

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Section  | Page  |
|--|-------|
| Volume I of III  |       |
| I. SUMMARY.....  | I-1   |
| A. Introduction.....   | I-1   |
| B. Brief Summary of the Proposed Action.....                           | I-1   |
| C. Location and Boundaries.....  | I-2   |
| D. Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved.....                 | I-2   |
| E. Summary of Environmental Impacts.....                               | I-5   |
| 1. Earth.....  | I-5   |
| 2. Air.....  | I-15  |
| 3. Water.....  | I-17  |
| 4. Plant Life.....   | I-18  |
| 5. Animal Life.....  | I-27  |
| 6. Jurisdictional Resources.....                                       | I-31  |
| 7. Noise.....  | I-31  |
| 8. Transportation and Circulation.....                                 | I-34  |
| 9. Public Services.....  | I-35  |
| 10. Utilities.....   | I-47  |
| 11. Safety.....  | I-51  |
| 12. Aesthetic Resources/View.....                                      | I-52  |
| 13. Cultural Resources.....  | I-54  |
| F. Description of Alternatives to the Proposed Project.....            | I-56  |
| 1. Alternative 1 – No Project/No Build Alternative.....                | I-57  |
| 2. Alternative 2 – Alternative Site Discussion.....                    | I-57  |
| 3. Alternative 3 – Stoney Hill Ridge Development Only Alternative..... | I-58  |
| 4. Environmentally Superior Alternative.....                           | I-58  |
| II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....   | II-1  |
| A. Statement of Objectives.....  | II-1  |
| B. Location and Boundaries.....  | II-2  |
| C. Project History and Background.....                                 | II-2  |
| D. Project Characteristics.....  | II-6  |
| III. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING.....                 | III-1 |
| A. Overview of Environmental Setting.....                              | III-1 |
| 1. Project Site and Surrounding Areas.....                             | III-1 |
| 2. Plans and Policies.....   | III-2 |
| B. Related Projects.....   | III-4 |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

| Section  | Page    |
|--|---------|
| IV. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS.....                     | IV-1    |
| A. Earth.....  | IV.A-1  |
| B. Air Quality.....  | IV.B-1  |
| C. Water.....  | IV.C-1  |
| D. Plant Life.....   | IV.D-1  |
| E. Animal Life.....  | IV.E-1  |
| F. Noise.....  | IV.F-1  |
| G. Light*.....   | IV.G-1  |
| H. Land Use.....   | IV.H-1  |
| I. Natural Resources*.....                                 | IV.I-1  |
| J. Risk of Upset*.....                                     | IV.J-1  |
| K. Population*.....  | IV.K-1  |
| L. Housing*.....   | IV.L-1  |
| M. Right-of-Way and Access*.....                           | IV.M-1  |
| N. Transportation and Circulation.....                     | IV.N-1  |
| O. Public Services.....                                    | IV.O-1  |
| 1. Fire.....   | IV.O-2  |
| 2. Police.....   | IV.O-21 |
| 3. Schools.....  | IV.O-28 |
| 4. Park and Recreation.....                                | IV.O-35 |
| 5. Libraries.....  | IV.O-46 |
| P. Energy Conservation.....                                | IV.P-1  |
| Q. Utilities.....  | IV.Q-1  |
| 1. Power.....  | IV.Q-2  |
| 2. Natural Gas.....  | IV.Q-6  |
| 3. Water Distribution.....                                 | IV.Q-10 |
| 4. Sanitary Sewers.....                                    | IV.Q-20 |
| 5. Storm Water Drainage.....                               | IV.Q-28 |
| 6. Solid Waste*.....                                       | IV.Q-29 |
| R. Safety.....   | IV.R-1  |
| S. Aesthetic Resources/View.....                           | IV.S-1  |
| T. Cultural Resources.....                                 | IV.T-1  |
| V. GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS.....                            | V-1     |
| VI. ALTERNATIVES.....                                      | VI-1    |
| VII. IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE INSIGNIFICANT.....           | VII-1   |
| VIII. ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS CONTACTED, REFERENCES..... | VIII-1  |
| IX. ESAC ACTION, NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND RESPONSES.....  | IX-1    |

\*Impacts determined not to be significant are addressed in this EIR under **Section VII, Impacts Determined to be Insignificant**, and have been omitted from the Impact Section of this report.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

### Section

---

#### X. APPENDICES

##### Volume II of III

- A. Geotechnical Assessment (through Appendix E)

##### Volume III of III

- A. Geotechnical Assessment (from Appendix F)
- B. Air Quality Assessment Data
- C. Psomas Report
  - 1. Sewer Study
  - 2. Water Study
  - 3. Hydrology Study
- D. Biota
- E. Noise Data
- F. Traffic Analysis Report
- G. Phase I Archaeological Survey/Paleontological Records Search Results
- H. Initial Study and NOP Comment Letters

# LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure   |  | Page               |
|----------|--|--------------------|
| I-1      | Project Location and Boundaries.....   | I-3                |
| II-1     | Regional Location.....   | II-3               |
| II-2     | Site Vicinity.....   | II-4               |
| II-3     | Originally Approved Mountaingate Master Plan.....  | II-7               |
| II-4     | Currently Developed Areas of the Mountaingate Community.....   | II-8               |
| II-5     | Currently Developed Areas of the Mountaingate Community<br>(with the 1990 Development Proposal)..... | II-9               |
| II-6     | Second Revised VTTM 53072.....   | (Map Pocket) II-10 |
| II-7     | Staging Areas for Construction Equipment.....  | II-15              |
| III-1    | Location of Related Projects.....  | III-5              |
| IV.A-1   | On-Site Geotechnical and Soil Information.....   | IV.A-3             |
| IV.A-2   | Soil Placement Locations.....  | IV.A-8             |
| IV.A-3   | Regional Fault Locations.....  | IV.A-19            |
| IV.C-1   | Existing Bundy Canyon Hydrology.....   | IV.C-3             |
| IV.C-2   | Proposed Hydrology and Storm Drain System.....   | IV.C-10            |
| IV.D-1   | Locations of Plant Communities, Coast Live Oaks<br>and Western Sycamores.....                        | IV.D-5             |
| IV.F-1   | Noise Attenuation by Barriers.....   | IV.F-5             |
| IV.F-2   | Staging Areas for Construction Equipment.....  | IV.F-12            |
| IV.F-3   | Noise Levels of Typical Construction Equipment .....   | IV.F-13            |
| IV.H-1   | Plan Amendment and Zone Change Map.....  | IV.H-11            |
| IV.N-1   | Location of Study Intersections.....   | IV.N-5             |
| IV.O.1-1 | Location of Fire and Secondary Access Road on Landfill.....  | IV.O-10            |
| IV.O.4-1 | Park and Recreation Facilities.....  | IV.O-37            |
| IV.O.4-2 | Proposed Open Space.....   | IV.O-44            |
| IV.Q.3-1 | Proposed Water Line System.....  | IV.Q-16            |
| IV.Q.4-1 | Proposed Sanitary Sewer System.....  | IV.Q-26            |
| IV.S-1   | Existing View 1: Sepulveda Pass Area.....  | IV.S-7             |
| IV.S-2   | Existing View 2: Mandeville Canyon Area.....   | IV.S-8             |

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table    | Page   |
|----------|--|
| II-1     | Land Use Characteristics.....II-11   |
| IV.A-1   | Local Fault Distance and Maximum Earthquake Magnitude.....IV.A-18  |
| IV.B-1   | Ambient Pollutant Concentrations Registered<br>in the Northwest Coast of LA County Area.....IV.B-9                   |
| IV.B-2   | Existing Carbon Monoxide Concentrations.....IV.B-10  |
| IV.B-3   | Estimated Construction Emissions.....IV.B-14   |
| IV.B-4   | Estimated Day to Day Project Emissions.....IV.B-15   |
| IV.B-5   | Predicted Future Carbon Monoxide Concentrations.....IV.B-17  |
| IV.C-1   | Existing Site Development Area Hydrology.....IV.C-2  |
| IV.C-2   | Comparison of Pre- and Post-Development Site Hydrology.....IV.C-12   |
| IV.D-1   | Plant Communities and Acreage Within the Project Site.....IV.D-3   |
| IV.D-2   | Oak Trees on the Project Site.....IV.D-12  |
| IV.D-3   | Direct Impacts to Vegetation on the Project Site.....IV.D-15   |
| IV.F-1   | Outside to Inside Noise Attenuation.....IV.F-4   |
| IV.F-2   | Los Angeles Land Use Compatibility Guidelines<br>for Exterior Noise Levels.....IV.F-6                                |
| IV.F-3   | Existing Off-Site Roadway Noise Levels.....IV.F-8  |
| IV.F-4   | With Project Off-Site Roadway Noise Levels.....IV.F-11   |
| IV.N-1   | Level of Service as a Function of CMA Values.....IV.N-6  |
| IV.N-2   | Critical Movement Analysis (2000) Summary.....IV.N-6   |
| IV.N-3   | Daily Trip Generation Adjustment Factors - Residential Developments.....IV.N-9                                       |
| IV.N-4   | Directional Trip Distribution.....IV.N-10  |
| IV.N-5   | Related Projects Trip Generation.....IV.N-12   |
| IV.N-6   | Summary of Critical Movement Analysis - Future (2005) Traffic<br>Conditions Without and With Project.....IV.N-14     |
| IV.N-7   | Project Freeway Volumes on San Diego Freeway.....IV.N-15   |
| IV.N-8   | Summary of Critical Movement Analysis - Future (2001) Traffic<br>Conditions With Project Plus Mitigation.....IV.N-16 |
| IV.O.3-1 | Schools Serving the Proposed Project Area.....IV.O-28  |
| IV.O.3-2 | Increase in Student Enrollment Due to Additional Residential Units.....IV.O-32                                       |
| IV.O.3-3 | Cumulative Increase in Student Enrollment Due to<br>Additional Residential Units.....IV.O-33                         |
| IV.O.4-1 | Parks and Recreational Facilities Located Within a Two-Mile<br>Radius of the Proposed Project Site.....IV.O-36       |
| IV.O.4-2 | Parkland Standards.....IV.O-40   |
| IV.Q.1-1 | Projected Electricity Consumption for the Proposed Project.....IV.Q-3  |
| IV.Q.1-2 | Projected Electricity Consumption for Cumulative Projects.....IV.Q-4   |
| IV.Q.2-1 | Projected Natural Gas Consumption for the Proposed Project.....IV.Q-7  |
| IV.Q.2-2 | Projected Natural Gas Consumption for Cumulative Projects.....IV.Q-8   |
| IV.Q.3-1 | Project-Related Water Demand.....IV.Q-17   |
| IV.Q.3-2 | Cumulative Water Demand.....IV.Q-18  |
| IV.Q.4-1 | Project-Related Wastewater Generation.....IV.Q-23  |
| IV.Q.4-2 | Cumulative Wastewater Generation.....IV.Q-25   |

