. However, the existing crime rate in the Foothill Area is well below the citywide average, and the relatively small size of the proposed project (i.e., 280 homes) is not expected to increase crime rates in the Foothill Area to the extent that a new or expanded police station or other facilities would be required.

In addition, the proposed project includes significant crime prevention design features (e.g., security gates) that would reduce the level of police protection required for the proposed project in comparison with a typical subdivision.

Nonetheless, mitigation measures are recommended below to reduce further the effects of the proposed project on police protection services.

Mitigation Measures

J.2-1 During construction activities, the project developer shall ensure that all onsite areas of

active development, material and equipment storage, and vehicle staging, that are adjacent to existing public roadways, be secured to prevent trespass.

J.2-2 The project developer shall submit a plot plan for the development to the LAPD's Crime Prevention Section for review and comment. Security features subsequently recommended by the LAPD shall be implemented, to the extent feasible.

J.2-3 Upon completion of the project, the project developer shall provide the Foothill Area Commanding Officer with a diagram of the project. The diagram shall include access routes, addresses, and any other information that might facilitate prompt and efficient police response.

J.2-4 The project developer shall give the Foothill Area Commanding Officer access codes and/or keys to lock boxes to gated portions of the project site.

J.2-5 The project homeowners' association(s) shall retain a single alarm and security patrol company to patrol the Development Areas and correct false alarms expeditiously.

J.2-6 The project homeowners' association(s) shall ensure that clearly identifiable address indicators are provided for all homes and other buildings.

Although mitigation measures are not required under CEQA, the above measures would further reduce the project's less-than-significant police protection impacts.

Recreation and Parks

Impacts

Based on the preferred parkland per population ratio of four acres per 1,000 persons, the proposed project would require 3.3 acres of new parkland. However, the increase in demand for parkland would be offset by the proposed project's three-acre equestrian park, 1.7 acres of other onsite recreational facilities and several hundred acres of preserved open space. If to the extent the proposed equestrian park and other onsite recreational facilities do not fully satisfy the requirements of the Quimby Act with respect to the proposed project, the project developer would be required to pay Quimby fees to the City to satisfy the balance of its obligations under the Quimby Act. Therefore, impacts on parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are recommended.

Libraries

Impacts

The proposed project would increase demand for library services at the Sunland-Tujunga Branch Library by increasing the permanent residential population in the area. The proposed project would generate the need for approximately 415.5 square feet of library space, which is the approximate equivalent of a 20 x 20-foot room, the construction of which would not be expected to result in any significant environmental impacts. Therefore, impacts on libraries would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are recommended.

Schools

Impacts

The increase in the number of permanent residents on the project site and the potential need to enroll any school-aged children into Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) schools would increase the demand for school services. The proposed project would generate a total of 122 students, including 61 elementary school students, 30 middle school students and 30 high school students. Based on existing capacities and enrollments, the proposed project would not exceed the overall enrollment capacities at local elementary or middle schools. However, there is an overall capacity shortfall at local high schools. This shortfall in high school capacity is expected to be resolved by the proposed East Valley Area New High School #2, which will be completed in 2005, approximately four years prior to the completion of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution of new students would not exceed overall enrollment capacities and school impacts would be less than significant.

Energy Conservation

Electricity

Impacts

In order to serve the proposed project's demand for an estimated 4,316 kilowatt hours (kwH) per day, existing electrical lines in the project area would need to be extended and upgraded. While electrical connection of the proposed project would entail expansion of distribution infrastructure and capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities, these requirements are not expected to create significant impacts to the physical environment because: (1) any disruption of service would be of a short-term nature, typically lasting a couple of hours: (2) extension of electrical lines would be within public rights-of-way; and (3) the full cost of the proposed connections and the fair share cost of the expansion of the electrical distribution systems would be borne by the project developer. In addition, with modern energy efficient construction materials and compliance with Title 24 standards, the proposed

project would be consistent with the City's energy conservation standards and therefore would not conflict with adopted energy conservation plans.

Mitigation Measures

K.1-1 In the event of full or partial road closures, the project developer shall employ flagmen during the construction of the electrical distribution system to facilitate the flow of traffic.

K.1-2 During the design process, the project developer shall consult with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Efficiency Solutions Business Group, regarding possible energy efficiency measures.

Although mitigation measures are not required under CEQA, the above measures would further reduce the project's less-than-significant impacts on electricity.

Natural Gas

Impacts

SCG has stated that it can accommodate the natural gas needs of the proposed project (i.e., 62,207 cubic feet per day) from existing medium pressure mains and current supply. While the extension of natural gas service to the proposed project would include expansion of distribution infrastructure and capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities, these requirements are not expected to create significant impacts to the physical environment because: (1) there would be no disruption in service to existing customers; (2) extension of natural gas mains would be within public right-of-ways and any required road closures would be for a short period of time; and (3) the full cost of the proposed service extensions and the fair share costs of the expansion of the natural gas distribution systems would be borne by the project developer. In addition, the proposed project would use modern energy-efficient construction materials and otherwise comply with the City's energy conservation standards in compliance with Title 24 standards.

Mitigation Measures

K.2-1 Prior to the start of construction, the proposed project's energy engineer shall consult with SCG for an energy analysis regarding efficiency and conservation measures.

K.2-2 The project developer shall hire flagmen to facilitate traffic flow during installation of the natural gas main extensions.

Although mitigation measures are not required under CEQA, the above measures would further reduce the project's less-than-significant impacts on natural gas.

Utilities and Service Systems

Water

Impacts

The proposed project would generate short-term construction-related demand for water for such activities as dust suppression and the washing of construction vehicles. Operationally, the proposed project would create a demand for water for domestic purposes and landscape irrigation. Total occupancy of the proposed project would result in the demand for approximately 110,880 gallons per day (gpd) of water. As there is no existing water infrastructure on the project site, water lines would need to be extended to the project site. During construction of the water lines within public street rights-of-way, short-term transportation/traffic impacts could occur. Such impacts could consist of temporary partial or complete lane closures as trenches are excavated, the pipes installed, and the trenches subsequently refilled and covered over. However, the construction of water lines would not require full roadway closures and no detours are anticipated. Therefore, no significant construction-related impacts are expected.

