MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW BOARD (ERB)
Unincorporated Coastal Zone, Santa Monica Mountains, Los Angeles County
Meeting of October 17, 2016

(Minutes approved, November 21, 2016)

Persons in Attendance

ERB Members
Rosi Dagit
Ron Durbin
Margot Griswold, PhD
Richard Ibarra

Regional Planning Staff
Joseph Decruyenaere, Biologist
Martin Gies, Planner
Joshua Huntington, Planner
Shirley Imsand, PhD, Biologist
Marie Pavlovic, Planner, ERB Coordinator
Maya Saraf, Planner, ERB member *pro tempore*

3929 Malibu Vista Drive, Project No.: 2016-000681-(3)
Natasha Roit

3004 Sequit Drive, Project No.: 2016-000681-(3)
Vitus Matare

MINUTES

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion/second to approve Minutes of August 15, 2016: Dagit/Griswold
Ayes: Dagit, Durbin, Griswold, Ibarra
Abstention: Saraf

NEW BUSINESS

1. **Project: 3929 Malibu Vista Drive**
   Project No.: 2016-000681-(3)
   CDP No.: RPPL 2016002521
   APN: 4443-003-012
   Location: Sunset Mesa
   Applicant: Rebecca Rickley / Natasha Roit
   Biologist: Travis Kegel
   USGS Quad: Topanga
   Planner: Joshua Huntington

Project description with regard to biological resources: Current aerial photographs (Google Earth and Los Angeles County GIS) indicate that both the area within 100 feet of the Proposed Project location and all of the area shown in Exhibit 5 on both the Rickley and Yazdani parcels do not contain natural vegetation. While those same photographs show that natural vegetation in the form of California encelia scrub exists adjacent to the Property (but more than 100 ft. from the Proposed Project), no new impacts to biological resources are expected or proposed as part of the permitting of the Proposed Project.

Landscape and Fuel Modification: No new landscaping is proposed. Existing ornamental landscaping on site is associated with permitted structures and confined to fuel modification zones A and B.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Project is subject to the LIP and all relevant requirements. Habitat categories of the LIP (H1 – H3) were developed based on prior National Park Service (NPS) vegetation mapping and are confirmed in the Biological Resources Map found at Map 2 to the LUP that was adopted in 2014. The NPS mapping was conducted based on aerial photographs. The LIP allows, in the event of mapping inconsistencies, for a "prove-in / prove-out" approach to modifying Habitat Categories based on site conditions. Specifically, County Code section 22.44.1830.A, provides that as part of the coastal development permit process and based on substantial evidence, a resource on any site may be classified or reclassified from one category to a higher or lower category and those changes reflected on the Biological Resources Map of the LUP found at Map 2. An evaluation of the H1 habitat mapped within 100 feet of the Proposed Project demonstrates that the H1 habitat is more appropriately considered H3 habitat. It is therefore recommended that the ERB consider, and recommend to the Hearing Officer, that such area (as shown in Exhibit 5) be re-designated as H3 habitat.

Staff therefore recommends that:

1. The Biological Resources Map be modified to show all the land shown in Exhibit 5 and designated as H-1 will be reclassified and shown as H-3;
2. The ERB find that the H-1 buffer of 100 feet is not violated by this proposed project;
3. The ERB find that the Proposed Project will not have an impact on mapped H1 habitat, and that the proposed development may proceed consistent with the policies of the LCP; and
4. That the minor Coastal Development permit be approved subject to conditions recommended by Staff.

BIOLOGICAL REPORT:

The Biological Assessment is complete.

ERB MOTION:

Motion: Approve as being consistent with the LIP.

Motion/second: Dagit/Griswold
Ayes: Unanimous

ERB date of review: October 17, 2016

Staff Recommendation:	**_X_ Consistent**	**__ Consistent after Modifications & Bio Report Completion**
	__ Inconsistent	**__ No decision**
ERB Evaluation:	**_X_ Consistent**	**__ Consistent after Modifications & Bio Report Completion**
	__ Inconsistent	**__ No decision**

---

2. Project: 3004 Sequit Drive, Malibu
Project No.: 2016-000681-(3)
CDP No.: RPPL 2016003088
APN: 4457-016-064
Location: El Nido, Solstice Canyon watershed
Applicant: Margot Mandel
Biologist: Andrew Forde
USGS Quad: Malibu Beach
Planner: Martin Gies

Project description with regard to biological resources: The project parcel is mapped entirely as H3 habitat. H1 habitat is mapped to the west within 100 ft of the building site and is primarily associated with willow-riparian vegetation along a drainage course running north to south and is separated from the parcel site by Sequit Drive. A portion of the building site is located within the 100 ft buffer of the mapped H1, and the remainder of the parcel is within the H1 Habitat Quiet Zone. The majority of the parcel is subject to brush clearing for neighboring developed parcels to the north, east, and south.