### INTRODUCTION

This section of the Draft EIR analyzes the potential noise impacts associated with implementation of the proposed project. The purpose of this noise analysis is twofold: (1) to evaluate the proposed project in terms of its design to ensure that land uses are planned appropriately from a noise perspective; and (2) to evaluate the noise impact of the project on the surrounding (off-site) area. The first part of the noise section under this introduction identifies the methodology used in identifying the noise characteristics and impacts. Following this introduction, the section includes the environmental setting, impacts, mitigation measures and adverse impact analyses of the proposed project on noise based on the identified methodology.

### Noise Analysis Methodology

The analysis of the existing and future noise environments presented in this section is based on technical reports and noise prediction modeling. Future noise levels for stationary activities and equipment were estimated based on available technical reports, and literature cited in this EIR section. Noise modeling procedures involved the calculation of existing and future vehicular noise levels along individual roadway segments in the vicinity of the proposed project site. This was accomplished using the Federal Highway Administration Highway Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD-77-108). This model calculates the average noise level at specific locations based on traffic volumes, average speeds, roadway geometry, and site environmental conditions. The average vehicle noise rates (energy rates) utilized in the FHWA Model have been modified to reflect average vehicle noise rates identified for California by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).<sup>1</sup> The Caltrans data show that California automobile noise is 0.8 to 1.0 dB(A) higher than national levels and that medium and heavy truck noise is 0.3 to 3.0 dB(A) lower than national levels.<sup>2</sup> Traffic volumes utilized as data inputs into the noise prediction model were provided by the project traffic engineer and are consistent with the traffic and circulation analysis provided in **Section IV.N, Transportation and Circulation**, of this Draft EIR. The analysis in this section addresses the existing and future noise environments on and off the proposed project site.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rudolf W. Hendriks, *California Vehicle Noise Emission Levels* (Sacramento, California: California Department of Transportation, January 1987), NTIS, FHWA/CA/TL-87/03.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

### ***On-Site Methodology***

The primary concern regarding on-site noise is the potential for proposed on-site land uses to be exposed to noise levels that exceed adopted or recommended thresholds (discussed later on in this EIR section). In essence, the analysis of on-site noise levels deals with the compatibility of the proposed on-site land uses with adjacent off-site land uses and with roadway traffic noise.

### ***Off-Site Methodology***

The assessment of off-site noise levels concerns itself with potential noise increases at other locations due to on-site activities and the addition of traffic generated by the proposed project. This section specifically focuses on impacts to existing noise-sensitive uses, or those uses that would be most sensitive to an increase in noise levels.

Noise levels were modeled both with and without the project's traffic volumes at those roadway locations where the project may have an impact on existing noise sensitive uses. Study areas were chosen based on roadway analysis submitted by the project traffic engineer and consideration of sensitive receptors identified during site investigations.

## **MOBILE NOISE**

### **Environmental Setting**

#### ***Noise Characteristics***

Noise is usually defined as unwanted sound. It is an undesirable by-product of society's normal day-to-day activities. Sound becomes unwanted when it interferes with normal activities, when it causes actual physical harm, or when it has adverse effects on health. The definition of noise as unwanted sound implies that it has an adverse effect on people and their environment.