With respect to water supplies, the City Department of Water and Power (DWP) has indicated that the water requirements for any project that is consistent with the City's General Plan have been taken into account in the planned growth in water demand and that sufficient water supplies are available to accommodate such a project. The proposed homes would be less dense than is permitted under the current General Plan land use designations for the project site, and therefore would be consistent with the City's growth projections. Therefore, impacts to water supply would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

L.1-1 The project developer shall ensure that the landscape irrigation system be designed, installed and tested to provide uniform irrigation coverage. Sprinkler head patterns shall be adjusted to minimize over spray onto walkways and streets.

L.1-2 The project developer shall install either a "smart sprinkler" system to provide irrigation for the landscaped areas or, at a minimum, set automatic irrigation timers to water landscaping during early morning or late evening hours to reduce water losses from evaporation. Irrigation run times for all zones shall be adjusted seasonally, reducing water times and frequency in the cooler months (fall, winter, spring). Sprinkler timer run times shall be adjusted to avoid water runoff, especially when irrigating sloped property.

L.1-3 The project developer shall select and use drought-tolerant, low-water consuming plant varieties to reduce irrigation water consumption.

L.1-4 The project developer shall install ultra-low flush water toilets and water-saving showerheads in new construction. Low-flow faucet aerators should be installed on all sink faucets.

Although mitigation measures are not required under CEQA, the above measures would further reduce the project's less-than-significant impacts on water supply.

Sewer

Impacts

The existing sewer line under La Tuna Canyon Road has the capacity to handle the additional sewage generation from the proposed project, based on the number of lateral tie-ins presently contributing to the sewer flow. Since there is an existing sewer line adjacent to the project site with sufficient capacity to handle the flows from the proposed project, no off-site sewer line improvements are anticipated, other than the proposed project's connection. Further, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, the proposed project's impact on sewer systems would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are recommended.

Solid Waste

Impacts

Solid waste would be generated at the project site by both short-term construction activities and long-term residential activities. The construction of 280 new homes would generate approximately 2,453 tons of waste over the construction period. Construction waste from the proposed project could be accepted at either the Sunshine Canyon Landfill or the Bradley Landfill. The addition of the proposed project's construction waste to Sunshine Canyon Landfill would not cause the landfill to exceed its permitted capacity. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Over the long-term, the proposed project's 280 homes would be expected to generate approximately 3,424 pounds (1.712 tons) of solid waste per day, or 625 tons per year. However, the AB 939 requirement to reduce the solid waste stream in landfills by 50 percent means that approximately 1,712 pounds (0.856 tons) of the proposed project's total daily solid waste generation (or 312 tons per year) must be recycled rather than disposed to a landfill. The long-term residential solid waste that would be generated by the proposed project could be accommodated at the Sunshine Canyon Landfill without causing the landfill to exceed its permitted daily capacity in the foreseeable future. Therefore, the proposed project's long-term impact on solid waste facilities would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

L.3-1 The construction contractor shall only contract for waste disposal services with a company that recycles construction-related wastes.

L.3-2 To facilitate the onsite separation and recycling of construction-related wastes, the construction contractor should provide temporary waste separation bins in front of each home during construction.

L.3-3 The project developer shall make information published by the City regarding the curbside recycling program, as well as onsite composting methods for yard waste, available to purchasers of dwelling units at the time of sale.

L.3-4 The project developer shall provide composting bins to purchasers of each new dwelling unit.

L.3-5 The project developer shall provide trash compactors in each new residence to allow more effective and sanitary method of trash disposal.

Although mitigation measures are not required under CEQA, the above measures would further reduce the project's less-than-significant solid waste impacts.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Environmental Site Assessment

Impacts

The proposed project would not routinely transport, use or dispose of hazardous materials, result in reasonably foreseeable conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, or emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The proposed project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites complied pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials. Nonetheless, mitigation measures are recommended below to reduce further the effects of the proposed project with respect to hazardous materials.

Mitigation Measures

M.1-1 All hazardous or potentially hazardous materials used on the project site during construction for purposes of blasting shall be under the control of the designated contractor from the time such materials are brought onsite through the time of their use and the time they are

removed from the project site. Access to these materials shall be controlled at all times. All such materials shall be fully accounted for both prior to and following all blasting work to be performed on the project site.

M.1-2 The large-scale application of herbicides for purposes of removing existing vegetation on the project site shall not be permitted. In addition, all hazardous or potentially hazardous materials used on the project site during construction shall be under the control of the designated contractor from the time such materials are brought onsite through the time of their use and the time they are removed from the project site. Access to these materials shall be controlled at all times. The designated storage location for these materials must be contained and separated from the ground surface by appropriate means to be designated in the construction site's SWPPP.

Electromagnetic Field Emissions

Impacts

There is insufficient scientific data from which to conclude that the existence of power lines in proximity to the project site would cause substantial adverse effects on people living in the proposed homes in proximity to the SCE Transmission Line ROW. Therefore, the potential EMF impacts associated with the proposed project would not be considered significant.

Mitigation Measure

M.2-1 For all residential lots in Development Area A located within 150 feet of the edge of the SCE Transmission Line ROW, the project developer shall provide an EMF information and disclosure statement to each prospective buyer and include as part of the final sales literature, which statement shall include the following:

- The location of the SCE transmission lines in the vicinity of Development Area A.
- A statement that this subject has been addressed in the Final EIR for the project and that the Final EIR is on file with the City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning.
- A statement that additional information regarding the potential health effects from EMF exposure may be obtained from the California State Department of Health or by contacting the California EMF Project located at 1515 Clay Street, Suite 1700, Oakland, California 94612, or by viewing available information posted on the California EMF Project's official internet site at http://www.dhs.cahwnet.gov/ehib/emf/general.html.

Although mitigation measures are not required under CEQA, the above measure is recommended in the interest of full disclosure with respect to the scientific community's uncertainty of potential health risks associated with electromagnetic field emissions exposure.