Most of the exposed bedrock along the western and southern boundaries of the parcel appears to have been cut for the construction of Sequit Drive. However, elements of H1 and H2 habitat are present at higher limits where the outcrops might be at natural grade (judging from coloring, weathering, vegetation, etc.).

New impacts to on-site biological resources would result from brush clearance within fuel-modification Zone B. The recommendations provided by the project biologist would minimize these impacts and preserve the H1 elements of the rock outcrop. The drainage plan does not indicate flows to be directed onto portions of rock outcrop supporting H1 elements.

Landscape and Fuel Modification: New landscaping is proposed, consisting of native and non-invasive non-native species in Fuel Modification Zone A and a small portion of Zone B. Throughout the majority of Zone B, landscaping is limited to seed drifts of native wildflowers (Sisyrinchium bellum) and thinning of existing vegetation.

H1 habitat to the west of the subject parcel is within 200 ft of existing residences, although it appears as if brush clearance is currently occurring only within a portion of this area.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Replace *Sisyrinchium bellum* with a species more tolerant of the sandstone-derived soils on site. Other native geophytes that be better adapted to the site include *Bloomeria crocea*, *Calochortus splendens*, *Calochortus venustus*, *Dichelostemma capitatum* ssp. *capitatum*, or *Muilla maritima*.
- Incorporate energy dissipaters at the outlets of drainage structures discharging on to or above Sequit Drive. Rain barrel capacities will be subject to approval of Public Works per stormwater retention requirements.

BIOLOGICAL REPORT:

The Biological Resource Assessment lacks some minor components but is generally complete. Missing items include:

- No project # on title page
- No application # in project description
- Map of general location is provided but doesn't label Solstice Canyon
- Acreage table for habitat categories is included but no such table is provided for vegetation types
- North arrow and scale bar on landscape plan is missing

The above omissions do not affect Staff's evaluation of the project and do not warrant revision of the Biological Assessment.

ERB RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Retain blue-eyed grass and incorporate various other appropriate local species in seed drifts.
- Maximize the capture of roof rain to the extent possible.

CONSISTENCY:

Motion: Incorporate staff recommendations and find the project consistent with the LIP.

Motion/second: Durbin/Dagit
Ayes: Unanimous

ERB date of review: October 17, 2016

Staff Recommendation:	**_ Consistent**	**X Consistent after Modifications & Bio Report Completion**
	_ Inconsistent	**_ No decision**
ERB Evaluation:	**_ Consistent**	**X Consistent after Modifications & Bio Report Completion**
	_ Inconsistent	**_ No decision**

OTHER ITEMS:

1. **Discuss draft ERB Irrigation Mitigation Guidelines.**
2. **Discuss draft ERB Landscape Guidelines and draft Landscape Review Form.**
3. **Discuss draft Restoration Review Form.**

Items 1 – 3 were discussed; suggestions from ERB were gathered by Staff and will be incorporated in updated materials to be reviewed by ERB at a future date.

4. **Review and update on ERB review of wireless renewal project with little or no changes:** ERB accepted Staff recommendations for exempting select wireless renewal projects from ERB review. (See Attachment 1)
5. **Update on whether ERB needs a meeting chair:** Staff and ERB agree that no Chair is needed.
6. **Upcoming meeting dates:** An agenda will be prepared for November 21, 2016.
7. **Public comment pursuant to Section 54954.3 of the Government Code:** no comment was given.

ERB Review of Wireless Facilities in the Public Right-of-Way

The ERB shall not review certain wireless telecommunications facilities within the Santa Monica Mountains Coastal Zone when they are in the public right-of-way, provided that they meet certain standards.

1. The project needs to be a renewal of a wireless facility with little to no discernable changes to the existing facility. The planner, in conjunction with a staff biologist as needed, will review application materials to confirm that no coastal resources are being impacted.

2. All new and renewed wireless facilities in the ROW will be conditioned for earth-based colors of the surrounding area.

3. Whenever possible, equipment cabinets for new facilities will be vaulted underground, and antennae will be co-located with other existing equipment on existing poles as long as the combined weight of all equipment doesn't create a toppling (and subsequent fire) hazard during high wind events.

4. New and existing wireless facilities that require the erecting of new poles in new locations in or out of the ROW will be brought to ERB for review; replacement poles of the same height and in the same location as poles being replaced shall be exempted from ERB review.

5. Wireless facilities that require trenching within the protected zone of oak trees or that require the trimming of oak tree canopies are subject to the provisions of the Oak Tree Ordinance, and will be brought to ERB for review.

6. Wireless facilities outside of the ROW will be brought to ERB for review.