Noise is measured on a logarithmic scale of sound pressure level known as a decibel (dB). The human ear does not respond uniformly to sounds at all frequencies, being less sensitive to low and high frequencies than to medium frequencies, which correspond with human speech. In response to this, the A-weighted noise level (or scale) has been developed. The A-weighted scale corresponds better with people's subjective judgment of sound levels than does the traditional decibel scale. The A-weighted sound level is called the "noise level" referenced in units of dB(A). Noise is measured on a logarithmic

scale; a doubling of sound energy results in a 3 dB(A) increase in noise levels. However, changes in a community noise level of less than 3 dB(A) are not typically noticed by the human ear. Changes from 3 to 5 dB(A) may be noticed by some individuals who are extremely sensitive to changes in noise. A 5.0 dB(A) increase is readily noticeable, while the human ear perceives a 10 dB(A) increase in sound level to be a doubling of sound.<sup>3</sup>

Noise sources are classified in two forms: (1) point sources, such as stationary equipment, a water reclamation plant, or individual motor vehicles; and (2) line sources, such as a roadway with a large number of point sources (such as motor vehicles). Sound generated by a point source typically diminishes (attenuates) at a rate of 6.0 dB(A) for each doubling of distance from the source to the receptor at acoustically “hard” sites and 7.5 dB at acoustically “soft” sites.<sup>4</sup> For example, a 60 dB(A) noise level measured at 50 feet from a point source at an acoustically hard site would be 54 dB(A) at 100 feet from the source and 48 dB(A) at 200 feet from the source. Sound generated by a line source typically attenuates at a rate of 3.0 dB(A) and 4.5 dB(A) per doubling of distance from the source to the receptor for hard and soft sites, respectively.<sup>5</sup> Sound levels can also be attenuated by man-made or natural barriers, as illustrated in **Figure IV.F-1**.

Solid walls, berms, or elevation differences typically reduce noise levels by 5.0 to 10.0 dB(A).<sup>6</sup> Sound levels for a source may also be attenuated 3.0 to 5.0 dB(A) by a first row of houses and 1.5 dB(A) for each additional row of houses.<sup>7</sup> The noise attenuation provided by typical structures in California is provided below in **Table IV.F-1**.

When assessing community reaction to noise, a scale must be established which averages varying noise exposure over time and quantifies the result in terms of a single number descriptor. Several scales have been developed which address community noise levels. Those that are applicable to this analysis are the Equivalent Noise Level ( $L_{eq}$ ) and the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL).  $L_{eq}$  is the average A-weighted sound level measured over a given time interval.  $L_{eq}$  can be measured over any time period, but is typically measured for 1-minute, 15-minute, 1-hour, or 24-hour periods. CNEL is another average A-weighted sound level measured over a 24-hour time period and is adjusted to account

<sup>3</sup> *Highway Noise Fundamentals* (Springfield, Virginia: U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, September 1980), p. 81.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 97. A “hard”, or reflective, site does not provide any excess ground-effect attenuation and is characteristic of asphalt, concrete, and very hard packed soils. An acoustically “soft”, or absorptive, site is characteristic of normal earth and most ground with vegetation.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 97.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18.

<sup>7</sup> T. M. Barry and J. A. Reagan, *FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model* (Washington DC: U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Research, Office of Environmental Policy, December 1978), NTIS, FHWA-RD-77-108, p. 33.



for some individual's increased sensitivity to noise levels during the evening and nighttime hours. A CNEL noise measurement is obtained after adding 5.0 decibels to sound levels occurring during the evening from 7:00 P.M. to 10:00 P.M., and 10.0 decibels to sound levels occurring during the nighttime from 10:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M. The 5.0 and 10.0 decibel "penalties" are applied to account for peoples' increased sensitivity during the evening and nighttime hours. For example, the logarithmic effect of these additions is that a 60.0 dB(A) 24-hour  $L_{eq}$  would result in a measurement of 66.7 dB(A) CNEL.

**Table IV.F-1  
Outside to Inside Noise Attenuation**

| <b>Building Type</b>         | <b>Noise Reduction - dB(A)</b> |                       |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
|                              | <b>Open Windows</b>            | <b>Closed Windows</b> |
| Residences                   | 12                             | 20                    |
| Schools                      | 12                             | 20                    |
| Churches                     | 20                             | 30                    |
| Hospitals/Convalescent Homes | 17                             | 25                    |
| Offices                      | 20                             | 30                    |
| Theaters                     | 17                             | 25                    |
| Hotels/Motels                | 17                             | 25                    |

Source: *Highway Noise Fundamentals*, p. 117.

## ***Plans and Policies for Noise Control***

California State Law (Government Code Section 65300 et seq.) requires that a noise element be included in the *General Plan* of each county and city in the state. The local government goals, objectives, and policies for noise control are established by the noise element of the *General Plan* and the passage of specific noise ordinances. Plans and policies developed by the City of Los Angeles which pertain to the noise issues of the proposed project are discussed below.

