I. SUMMARY

A. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR") is to inform decision-makers and the general public of the potential environmental impacts resulting from the construction and operation of the proposed Canyon Hills project ("proposed project"). The project applicant is Whitebird, Inc., c/o 444 S. Flower Street, Suite 1300, Los Angeles, California 90071. A detailed description of the proposed project is contained in Section III (Project Description) of this Draft EIR.

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

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

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

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

---

[1] *Public Resources Code Sections 21000-21178.*

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

Notice of Preparation

In compliance with Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was prepared by the Department of City Planning and distributed to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, responsible agencies and other interested parties on September 6, 2002. The NOP for the Draft EIR was circulated for 30 days, until October 7, 2002. Appendix A and Appendix B to this Draft EIR contain a copy of the NOP and written responses to the NOP, respectively.

Environmental Issues to be Analyzed in the Draft EIR

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

- Geology and Soils
- Air Quality
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Biological Resources
    - Flora and Fauna
    - Native Trees
    - Wildlife Movement
- Noise
- Artificial Light and Glare
- Land Use
- Population and Housing
- Transportation/Traffic
- Public Services
    - Police Protection
    - Recreation and Parks
    - Libraries
    - Schools
- Energy Conservation
    - Electricity
    - Natural Gas
- Utilities and Service Systems
    - Water

  - Sewer
  - Solid Waste
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
  - Environmental Site Assessment
  - Electromagnetic Field Emissions
- Aesthetics
- Cultural Resources
  - Historic Resources
  - Archaeological Resources
  - Paleontological Resources

The Department of City Planning determined that the proposed project would not have the potential to result in environmental impacts to agricultural resources. Therefore, this issue is not examined in this Draft EIR.

Environmental Review Process

This Draft EIR will be circulated for review and comment by the public and other interested parties, agencies and organizations for 90 days, which is 45 days longer than the public comment period required under CEQA. Public hearings on the proposed project will be held after the review period and the preparation of the Final EIR. Notice of the time and location will be published prior to the public hearing date. All comments or questions about the Draft EIR should be addressed to:

Maya Zaitzevsky, Project Coordinator
City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning
200 North Spring Street, Room 763
Los Angeles, California 90012
Fax: (213) 978-1343

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

Organization of the Draft EIR

This Draft EIR is organized into nine sections.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B. PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project includes the development of 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.

C. AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Concerns raised at the public scoping meeting (held on September 23, 2002) and in letters submitted to the Department of City Planning in response to the NOP include the following:

- **Biological Resources** - Concerns were raised regarding threatened and endangered species that may be present on the project site. In addition, concerns regarding potential impacts to jurisdictional streambeds and habitats were expressed, as well as potential obstacles to wildlife movement within and through the project site. These issues are addressed in Section IV.D (Biological Resources).

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

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

- **Traffic** - Concerns were raised regarding potential increases in traffic on the roadways in close proximity to the project site during construction and operation of the proposed project. Safety concerns were also expressed in association with traffic along La Tuna Canyon Road. These issues are addressed in Section IV.I (Transportation/Traffic).

- **Land Use** - Concerns were raised regarding consistency with the draft San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan ("Draft Specific Plan"). Land use consistency with the Draft Specific Plan, as well as other applicable plans and policies, are discussed in Section IV.G (Land Use). In addition, it was requested that this Draft EIR include analysis of

an alternative project based on current zoning. That alternative has been included in Section VI (Alternatives to the Proposed Project).

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

- **Public Services** - Concerns were raised regarding potential impacts to local schools and potential fire hazards. These issues are addressed in Section IV.J.1 (Fire Protection) and IV.J.5 (Schools), respectively.

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

- **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 effects of the proposed project on local hydrology are addressed in Section IV.C (Hydrology and Water Quality).

A summary matrix of the issues raised in the letters submitted in response to the NOP, and the response letters themselves, are attached as Appendix B to this Draft EIR.

D. ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

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

E. ALTERNATIVES

This Draft EIR considers a range of alternatives to the proposed project to provide informed decision-making in accordance with Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines. The alternatives analyzed in this Draft EIR include: (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[3] (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.

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.

F. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

---

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

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 therefore 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 and grading construction of the proposed 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.

The above recommended mitigation measures would reduce PM_{10} emissions by approximately 60 percent. Emissions of NOx and PM_{10} would remain significant after mitigation. Adherence to SCAQMD regulations, combined with distance from the source, would reduce PM_{10} emissions to levels that would not constitute significant adverse impacts on sensitive receptors.

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 Project shall adhere to applicable provisions of the LAMC, Flood Hazard Management Specific Plan and the recommendations of the City Engineer/Department of Building and Safety.

C-12 The project developer and homeowners' association(s) shall work with the City to make residents aware of used motor oil recycling facilities and household hazardous waste drop-off centers in the area. Availability of 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 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 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 associated with implementation of the project would not be considered adverse or significant.