Aesthetics

Impacts

While the project has been designed to minimize the visibility of the proposed homes, based on the close proximity of the proposed Development Areas to two designated scenic highways (i.e., Interstate 210 and La Tuna Canyon Road), the proposed development would have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas from those highways.

Clustering the proposed homes provides the opportunity to maximize open space and minimize the impacts to the most sensitive scenic resources on the project site. Nonetheless, substantial portions of the 194-acre Development Areas would involve the removal or alteration of existing scenic resources such as major landforms and undisturbed native vegetation, which would substantially impact scenic resources. Therefore, the proposed project's impacts on scenic resources would be considered significant.

While the proposed project has been designed to preserve the existing visual character and quality of the project site (by creating a low-density clustered residential community that avoids the appearance of a "tract" development), the proposed project would transform undisturbed hillsides into a 194-acre residential community. In particular, the proposed homes in proposed Development Area A would substantially affect the visual character or quality of open space to which the existing residential community to the north and northeast is accustomed. With respect to Development Area B, the introduction of new homes would substantially change the visual character of La Tuna Canyon. Furthermore, the proposed homes in proposed Development Area B would substantially impact the rural ambiance of that portion of La Tuna Canyon. Therefore, the proposed project's impacts on visual character and quality would be considered significant.

Mitigation Measures

N-1 All structures on the project site shall comply with the applicable requirements of the Specific Plan.

N-2 All fences, gates and walls visible from Interstate 210 or La Tuna Canyon Road shall be constructed of one or more of the following materials: rough-cut, unfinished wood; native-type stone; split-face concrete bloc; textured plaster surface walls; black or dark green chain link; wrought-iron in combination with small-gauge tubular steel posts (tubing posts not to exceed 1½" square in dimension).

N-3 The project developer shall prepare and implement a landscape plan that provides planting and maintenance guidance for common landscaped areas, slopes, and undeveloped building pads. A separate landscape plan may be prepared for each Development Area. The project developer shall be responsible for the plan's implementation until such time as a homeowners' association assumes responsibility for landscape maintenance. The landscape plan shall be subject to the review and approval by the Department of City Planning prior to issuance of any grading permit. To ensure its implementation, the landscape plan shall be incorporated into the project's CC&Rs. Major features of the landscape plan shall include:

- A listing of plant species appropriate for use for both temporary slope stabilization purposes and long-term landscaping designs for common areas. The plan shall emphasize the use of drought-tolerant, fire retardant, native plant species. Only non-invasive non-native plant species shall be included in the listing of acceptable planting materials. In addition, wherever practical, plants which are relatively pest resistant and which require a minimum of added nutrients shall be utilized in landscaping.
- Retention of a landscape contractor thoroughly familiar with the provisions of the landscape plan, by the project's homeowners' association, for ongoing implementation of the landscape plan.

N-4 All utilities installed in connection with the development of the project shall be placed underground.

N-5 All roofs visible from Interstate 210 and La Tuna Canyon Road shall be surfaced with non-glare materials and no equipment shall be placed thereon. This provision shall not apply to solar energy devices and satellite dishes.

N-6 Where feasible, drainage devices (terrace drains, benches and intervening terraces) visible from surrounding areas shall be bermed and placed in swales.

N-7 Concrete drains and all other drainage devices shall be tinted with an appropriate earth tone to effectively conceal them from surrounding views.

N-8 Where required sound walls may interrupt views of the surrounding scenery, sound walls constructed of a combination of Plexiglas and concrete blocks may be installed.

The above mitigation measures would reduce the proposed project's impacts on scenic vistas, scenic resources and the existing visual character of the environment. However, impacts would remain significant following implementation of these mitigation measures.

Cultural Resources

Historic Resources

Impacts

There are no historic resources on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact any historic resources and no mitigation measures are recommended.

Archaeological Resources

Impacts

All accessible portions of the project site were field examined and no archaeological resources were discovered. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact any known unique or non-unique archaeological resources.

Mitigation Measures

O.2-1 If buried cultural materials are exposed during construction, work shall be halted in the immediate vicinity of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess their significance.

O.2-2 If the finds are termed significant (i.e., a unique archaeological resource), the archaeologist and a Native American Observer shall be permitted to remove the items in a professional manner for further laboratory evaluation.

O.2-3 If human remains are unearthed during construction, no further disturbance shall occur until the Los Angeles County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition in accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined to be those of a Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento shall be contacted before the remains are removed in accordance with Section 21083.2 of the California Public Resources Code.

Although mitigation measures are not required under CEQA, the above measures would provide direction in the event that archaeological resources are discovered during construction.

Paleontological Resources

Impacts

The development of the proposed project would have no impact on paleontologic resources because (1) earth-moving activities would take place in areas of the project site underlain by rock units that do not

contain fossils and (2) no earth-moving activities would occur in areas of the project site underlain by rock units that potentially contain fossils.

Mitigation Measures

O.3-1 If fossil remains are encountered during grading activities, no further disturbance of the fossil remains shall occur until a vertebrate paleontologist approved by the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Vertebrate Paleontology Department (LACMVP) has been retained by the project developer to evaluate and, if and to the extent warranted and feasible, recover the remains and/or implement other appropriate mitigation measures, if necessary.

Although mitigation is not required under CEQA, the above measure would provide direction in the event that paleontological resources are discovered during construction.

D. AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED, INCLUDING THE CHOICE AMONG ALTERNATIVES

CEQA requires a discussion of areas of known controversy and issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives. In addition to the summary of issues above, areas of known controversy are summarized as follows:

- **Biological Resources** - Concerns were raised regarding threatened and endangered species that may be present on the project site. In addition, concerns were expressed regarding potential impacts to jurisdictional streambeds and habitats, potential obstacles to wildlife movement within and through the project site and potential impacts to native trees. These issues were addressed in Section IV.D (Biological Resources) of the Draft EIR and are further addressed in Topical Responses 2 and 5.