### ***City of Los Angeles General Plan***

The City of Los Angeles has developed standards for noise and land use compatibility intended to ensure an acceptable noise environment. The City also identifies "sensitive receptors", or land uses that are especially sensitive to elevated noise levels. Sensitive noise receptors identified by the City in the *General Plan* include areas containing residences of all types, schools, hospitals, rest homes, convalescent hospitals, and places of worship. With the intention of preventing noise/land use conflicts, the City has thus designed specific criteria and noise level limits for various land uses.

**Figure IV.F-1**  
**Noise Attenuation By Barriers**

Table IV.F-2 summarizes the noise/land use compatibility guidelines for exterior noise exposure used in the City of Los Angeles.

**Table IV.F-2  
Los Angeles Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Exterior Noise Levels**

| Land Use   | dB(A) CNEL         |                     |                       |                      |
|--|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
|  | Clearly Acceptable | Normally Acceptable | Normally Unacceptable | Clearly Unacceptable |
| Residential Single-Family, Duplex, Multiple Family, Mobile Homes     | 50-60              | 60-65               | 65-75                 | 75+                  |
| Schools, Churches, Hospitals   | 50-60              | 60-65               | 65-75                 | 75+                  |
| Outdoor Spectator Sports, Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks            | 50-60              | 60-65               | 65-75                 | 75+                  |
| Golf Courses, Riding Stables, Water Recreation, Cemeteries           | 50-60              | 60-70               | 70-80                 | 80+                  |
| Office Buildings - Personal, Business, and Professional              | 50-65              | 65-75               | 75-80                 | 80+                  |
| Commercial - Wholesale, Retail, Industrial, Manufacturing, Utilities | 50-70              | 70-80               | 80+                   | --                   |

Source: City of Los Angeles General Plan, 1975.

### City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance

Construction noise sources cannot be strictly related to a 24-hour community noise standard because they occur only during certain hours of the day, and construction source noise levels vary greatly with time. Construction activities are also treated separately in many community noise ordinances because they do not represent a chronic, permanent noise source. To abate the potential nuisance from construction noise, the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance and Public Welfare regulations (Chapter IV of the Los Angeles Municipal Code) regulate construction noise in several ways. The standards imposed by the City aimed at construction activity noise control include the following:

- Section 41.40(a) limits hours of construction activities to 7 A.M. to 9 P.M. if such activities may disturb the sleep of any persons in the vicinity. Construction activities include equipment operations, as well as equipment repair and servicing, and also the delivery of any construction materials (Ordinance No. 158 587).
- Section 41.40(c) further limits hours of allowable operations from 8 A.M. to 6 P.M. on Saturday or any holiday (Ordinance No. 166 170; effective 9/29/90). Construction work is not permitted on Sundays.
- Additionally, Section 112.05 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (Ordinance No. 161 564) establishes performance standards for powered equipment or tools. The maximum allowable noise level for operations within 500 feet of any residential zone is 75 dB(A) measured at 50 feet

from the noise source. This restriction holds unless compliance is not technically feasible even with the use of noise “mufflers, shields, sound barriers, and/or other noise reduction devices or techniques.”

### **Existing Noise Environment**

The noise environment in the project vicinity is influenced by existing residential uses, roadways, and open space of the Santa Monica Mountains. Noise levels in the project vicinity are highest along major roadways that include the I-405 (San Diego Freeway), Sepulveda Boulevard, Mulholland Drive, and Mountaingate Drive. As the project vicinity is largely undeveloped, and as existing developments are relatively quiet residential land uses, noise levels are quite low compared to those in more urbanized areas.

### **On-Site Noise Environment**

The project site is bounded by existing residential land uses to the north and northeast, and by open space of the Santa Monica Mountains along the remainder of its perimeter. Noise levels on-site are primarily influenced by the adjacent residential developments, light traffic along Mountaingate Drive, Stoney Hill Road, and Canyonback Road, wildlife, and wind. Impact Sciences, Inc. conducted two sets of noise measurements at the project site, one along the proposed Stoney Hill Road continuation, and the other along the proposed Canyon Back Road continuation. Noise monitoring was conducted on May 10, 2000, using a Bruel and Kjaer Type 2226 sound level meter, which satisfies the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for general environmental noise measurement instrumentation. At both locations, an average 60-second  $L_{eq}$  of 50.7 dB(A) was measured.

### **Off-Site Noise Environment**

The area immediately surrounding the project site consists of residential land uses and open space. As such, the area has a quiet noise environment. Based on field investigations and review of the project traffic report, the following roadway sections were identified where the proposed project could potentially cause significant noise impacts to sensitive receptors.