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. The proposed mitigation and monitoring plan shall be subject to approval by the Corps, CDFG and the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

D.1-3 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.1-4 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.1-5 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.1-6 If grading or clearing of vegetation is scheduled to take place during the nesting season for migratory 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 birds are located, measures to ensure protection of the nesting migratory 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.

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 232 of the estimated 1,247 coast live oaks on the project site, 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 232 coast live oaks 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.[4] 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.

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.

---

[4] *Matheny, Nelda and James R. Clark. 1998. "Trees and Development." International Society of Arboriculture, Champaign, Illinois.*

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 conceptual tree planting program summarized in Table IV.D-16, below. These plantings would more than compensate for the losses of 232 coast live oaks and 27 western sycamores. These replacement plants represent almost 8:1 replacement of coast live oaks and almost 7:1 replacement of western sycamores. Strictly relative to 15-gallon and larger stock, the replacement program described in Table IV.D-16 provides almost 5:1 replacement of coast live oaks and greater than 4:1 replacement of western sycamores. The plantings would occur within entry points, common areas, road right-of-ways, perimeters of detention basins, common slopes, flood control facilities, fuel modification managed slopes, and private residential lots. Table IV.D-16 provides a synopsis of the conceptual tree planting program based on container stock size and quantity of tree plantings.

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 would be subject to a five-year monitoring effort by an independent certified arborist. This monitoring effort would consider growth, health, and condition of the 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.

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 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 developer shall install lower-intensity lighting along paved portions of Verdugo Crestline Drive if Verdugo Crestline Drive is improved for an emergency access road.

D.3-3 The project developer shall incorporate native vegetation along equestrian trail edges.

D.3-4 The project developer shall incorporate native vegetation into the streetscape along Verdugo Crestline Drive, if Verdugo Crestline Drive is improved for an emergency access road.

D.3-5 The project homeowners' association(s) shall maintain openings in walls at key locations within the Development Areas to maintain 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 LAMC Section 41.40(c), 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. 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.
- 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 If the first option in Mitigation Measure E-12 is implemented, then sound walls (as shown in Figure IV.E-2) at 277 of the 280 homes will meet the Caltrans standard. Sound levels at the remaining three homes (R10 through R12 in Figure IV.E-2) close to Interstate 210 cannot be sufficiently lowered with sound walls to satisfy Caltrans standards because the proposed site plan does not allow for sound wall placement directly adjacent to R10 through R12. As such, it is recommended that the proposed homes on R10 through R12 be eliminated from the site plan unless the site plan is modified so that compliance with the Caltrans sound criterion is possible if the first option in Mitigation Measure E-12 is implemented. Potential modifications include the following:

- Moving the proposed lots on R10, R11 and R12 further from Interstate 210.
- Re-designing the access road so that sound walls can be placed closer to R10, R11 and R12.

E-14 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 Development Area B. Therefore, the proposed project would have a significant lighting impact in relation to nighttime views of Development Area B from vehicles traveling on La Tuna Canyon Road. Although the recommended mitigation would reduce the lighting impact of 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 Development Area A on the adjacent residential community would be significant. Although the recommended mitigation would reduce the lighting impact of 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 proposed project shall include CC&Rs that 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 of Interstate 210 rights-of-way, as shown on the vesting tentative tract map, 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 in Section IV.G (Land Use)). 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.

Although not yet adopted by the Los Angeles City Council, the draft San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan ("Draft 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 Draft Specific Plan.

An oak tree permit would be required for the removal and replacement of up to 232 oak trees in accordance with Section 46.00 et seq. of the LAMC (as discussed in Section IV.D.2 (Native Trees)).

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 Development Areas. Primary access to 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 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 Development Areas would be provided via internal roadways.

Emergency Access

Secondary emergency access to Development Area A would be provided via either Inspiration Way or Verdugo Crestline Drive. The project applicant's preferred secondary emergency access to Development Area A is via Inspiration Way. However, implementation of either the Inspiration Way or Verdugo Crestline Drive 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 Development Area A.

Emergency access to 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).

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 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) regarding construction impacts resulting from the installation of water lines).

Although the project site is within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHGHSZ), 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 Sprinkler systems 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 proposed 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 Los Angeles Police and Fire Departments for review prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy. Upon establishment, it shall become the responsibility of the homeowner's association 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 proposed development shall be cleared or thinned periodically by the homeowners' association(s) under supervision of the LAFD in order to reduce the risk of brush fires spreading to the homes.

J.1-19 The vesting 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 proposed 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 site 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. 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. 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 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 right-of-ways, 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 and no mitigation measures are recommended.

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 included 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 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 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 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 Draft San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation 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 new subdivision 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.

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 California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If the remains are determined to be those of a Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento shall be contacted before the remains are removed in accordance with Section 21083.2 of the California Public Resources Code.

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 City and 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.