- **Access Routes** - Concerns were raised regarding emergency access to and from Development Area A. In addition to the primary access to and from Development Area A from La Tuna Canyon Road, two options for emergency access to and from the northern portion of Development Area A were addressed in Section IV.I (Transportation/Traffic) of the Draft EIR and are further addressed in Topical Response 11.

- **Air Quality** - Concerns were raised regarding potential air pollutants that may be generated during the construction and operation of the proposed project. This issue was addressed in Section IV.B (Air Quality) of the Draft EIR.

- **Traffic** - Concerns were raised regarding potential increases in traffic on the roadways in proximity to the project site during construction and operation of the proposed project. Safety

concerns were also expressed in association with traffic along La Tuna Canyon Road. These issues were addressed in Section IV.I (Transportation/Traffic) of the Draft EIR and are further addressed in Topical Responses 9, 10 and 12.

- **Land Use** - Concerns were raised regarding consistency with the Sunland-Tujunga Community Plan, other elements of the City's General Plan, the San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan and the LAMC. The consistency of the proposed project with those plans, ordinances and policies, were discussed in Section IV.G (Land Use) of the Draft EIR. It was requested that the Draft EIR include an analysis of an alternative project based on the current land use and zoning designations for the project site. This alternative was included in Section VI (Alternatives to the Proposed Project) of the Draft EIR. In addition, concerns were expressed regarding the potential loss of equestrian land uses associated with the proposed project. This issue is addressed in Topical Response 8.

- **Noise** - Concerns were raised regarding potential noise from project-related traffic on adjacent homes. This issue was addressed in Section IV.E (Noise) of the Draft EIR.

- **Public Services** - Concerns were raised regarding potential fire hazards, potential impacts on police protection services, potential obstacles to hiking and biking on the project site and potential impacts to local schools. These issues were addressed in Sections IV.J.1 (Fire Protection), IV.J.2 (Police Protection), IV.J.3 (Recreation and Parks) and IV.J.5 (Schools) of the Draft EIR, respectively. In addition, Topical Response 13 addresses many of the concerns with respect to fire protection expressed in the comment letters.

- **Aesthetics** - Concerns were raised regarding views of the project site from Interstate 210, views from surrounding and existing homes, as well as the potential change in the rural character of La Tuna Canyon Road. These issues were addressed in Section IV.N (Aesthetics) of the Draft EIR and are further addressed in Topical Response 6.

- **Hydrology** - Concerns were raised regarding potential flooding along and adjacent to La Tuna Canyon Road, where flooding has sometimes occurred in the past. Potential flooding within and surrounding the project site and the effect of the proposed project on local hydrology were addressed in Section IV.C (Hydrology and Water Quality) of the Draft EIR.

- **Related Projects** - Concerns were raised regarding certain projects in the vicinity of the project site that should potentially have been included in the list of related projects in the Draft EIR. These potential related projects are addressed in Topical Response 7.

- **Alternatives to the Proposed Project** - Concerns were raised regarding the range of alternatives to the proposed project. These issues were addressed in Section VI (Alternatives to the Proposed Project) and numerous Responses to Comments.

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

The Draft EIR considered a range of alternatives to the proposed project to provide informed decision-making in accordance with Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines. The alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIR included: (A) No Project Alternative; (B) Development Area A Only (280 Homes); (C) Duke Property Alternative Access (280 Homes); (D) Reduced Density Alternative (87 Homes); and (E) Reduced Density Alternative (210 Homes).

Alternative A: No Project Alternative

Under Alternative A, the proposed project would not be constructed and the project site would remain in its current condition.

Alternative B: Development Area A Only, 280 Lots

Under Alternative B, 280 homes would be developed on the north side of Interstate 210 and no development would occur south of Interstate 210. To the extent possible, Alternative B would be constructed within the defined Development Area A. The homes would be somewhat smaller than for the proposed project.

Alternative C: Duke Property Alternative Access, 280 Lots

Alternative C provides an alternative access route into Development Area A. Under Alternative C, access to Development Area A would be through the adjacent 56-acre site (the "Duke Property") on which the City has previously approved a 10-home development (the "Duke Project"), with respect to which the City prepared an Environmental Impact Report[2] (the "Duke Project EIR") located to the east of the project site. Other than some rearrangement of lots along the access road as it enters Development Area A, Development Areas A and B would essentially be the same as the proposed project.

---

[2] *City of Los Angeles, Draft Environmental Impact Report for Hillview Estates, EIR No. 89-1163-SUB(ZC/GPA), SCH No. 93021045, 1997.*

Alternative D: Reduced Density, 87 Lots

Under Alternative D, the entire 887-acre project site would be developed with 87 large single-family homes. Eighty-seven is the maximum number of homes that could be developed on the project site under the current land use designations for the project site and the City's slope density formula.

Alternative E: Reduced Density, 210 Lots

Under Alternative E, the density of development within the Development Areas would be reduced by approximately 25 percent. This would result in the construction of 210 single-family homes on the project site, although the homes would be somewhat larger than for the proposed project.

E. DRAFT EIR COMMENT LETTER SUMMARY CHART

The following chart summarizes the Draft EIR comment letters and the issues expressed in those letters. In all, 199 comment letters were submitted in response to the Draft EIR. Each of those comment letters is responded to in writing in Section IV of this Final EIR.

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
1. Stephen Buswell, IGR/CEQA Branch Chief, Department of Transportation, Regional Transportation Planning Office, District 7, 120 S. Spring St., Los Angeles, CA 90012, October 8, 2003.												X																	
2. Alfred B. Hernandez, Assistant Fire Marshall, Bureau of Fire Prevention and Public Safety, Los Angeles City Fire Department, October 8, 2003.													X																
3. Jeffrey M. Smith, AICP, Senior Regional Planner, Intergovernmental Review, Southern California Association of Governments, 818 West 7th Street, 12th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017-3435, October 24, 2003.																													X
4. Jerome C. Daniel, Chairperson, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, 5750 Ramirez Canyon Road, Malibu, CA 90265, October 27, 2003.					X	X	X		X	X		X												X		X			X
5. Lisa Salinas, Title & Real Estate Services, Corporate Real Estate Department, Southern California Edison, 14799 Chestnut Street, Westminster, CA 92683, October 31, 2003.	X																												