- Mountaingate Drive west of Sepulveda Boulevard
- Sepulveda Boulevard north of Skirball Center Drive

Noise sensitive land uses along these study roadways are single-family residences, adjacent to Mountaingate Drive west of Sepulveda Boulevard, and Steven S. Wise Temple High School, which is

located northwest of the intersection of Sepulveda Boulevard and Skirball Center Drive. Computer modeling was conducted to characterize existing noise levels along these roadway segments. Results are shown in **Table IV.F-3**. The noise levels for these locations are presently consistent with noise/land use guidelines presented in **Table IV.F-2**.

**Table IV.F-3**  
Existing Off-Site Roadway Noise Levels

| <b>ROADWAY/Segment</b>                                | <b>Sensitive Receptor</b> | <b>Distance from Center of Roadway</b> | <b>CNEL in dB(A)</b> |
|---|---------------------------|--|----------------------|
| MOUNTAINGATE DRIVE<br>West of Sepulveda Boulevard     | Residences                | 75 feet                                | 58.2                 |
| SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD<br>North of Skirball Center Drive | High School               | 250 Feet                               | 64.8                 |

Source: *Impact Sciences, Inc.* Calculations are presented in **Appendix E** of this Draft EIR.

## Environmental Impact Analysis

### Threshold Significance Criteria

Noise thresholds consider both the Noise Compatibility Criteria and community responses to changes in noise levels. The following thresholds of significance were developed for this noise impact analysis based on information contained in the L.A. CEQA *Thresholds Guide*, the plans and policies identified previously in this EIR section, and also taking into account community responses to noise level changes. These thresholds apply to both the project and cumulative project impacts.

### Project Construction

The proposed project would result in significant noise impacts from construction if any of the following situations occurred:

- Construction activities lasting more than a day would exceed existing ambient exterior noise levels by 10 dB(A) or more at a noise sensitive use;
- Construction activities lasting more than 10 days in a 3-month period would exceed existing ambient exterior noise levels by 5 dB(A) or more at a noise sensitive use; or

- Construction activities would exceed the ambient noise level by 5 dB(A) at a noise sensitive use between the hours of 9:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. Monday through Friday, before 8:00 A.M. or after 6:00 P.M. on Saturday, or at anytime on Sunday.<sup>8</sup>

### **Project Operation**

The proposed project would result in a significant impact on noise levels from project operation if the project would cause the ambient noise level measured at the property line of affected noise uses to increase by 3 dB(A) in CNEL to or within the “normally unacceptable” or “clearly unacceptable” category as identified in **Table IV.F-2**, or any 5 dB(A) or greater noise increase.<sup>9</sup>

### **Project Impacts**

The following will analyze noise impacts associated with mobile noise resulting from the proposed project. Impacts could result from project construction noise and its effect on off-site residential developments, as well as impacts to on and off-site locations due to the projects increase of mobile source noise on the local roadway system.

### **Construction Impacts**

Construction of the project would involve two basic phases, site preparation and home construction. Excavation, grading, and construction activities associated with development of the proposed project would involve the use of heavy equipment such as tractors, loaders, concrete mixers, cranes, etc. Smaller equipment such as jackhammers, pneumatic tools, saws, and hammers would also be used throughout the site during the construction phase. This equipment would generate both steady state and episodic noise that would be heard both on and off the project site. Trucks would be used to deliver equipment and building materials, and to haul away waste materials.

It should be noted that the construction equipment would be transported to the project site via the proposed secondary access road located on the Mission Canyon 8 Landfill site aside from a single maintenance truck that would arrive at the project site during construction activities in the morning and leave in the evening. This access road would serve as the primary access route for all heavy and noise intensive equipment. This would ensure that the existing residential uses would not be exposed to noise generated from the transportation of construction equipment on local public roads. Once the equipment

---

<sup>8</sup> L.A. CEQA *Thresholds Guide*, May 14, 1998, p. I.1-3.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. I.2-3 through I.2-4.

has arrived at the project site, it would be stored on site at two staging areas. The location of these staging areas is presented in **Figure IV.F-2**. As shown, one is located on the Stony Hill ridgeline, while the other is located on the Canyonback Ridgeline. These locations have been selected in order to minimize, to the greatest extent possible, any noise impacts to the existing residential uses. By creating two staging areas, each on one of the ridgelines that would be developed, this minimizes the time and noise associated with transporting and moving equipment from one location to the other via the existing residential roadways, thereby further reducing noise impacts on the residential uses. Additionally, as the project has been designed to balance all soils on-site, no export of the soils is required. As a result, trips associated with the exporting of soils, and consequently, the noise generated by trucks traveling the haul route is eliminated.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) has compiled data regarding the noise generating characteristics of specific types of construction equipment. These data are presented in **Figure IV.F-3**. As shown, noise levels generated by heavy equipment can range from approximately 68 dB(A) to noise levels in excess of 100 dB(A) when measured at 50 feet. Because loud construction equipment, such as tractors, backhoes, trucks, jackhammers, etc., would be utilized during project construction, noise levels over 95 dB(A) and possibly over 100 dB(A) are anticipated within 50 feet of operation.