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
6. Kathryn Ballard, 9957 Warnon Avenue, Shadow Hills, CA 91040, November 5, 2003.										X																			
7. Jim Cahoon, Captain, Department of California Highway Patrol, 2130 Windsor Ave., Altadena, CA 91001, November 12, 2003.								X				X																	
8. Milton D. Cushman, 9522 Reverie Road, Tujunga, CA 91042, November 12, 2003.																													X
9. Michael Long, 6128 No. Reno Avenue, Temple City, CA 91780, November 16, 2003.					X	X																							
10. Micah Dyer, 9595 Hillhaven Ave., Tujunga, CA 91402, November 26, 2003.										X	X																		
11. Joe Decruyenaere, Staff Biologist – Impact Analysis, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012, December 3, 2003.					X	X	X						X																
12. Elektra Kruger, President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041, December 3, 2003.										X														X					

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
13. Elektra Kruger, President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041, December 5, 2003.										X																X			
14. Elektra Kruger, President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041, December 5, 2003.												X																	
15. Elektra Kruger, President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041, December 6, 2003.		X																							X				
16. Shelley Marie Owen, 3345 Alabama Street, La Crescenta, CA 91214, December 6, 2003.																								X					X
17. Elektra Kruger, President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041, December 7, 2003.																							X						
18. Elektra Kruger, President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041, December 7, 2003.					X																								

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
19. Roger Baker, Deputy City Planner, City of Burbank Community Development Department, 275 East Olive Avenue, P.O. Box 6459, Burbank, CA 91510, December 8, 2003.																			X										
20. Elektra Kruger, President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041 December 29, 2003.					X	X																							
21. Susan M. De Santis, 19630 Cantara St., Reseda, CA 91335, December 8, 2003.																													X
22. Elektra Kruger, President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041, December 9, 2003.						X																							
23. Elektra Kruger, President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041, December 9, 2003.													X																
24. Randy Perez, 10140 Woodward Avenue, Sunland, CA 91040-3342, December 9, 2003.					X					X		X																	X

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
25. Elektra Kruger, President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041, December 10, 2003.												X	X	X															
26. Lien Stoorvogel Seesee, 9515 Reverie Rd., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 10, 2003.												X																	
27. Thomas Seesee, 9515 Reverie Rd., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 10, 2003.					X										X														
28. Elektra Kruger, President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041, December 10, 2003.				X						X		X			X													
29. Karl Johnson, 9631 Crystal View Dr., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 12, 2003.					X	X				X		X		X															X
30. Yvonne Johnson, 9631 Crystal View Dr., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 12, 2003.			X		X					X		X		X					X										X
31. Jane Harrison, 613 San Jose Avenue, Burbank, CA 91501, December 13, 2003.					X							X			X										X				X
32. Rick Pruetz, 6 Fleet Street, #301, Marina Del Rey, CA 90292, December 13, 2003.							X			X					X														

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
33. Elektra Kruger, President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041, December 14, 2003.		X								X																		
34. Michael and Victoria Gaffney, 10254 Sunland Boulevard, Shadow Hills, CA 91040, December 15, 2003.												X		X															X
35. Barbara E. Trees, 6903 Beckett Street, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 15, 2003.					X	X							X										X						X
36. Elektra Kruger, President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041, December 16, 2003.		X								X												X				X		
37. Nancy Cleary, 10135 Hillhaven Avenue #112, Tujunga, CA 91042												X		X	X														X
38. William C. and Marva M. Grove, 7162 Estepa Drive, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 17, 2003.	X												X						X										X
39. Barbara Howell, 10445 Fernglen Ave., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 17, 2003.		X	X	X	X	X	X			X					X									X					
40. Paul Armbruster, 9618 Hillhaven Avenue, Sunland, CA 91042, December 18, 2003.					X							X																	X
41. David Hedge, 8530 Wentworth Street, Sunland, CA 91040, December 18, 2003.					X																								

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
42. Brad Monsma, 10315 Westcott Ave., Sunland, CA 91040, December 18, 2003.							X					X			X									X					X
43. Patricia Nelson, 6638 St. Estaban Street, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 18, 2003.										X																			
44. Richard Seeley, 3924 El Caminito, La Crescenta, CA 91214, December 18, 2003.																							X						
45. John Crother, 2539 Rockdell Street, La Crescenta, CA 91214, December 19, 2003.				X						X				X										X					
46. John Crother, 2539 Rockdell St., La Crescenta, CA 91214, December 19, 2003.				X						X				X										X					
47. Betty T. Hori, 6564 Elmhurst Drive, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 19, 2003.			X									X		X															X
48. Heiko Krippendorf, 9755 Hillhaven, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 19, 2003.	X									X		X																	X
49. Richard Seeley, 3924 El Caminito, La Crescenta, CA 91214, December 18, 2003.					X																			X					X
50. Eric Sorensen, 13326 Borden Avenue, Sylmar, CA 93542, December 19, 2003.						X				X		X															X		
51. Lew Stone, 901 Andover Drive, Burbank, CA 91504, December 19, 2003.												X																	
52. Devon and Randall Vaughn, 6543 Greeley Street, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 19, 2003.					X	X				X	X	X	X		X		X							X					X

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
53. Mr. and Mrs. Paul Brunton, 3916 El Caminito, La Crescenta, CA 91214, December 20, 2003.												X					X												X
54. Gloria Harber, 7079 Highcliff Trl., Tujunga, CA 91405, December 20, 2003.					X					X																			
55. Gloria Harber, 7079 High Cliff Trl., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 20, 2003.												X																	
56. Matthew Kearl, 9426 Carlynn Place, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 20, 2003.												X	X		X		X												X
57. Tina Krippendorf, 9755 Hillhaven Ave., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 20, 2003.			X		X			X		X		X																	X
58. Elektra Kruger, President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041, December 20, 2003.		X																							X				
59. Melinda A. Lirones, 7032 Flora Morgan Trail, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 20, 2003.					X							X																	
60. Samuel S. Lirones, 7032 Flora Morgan Trail, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 20, 2003.										X																			
61. David Long, 8015 Glenties Lane, Sunland, CA 91040, December 20, 2003.							X					X																	X