As previously stated in this section, the City of Los Angeles has designated a maximum allowable noise level of 75 dB(A) measured at 50 feet from the noise source operation in any area that is within 500 feet of any residential zone. Operations in such areas that exceed 75 dB(A) at 50 feet from the noise source are not allowed by the City unless use of all feasible noise reduction devices and/or techniques cannot satisfactorily attenuate noise levels.

Construction activities associated with the proposed lots and homes along the north and northeast perimeter of the site would occur within 100 feet of existing residences. Employment of all feasible noise attenuation devices and techniques may be capable of reducing noise levels for stationary equipment to some degree, but trucks and other mobile equipment cannot be surrounded by noise barriers at all locations. Given these factors, periodic noise levels of 95 dB(A) should be anticipated at 50 feet from various types of mobile and stationary construction equipment. Noise levels would diminish with distance from the construction site at a rate of approximately 6 dB(A) per doubling of distance. Thus, as the nearest residences are within 100 feet of the loudest construction equipment, periodic noise levels of up to 90 dB(A) could occur on adjacent off-site residential properties. As stated in existing conditions, the area that is bordered by the project site and adjacent residences is presently quiet, with an average measured 60-second  $L_{eq}$  of 50.7 dB(A). Periodic construction noise levels would be noticeable to residents

at home during the time of construction operations, and would constitute a temporary significant noise impact at these off-site residences.

## Operational Impacts

### On-Site Impacts

Noise levels at proposed residences would be influenced by light traffic on Stoney Hill Road, Canyonback Road, and internal streets of the proposed development. The roadways proximal to the project site would have light traffic volumes, which are not expected to produce high noise levels on the project site. Future noise levels on the project site would be typical of a low-density residential area, and given the small amount of trips generated from the 29 homes, it is unlikely that the normally acceptable classification of the noise/land use compatibility standards set by the City of Los Angeles would be violated. Thus, it is concluded that noise impacts to proposed on-site residences would not be significant.

### Off-Site Impacts

The proposed project would increase traffic along Stoney Hill Road and Canyonback Road. However, as indicated in **Section IV.N, Transportation and Circulation**, of this EIR, traffic levels and noise levels along these roads are still expected to be quite low. Noise modeling was focused on Mountaingate Drive and Sepulveda Boulevard. Project traffic generation at the off-site study roadways, as determined by the project traffic engineer, was added to existing roadway volumes in order to estimate project impacted noise levels at the study roadway sections. Resulting noise levels are shown on **Table IV.F-4**.

**Table IV.F-4**  
**With Project Off-Site Roadway Noise Levels**

| <b>ROADWAY/Segment</b>                                | <b>Sensitive Receptor</b> | <b>dB(A)<br/>CNEL</b> | <b>dB(A)<br/>Increase</b> |
|---|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| MOUNTAINGATE DRIVE<br>West of Sepulveda Boulevard     | Residences                | 59.3                  | 1.1                       |
| SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD<br>North of Skirball Center Drive | High School               | 65.3                  | 0.5                       |

Source: *Impact Sciences, Inc.* Calculations are presented in **Appendix E**.



**Figure IV.F-2  
Staging Areas for Construction Equipment**

**Figure IV.F-3  
Noise Levels of Typical Construction Equipment**

According to the model calculations, project impacts to the noise environment at Steven S. Wise Temple High School would be minimal. Although the resulting noise level would be above 65.0 CNEL, the change in noise level would barely be measurable. As the 0.5 dB(A) increase to the forecasted 65.3 dB(A) CNEL is less than 3.0 dB(A), the increase would not be noticeable to the human ear. Residences along Mountaingate Drive would experience a 1.1 dB(A) rise in ambient noise level to 59.3 dB(A) CNEL as a result of project generated traffic. Residences along Mountaingate Drive are at least 75 feet from the center of the roadway. The noise level along this roadway segment would still be within the City of Los Angeles normally acceptable classification of 65 dB(A) CNEL for residential land uses. Further, the increase due to the project would be less than the community noise level increase standard of 5 dB(A). In addition, changes in a noise level of less than 3 dB(A) are not typically noticed by the human ear. Therefore, the project would not cause or contribute to a significant increase in roadway noise levels, and would not result in significant roadway noise impacts to off-site sensitive land uses.

### ***Cumulative Impacts***

A number of projects are planned, approved, or under construction in the general project area, but only one cumulative project has been identified within a 1-mile radius of the project site. Thus, while noise levels would temporarily increase from construction activities taking place throughout the study area, no cumulative construction noise impacts are anticipated given the distance between the project site and the cumulative projects in the area.

On an operational basis, it is estimated that cumulative noise levels on Mountaingate Drive west of Sepulveda would be 59.3 dB(A), while that of Sepulveda Boulevard north of Skirball would be 70.7 dB(A) (see **Appendix E**). The increases in cumulative noise represent 1.1 and 0.5 decibels respectively, which are less than the normally perceptible noise increase of 3 decibels. Note that the noise prediction modeling for cumulative analysis was based on future (2005) traffic volumes, including that of the proposed project, and was provided by the project traffic consultant (Crain and Associates).

The Noise Element of the *General Plan* and the passage of specific noise ordinances establish the City of Los Angeles's goals, objectives, and policies for noise control. Given that cumulative noise levels along studied roadway segments are not perceptible to the human ear, and assuming implementation of noise standards contained in the City's *General Plan* and the enforcement of ordinances pertaining to noise control, no cumulative impacts are expected.

## Mitigation Measures

The following required and recommended mitigation measures are intended to reduce project construction noise level impacts to the greatest extent possible.

1. As per Section 41.40 of the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance, construction operations shall be limited to the hours of 7 A.M. to 6 P.M. Monday through Friday and 8 A.M. to 6 P.M. on Saturdays and holidays. No construction operations shall be permitted on Sundays.
2. As per Section 112.05 of the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance, all technically feasible measures shall be implemented to reduce noise levels of construction equipment operating within 500 feet of residential areas in cases where noise levels exceed 75 dB(A) at 50 feet from the noise source. Technically feasible measures include, but are not limited to, changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting off idling equipment, notifying adjacent land uses in advance of construction work, ensuring that construction equipment is fitted with modern sound reduction equipment, and installing temporary acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources.
3. The project applicant shall provide staging areas on site to minimize off-site transportation of heavy equipment. These areas shall be located as to maximize the distance between staging areas and residential areas.
4. Minimize off-site heavy truck activities in local residential areas.
5. Ensure that construction equipment is fitted with sound reduction equipment, per manufacturer's specifications.
6. Where feasible, all heavy-duty construction equipment shall arrive at the site by utilizing the proposed secondary access road located on the Mission Canyon 8 Landfill property.

## Adverse Impacts

With implementation of mitigation measures and standard construction techniques presented earlier, construction noise would be less than significant. The noise impacts of day to day project operations on and off-site study roadways and adjacent residential land uses have been shown to be less than significant when compared to the significance threshold criteria. Noise impacts to proposed on-site

residences were also determined to be less than significant, as were the noise impacts of cumulative developments in the project vicinity on study roadways. Therefore, no adverse impacts would occur.

## **STATIONARY NOISE**

### **Existing Noise Environment**

#### ***On-Site Activity***

The project site is presently vacant and does not support activities that would generate noise from stationary sources.

### **Environmental Impact Analysis**

#### ***Threshold Significance Criteria***

The noise associated with operational activities on the project site and surrounding residential land uses would result in a significant impact to on-site and off-site land uses if the City of Los Angeles normally acceptable noise/land use compatibility guideline of 65 dB(A) CNEL were expected to be violated.

#### ***Project Impacts***

##### **On-Site Impacts**

Noise levels at proposed residences would be influenced by point sources of adjacent off-site residences along the north and northeast perimeter of the project site. As previously mentioned, the majority of the project site is surrounded by open space. Point sources such as people talking, car doors slamming, dogs barking, stereos, etc., are typical of a residential area and do not generally exceed the City of Los Angeles normally acceptable noise/land use compatibility guideline of 65 dB(A) CNEL. As a result, the project would not generate substantial increases to existing noise levels that would be significantly disruptive to residents of the proposed development. Thus, it is concluded that noise impacts to proposed on-site residences would not be significant.

### **Off-Site Impacts**

Future on-site point sources of the proposed project (e.g., people talking, car doors slamming, dogs barking, stereos, etc.) would be typical of those encountered at nearby residential land uses and would not create significant noise impacts substantially increase noise levels to adjacent off-site land uses as setbacks and other operational design standards would be incorporated into the projects design. Therefore, the City of Los Angeles normally acceptable noise/land use compatibility guideline of 65 dB(A) CNEL would not be exceeded at adjacent residential uses. No significant impacts would occur.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

Stationary noise sources of related projects are not considered cumulative because they are not additive in nature; noise levels will only be affected in the immediate vicinity of stationary noise sources. If the stationary noise sources of each individual project comply with applicable noise level standards, no significant impacts to the area will occur. As project stationary sources themselves are not expected to cause any violations of the City's noise/land use compatibility guidelines, project stationary source noise would not be significant.

### **Mitigation Measures**

Stationary noise sources would not significantly impact any on-site or off-site noise receptor. Therefore, no mitigation measures regarding these noise sources are required or recommended.

### **Adverse Impacts**

No adverse stationary source noise impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.