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
62. Elisa Orozco, 10704 Memory Park Ave., Mission Hills, CA 91345, December 20, 2003.																													X
63. Craig Ward Durst, 7350 Verdugo Crestline, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 21, 2003.					X	X				X		X																	X
64. Andrea and James Gutman, 10511 Mahoney Drive, Sunland, CA 91040, December 21, 2003.										X		X	X		X														
65. Louise Henshaw, 6616 S. Esteban Street, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 21, 2003.																													X
66. Elektra Kruger, President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041, December 21, 2003.															X		X										X		
67. Douglas Moore, 9774 Samoa Ave., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 21, 2003.	X																												
68. Douglas Moore, 9774 Samoa Ave., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 21, 2003.									X																				
69. Antonia Napolitano, 9525 Reverie Road, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 21, 2003.												X																	

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
70. Kyle Springer, 9765 Tujunga Cyn. Blvd., Tujunga, CA 91042 December 21, 2003.													X																X
71. Janice Vogel Ackles, 7100 Flora Morgan Trail, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 22, 2003.													X	X															X
72. Roberta Actor-Thomas, 10635 Las Lunitas Ave., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 22, 2003.										X																			
73. Antonia Carrasco, 11014 Scoville Ave., Sunland, CA 91041, December 22, 2003.		X			X				X					X															X
74. Edward Condit, 7080 Flora Morgan Tr., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 22, 2003.						X																							
75. Steve Crouch, Canyon Area Preservation, P.O. Box 633, Tujunga, CA 910431, December 22, 2003.	X									X																			
76. Don and Betty Cushman, 9522 Reverie Road, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 22, 2003.																													X
77. Sharon and Edward Emery, 8225 Oswego, Sunland, CA 91041, December 22, 2003.					X		X		X			X																	X

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
78. Connie Kelly, 8248 Oswego, Sunland, CA 91041, December 22, 2003.					X	X																					X		X
79. Kevin Kelly, 8248 Oswego, Sunland, CA 91041, December 22, 2003.									X	X		X	X	X				X	X										X
80. Tanya Knight, 8243 Oswego, Sunland, CA 91040, December 22, 2003.		X			X				X	X		X	X								X			X					X
81. Athena Knight-Garcia, White Oak Lane, Sunland, CA (no zip code available) December 22, 2003.								X				X																	X
82. Elektra Kruger, President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041, December 22, 2003.												X																	
83. Anthony & Candida Piscitelli, 10415 Fernglen Ave., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 22, 2003.		X			X				X					X															X
84. Anne Radogna, 3915 El Caminito, La Crescenta, CA 91214, December 22, 2003.												X															X		
85. Raymond Roldan, 8243 Oswego, Sunland, CA 91041, December 22, 2003.			X					X		X														X					X
86. Virginia Sloane, 8511 La Tuna Canyon Rd, Sun Valley, CA 91352, December 22, 2003.				X						X		X																	X

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
87. Margie and Andy Vogel, 8255 Oswego, Sunland, CA 91041, December 22, 2003.												X					X				X			X					X
88. Agneta Dobos, 2750 Hillhaven, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 23, 2003.					X					X		X																	X
89. Maryellen Eltgroth, 6733 Shady Grove Street, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 23, 2003.								X		X		X								X				X					X
90. SueEllen Hussung, 7233 Lonzo Street, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 23, 2003.					X		X			X																			X
91. Harry Nelson, 7035 Estepa Dr., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 23, 2003.			X		X				X	X		X																	X
92. Mark Fogwell, 7094 Highcliff Trail, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 24, 2003.	X				X				X			X		X									X	X		X				X
93. Lisa and Russell Martin, 10319 Haines Canyon Avenue, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 24, 2003.			X									X			X														X
94. Sam Palahnuk, 501 E. Santa Anita, Suite 108, Burbank, CA 91501, December 24, 2003.			X		X	X			X	X		X												X			X		X
95. Mel Springer, 10347 Haines Canyon Avenue, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 24, 2003.												X	X	X	X		X													X
96. Darci Kahan, 9609 Hillhaven Avenue, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 25, 2003.			X		X	X	X	X		X		X																		X

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
97. Robert Mauk, Ph.D, 2121 Valderas Dr. #67, Glendale, CA 91208, December 25, 2003.					X	X																		X					X
98. Debby Beck, 8015 Glenties Lane, Sunland, CA 91040, December 26, 2003.					X		X																						X
99. Ron Clark, 10313 Wilsey, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 26, 2003.					X	X				X																			
100. John Crother, 2539 Rockdell Street, La Crescenta, CA 91214, December 26, 2003.					X					X																			
101. Teresa and Kevin Draper, 9528 Hillhaven, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 26, 2003.	X											X	X																X
102. Stephen Fischer, 5711 Betty Place, Los Angeles, CA 90024, December 26, 2003.					X	X																							
103. Tomas and Jill Gargano, 9437 Carlynn Place Tujunga, CA 91042, December 26, 2003.					X								X																X
104. Karen R. Imendorf, 9028 Wildwood Ave., Sun Valley, CA 91352, December 26, 2003.												X																	X
105. Richard L. Imendorf, 9028 Wildwood Ave., Sun Valley, CA 91352, December 26, 2003.												X																	X

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
106. Elektra Kruger, President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041, December 26, 2003.		X	X					X																		X		
107. Charles and Lareen Kunze, 9413 Reverie Road, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 26, 2003.					X		X			X		X	X											X				
108. Carolyn McBride, 2532 Rockdell Streeet, La Crescenta, CA 91214, December 26, 2003.										X			X															X
109. Steve Metzler, 9436 Carlynn Place, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 26, 2003.					X								X															X
110. Patricia Murphy-Pattenson, 9581 Hillhaven Ave., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 26, 2003.					X				X			X	X							X								X
111. Linda, Loyle and Karen Sallee, 7224 Tranquil Place, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 26, 2003.		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X										X	X				
112. Dr. Alan Tanner, 10926 Cardamine Place, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 26, 2003.					X		X								X													X
113. Barbara Tarnowski, 10410 Las Lunitas Ave., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 29, 2003.																												X

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
114. Les Vincent, 3511 El Lado Drive, Glendale, CA 91108, December 26, 2003.								X																X					X
115. Mary Anderson, 9953 Amanita Avenue, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 27, 2003.								X		X														X					X
116. Maureen Gibson, 9914 Hirondelle Lane, Tujunga CA 91042, December 27, 2003.										X		X	X																X
117. Elektra Kruger, President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041, December 27, 2003.	X									X																			
118. Marc Stirdivant, Chairman of the Board, Glendale-Crescenta Volunteers Organized in Conserving the Environment (V.O.I.C.E.), P.O. Box 273, Montrose, CA 91021, December 27, 2003.	X			X								X	X		X				X							X			X
119. John Thomas, 10635 Las Lunitas, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 27, 2003.										X																			
120. Corinne Adajian-Thompson, 9431 Carlynn Place, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 28, 2003.				X	X							X	X	X															X
121. Gregory Brown, 9328 Reverie Road, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 28, 2003.	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X									X		X			X

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
122. Barbara & Christopher Carter, 9522 Cordero Avenue, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 28, 2003.		X	X		X				X	X		X	X		X		X		X	X	X			X				X
123. Kim Clark**,** 10369 Silverton Ave., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 28, 2003.					X					X		X							X					X		X		
124. Helen and Donald De Ruiter, 9508 Glory Ave., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 28, 2003.		X								X																		
125. Catherine Giesiche**,** 7526 Wentworth St., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 28, 2003.										X		X																X
126. William D. Green, 10520 Alskog St., Sun Valley, CA 91352, December 28, 2003.		X																										X
127. Elizabeth Helms, Ahead With Horses Inc., 9311 Del Arroyo Drive, Sun Valley, CA 91352, December 28, 2003.																												X
128. Lisa Keene, 7314 Verdugo Crestline, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 28, 2003.												X	X											X				
129. Elektra Kruger**,** President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041, December 28, 2003.		X								X																		

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
130. Robert C. Lappo, 10237 Fernglen Ave., #203, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 28, 2003.																													X
131. Charlie Marko, 7930 Apperson Street, Sunland, CA 91040, December 28, 2003.		X								X													X					X
132. Wayne Meseberg &: Lucy Burger, 7431 Tranquil Dr., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 28, 2003.	X				X					X															X			X
133. John Novak, 10041 Silverton Avenue, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 28, 2003.																													X
134. Anja Schaefer and Ole Kagelmacher, 7702 Valmont Street, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 28, 2003.												X												X	X				X
135. LG Swan, 8764 Apperson Street, Sunland, CA 91040, December 28, 2003.	X				X							X													X				X
136. Daniel and Nancy Sweeney, 9517 Cordero Avenue, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 28, 2003.						X				X			X																X
137. Annelene Voigt, 3427 Montrose Avenue, La Crescenta, CA 91214, December 28, 2003.					X	X		X		X		X	X								X								X
138. Dean Wallraff, 10211 Sunland Blvd., Shadow Hills, CA 91040, December 28, 2003.		X								X		X		X										X					X

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
139. Michele Zack, 2485 N. Marengo, Altadena, CA 91001, December 28, 2003.																													X
140. Paul Ayers, P.O. Box 29011, Glendale, CA 91209, December 29, 2003.			X		X	X			X			X	X		X		X				X			X					X
141. Niguine Bensimon-Tree, 12050 Spring Trail, Kagel Canyon, CA 91342, December 29, 2003.					X										X														X
142. Toni Bird, 432 Georgian Road, La Canada, CA 91011, December 29, 2003.																													X
143. Douglas Carstens, F.A.L.C.O.N., 3250 Ocean Park Boulevard, Suite 300, Santa Monica, CA 90405, December 29, 2003.					X	X	X			X														X		X			X
144. Ivan & Roberta C. Cole, 10040 Wentworth Street, Shadow Hills, CA 91040, December 29, 2003.	X							X					X			X		X							X				X
145. Michael Cornish, 9319 La Tuna Canyon, Sun Valley, CA 91352, December 29, 2003.					X	X																							
146. Steve Crouch, Canyon Area Preservation, P.O. Box 633, Tujunga, CA 91043, December 29, 2003.	X									X		X							X							X			X
147. Julie Davis, 7439 Tranquil Drive, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 29, 2003.		X	X		X	X		X				X	X																X

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
148. Thomas L. Davis, 3916 Foothill Blvd. #B, La Crescenta, CA 91214, December 29, 2003.		X																											X
149. Fred Dong, Chairman, Sierra Club, P.O. Box 423, Montrose, CA 91021, December 29, 2003.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
150. Fred Dong**,** P.O. Box 423, Montrose, CA 91021, December 29, 2003.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
151. Ken Gilliland, 7647 McGroarty Street, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 29, 2003.					X	X				X		X												X		X			X
152. Rhonda Herbel, 7647 McGroarty St., Tujunga, CA 91214, December 29, 2003.	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X			X	X		X		X	X
153. Craig Houchin, 10688 Vanora Dr., Sunland, CA 91040, December 29, 2003.												X																	
154. Elektra Kruger, President, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, P.O. Box 345, Sunland, CA 91041 December 29, 2003.	X	X										X												X		X			
155. Bill Lukehart, Department of Recreation and Parks, 200 North Main Street, 12th Floor, Room 1250CHE, Los Angeles, CA 90012, December 29, 2003.															X														

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
156. Sally A. MacAller, 851 W. Mountain St., Glendale, CA 91202, December 29, 2003.		X	X		X	X			X			X	X		X		X				X			X					X
157. Carmen Martinez, 9328 Reverie Road, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 29, 2003.			X							X		X	X		X		X												X
158. Julianne Maurseth, Ph.D**.,** 7217 Tranquil Place, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 29, 2003.	X				X				X	X														X			X		X
159. Mike McCorison, 15037 Daffodil Ave., Canyon Country, CA 91387, December 29, 2003.																								X					X
160. Helen Nickerman, 10026 Pali Ave., Tujunga, CA 91214, December 29, 2003.			X							X		X																	X
161. Janet Nickerman, 10026 Pali Ave., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 29, 2003.			X		X	X						X																	X
162. Allen & Helen Petrinka, 9923 Hirondelle Lane, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 29, 2003.					X					X		X												X					
163. Roxanna Spear, 7100 Estepa Drive, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 29, 2003.					X					X																			X
164. Philip V. Spradling, [No address available] Altadena, CA, December 29, 2003.	X	X			X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X		X				X			X					X

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
165. Joanne B. Watkins-Batchelor**,** 10825 Tuxford St., La Tuna Canyon, CA 91352, December 29, 2003.					X							X																	X
166. Candace Young, 7136 Estepa Drive, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 29, 2003.					X		X																				X		X
167. Robert F. Brennan, 3150 Montrose Avenue, La Crescenta, CA 91214, December 30, 2003.					X					X		X												X					X
168. John & Karan Clarke, 6588 Elmhurst Drive, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 30, 2003.		X										X												X					X
169. William Eick**,** 2604 Foothill Blvd. #C, La Crescenta, CA 91214, December 30, 2003.				X								X													X				
170. William M. Funkhouser, 6903 Beckett Street, Tujunga, CA 91042-2036, December 31, 2003.										X																			X
171. John Laue, 11063 Eldora Place, Sunland, CA 91048, December 30, 2003.					X			X		X					X														X
172. Julianne Maurseth, Steering Committee, F.A.L.C.O.N, 7217 Tranquil Place, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 30, 2003.																														X

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
173. Ron Schafer, District Superintendent, Department of Parks and Recreation-Angeles District, 1925 Las Virgenes Road, Calabasas, CA 91302, December 30, 2003.					X	X	X																	X		X			
174. Edward and Roxanne Spear, 7100 Estepa Drive, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 30, 2003.		X					X			X																			X
175. Michele Stone, 7354 Verdugo Crestline Drive, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 30, 2003.	X		X	X						X	X	X	X	X		X										X			X
176. Manon Tree, 12050 Spring Trail, Kagel Canyon, CA 91342, December 30, 2003.					X												X												X
177. J. Anthony Vergona & Kathryn Ragland, 9300 Reverie Rd. Tujunga, CA 91042, December 30, 2003.	X				X	X				X																			
178. Frank Buchanan, 8351 La Tuna Canyon Road, Sun Valley, CA 91352, December 31, 2003.				X	X							X																		X
179. Cheryl Conel, 5420 Ocean View Blvd., La Canada, CA 91011, December 30, 2003.		X			X	X	X																			X				X
180. Spencer Davis, 8427 Fenwick St., Sunland, CA 91040 January 26, 2004.					X																			X						X

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
181. Johnye Harrel Dong, 9814 Hillhaven Ave., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 31, 2003.		X								X		X																	
182. Rick Grubb, 8764 Apperson Street, Sunland, CA 91040, December 31, 2003.					X		X			X																			
183. Carol Hartwell, 10330 Russett Ave., Sunland, CA 91042, December 31, 2003.					X																								
184. Rhonda Herbel, 7647 McGroarty St., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 31, 2003.				X	X					X		X												X					X
185. Jeffrey Kahan, Ph.D., 9609 Hillhaven, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 31, 2003.							X			X		X																	X
186. Sylvia Vonk McIntyre, 11419 Caern Ave., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 31, 2003.		X			X							X																	X
187. Don J. Pickering, 7717 Verdugo Crestline Drive, Tujunga, CA 91214, December 31, 2003.								X	X										X										X
188. Michael Rhine, 1740 Canada Blvd. #B, Glendale, CA 91208, December 31, 2003.					X																								X
189. Nina Royal, 10110 Samoa Avenue, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 31, 2003.										X			X	X					X										X
190. Regina Star, 9347 Reverie Road, Tujunga, CA 91042, December 31, 2003.						X				X																			X

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
191. Sergio Valdez, City of L.A. Department of Transportation, No Address Provided, December 31, 2003.												X																	
192. Ramona Zaratanya, 9347 Reverie Rd., Tujunga, CA 91042, December 31, 2003.	X		X		X			X		X		X	X																X
193. Dr. Robert Bradley, 10040 La Tuna Canyon Rd., Sun Valley, CA 91352, January1, 2004.										X		X	X																X
194. Terry Roberts, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit, 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95812, January 2, 2004.																													X
195. Cherrie Peterson, 706 Reiner Circle #1, Santa Clarita, CA 91387, January 4, 2004.												X																	X
196. Penny Armbruster, 9618 Hillhaven Ave., Tujunga, CA 91042, January 6, 2004.					X					X		X																	X
197. Katherine Velasco**,** 3929 Franklin St., La Crescenta, CA 91214, January 8, 2004.		X			X			X			X	X												X					X
198. Maria Garas, 7249 Verdugo Crestline Drive, Tujunga, CA 91042, January 16, 2004.					X							X																	X

SUMMARY OF COMMENT LETTERS CANYON HILLS PROJECT Draft EIR **ENV-2002-2481-EIR** **SCH # 2002091018**	**Project Description**	**Geology and Soils**	**Air Quality**	**Hydrology and Water Quality**	**Flora and Fauna**	**Native Trees**	**Wildlife Movement**	**Noise**	**Artificial Light and Glare**	**Land Use**	**Population and Housing**	**Transportation/Traffic**	**Fire Protection**	**Police Protection**	**Recreation and Parks**	**Libraries**	**Schools**	**Energy Conservation**	**Water**	**Sewer**	**Solid Waste and Disposal**	**Hazardous materials**	**Electromagnetic Field Emissions**	**Aesthetics**	**Cultural Resources**	**Alternatives**	**Cumulative Impacts**	**General Impact Categories**	**General Comments**
199. Rod H. Kubomoto, County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, P.O. Box 1460, Alhambra, CA 91802-1460, January 28, 2004.																													X