

# Environmental Checklist Form (Initial Study)

## County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning



**Project title:** Hidden Terraces Specific Plan/Project No. PM070606/Vesting Tentative Parcel Map No. 070606/Local Plan Amendment No. 201100001/Zone Change No. 201100001/Specific Plan No. 201100001/Variance No. 200800010/Conditional Use Permit No. 200800036/Oak Tree Permit No. 200800008/Environmental Assessment No. 200800028.

**Project location:** 200 feet east of Mountain View Drive, and north of Mureau Road and U.S. Highway 101  
*APN:* 2049-044-001 *Thomas Guide:* 559 B4, B5 *USGS Quad:* Calabasas

**Gross Acreage:** 26.5 acres

**Description of project:** Forestar Real Estate Group Inc., is proposing the Hidden Terraces Specific Plan Project (Project), an adult residential facility (ARF) consisting of a total of 258 units (151 units, consisting of 73 independent living units with kitchens, 54 assisted living units with kitchens and 24 dementia care units, and 107 independent living units with kitchen). The Project consists of a vesting tentative parcel map to create two parcels, a local plan amendment to change the area plan land use designation on 26.5 acres from N5 (Mountain Land 5) to Specific Plan (SP); a zone change on 26.5 acres from A-2-5 (Heavy Agriculture-Five Acres Minimum Required Lot Area) to SP; a specific plan to establish a plan to allow for the proposed adult residential facility with an independent living component, assisted living units with kitchens, and dementia units; a variance to allow development of structures within 50 vertical feet of a significant ridgeline; a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow development of an ARF, to authorize 630,420 cubic yards (386,710 of and 243,710 of fill) of on-site grading, with 143,000 cubic yards of off-site Project grading, and grading over 5,000 cubic yards within the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District; and an oak tree permit to authorize the encroachment of two oak trees and the removal of 16 oak trees.

The Project is proposed to be developed on approximately 9 acres (approximately 34 percent) of the 26.5 acre site. The remaining 17.5 acres (66 percent) of the Project site is proposed to remain as natural and disturbed open space, including the creation of a small private park. Regional access is provided to the Project site from U.S. Highway 101 (Ventura Freeway). Primary access is taken from Mureau Road, onto a private driveway/fire lane into the site. A secondary emergency access is proposed by a new off-site roadway connection on the eastern side of the Project site through three properties. The Project would consist of 258 units (54 assisted living with kitchens, 24 dementia care and 180 independent living with kitchens) and 5 hospitality suites for a total of 263 units within two structures, Buildings A and B, proposed on the northern portion of the site. Street improvements include the widening from 28.5 feet to 52 feet of pavement, restriping and shifting of a bicycle lane along approximately 1,060 feet of Mureau Road adjacent to the Project site; paving, widening to 20 feet wide in each direction and realignment of the existing 12-foot-wide unpaved road on the site to be known as a private driveway/fire lane; addition of a secondary means of access (for emergency vehicle use); and an internal street system accessed from the private driveway/fire lane. On-site Project parking is proposed, including 85 surface parking spaces and approximately 256 subterranean parking spaces located within two separate levels, for a Project total of 341 spaces. The Project will be connected to public water and sewer provided by the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District. A total of 341 parking space spaces will be provided in both perimeter and subterranean areas. A private park is proposed on the south side of the significant ridgeline along the western side of the property. A dedicated 20-foot trail easement to the Los Angeles County Parks and Recreation

is proposed to traverse the property. A detention basin would be located in the southern portion of the Project site to the west of the private driveway/fire lane. Retaining walls will be employed along the private driveway/fire lane and adjacent to slopes to reduce grading. The facility will have a 24-hour operation with a maximum of 80 employees during the day shift. There are currently no structures on the property, which contains an existing unpaved road and a disturbed area of approximately 8 acres created by prior unpermitted grading by a previous owner.

**General plan designation:** Rural-Non-Urban

**Community/Area wide Plan designation:** N5 (Mountain Lands 5) Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan

**Zoning:** A-2-5 (Heavy Agriculture-Five Acres Minimum Required Lot Area).

**Surrounding land uses and setting:** The Project site is immediately bordered by undeveloped land on all sides. Nearby land uses include Mesivta School about 600 feet to the east, single-family residential uses about 500 feet to the northeast, Crummer Canyon, zoned O-S (Open Space), to the immediate north and west, and the Ventura Freeway to the south. Crummer Canyon is privately owned by the Mountain View Estates homeowners association.

The northeastern portion of the Project site has previously been disturbed and improved for equestrian facilities without permits, which included a polo field in the northern approximate 4 acres portion of the Project site. Plant communities supported on the on- and off-site parcels are scrub, woodland and herbaceous formations representative of open space areas in the wider northern Santa Monica Mountains region. Much of the site supports native vegetation; however, large portions support a heavy growth of non-native annual species. In general, these non-native annual species dominate on south-facing slopes throughout the site. The property contains annual grassland, purple sage, California sagebrush scrub, elderberry scrub, California walnut woodland, mulefat scrub, arrow willow riparian woodland and ornamental woodland habitats. Two special-status plant species, California black walnut (*Juglans californica*) and Catalina mariposa lily (*Calochortus catalinae*), are present on site. Four special-status animal species, Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperi*), ashy rufous-crowned sparrow (*Aimophila ruficeps canescens*), Vaux's swift (*Chaetura vauxi*), and Allen's hummingbird (*Selasphorus sasin*) were observed on the Project site. Elevations on the site range from 1,000 feet above mean sea level (msl) to over 1,250 feet above msl. The site contains a ridgeline designated as a significant ridgeline in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan. The significant ridgeline intersects the property, in a north-south direction within the northern portion of the property and turns east along the middle portion of the property. This portion of Los Angeles County is proximate to the cities of Calabasas to the south, and Hidden Hills to the northeast. Regional access to the site is provided by the Ventura Freeway, and local access is provided via Mureau Road. On- and off-ramps at Las Virgenes Road provide access to and from the Ventura Freeway.

### Major Projects in the area:

<i>Project/ Case No.</i>	<i>Description and Status</i>
02-121	Mesivta School – Approved December, 2003

**Reviewing Agencies:**

*Responsible Agencies*

- None
- Regional Water Quality Control Board:
  - Los Angeles Region
  - Lahontan Region
- Coastal Commission
- Army Corps of Engineers
  
- Las Virgenes Municipal Water District
- Caltrans
- California Highway Patrol
- Dept. of Social Services
- Native American Heritage Commission
- Local Tribal Representatives

*Trustee Agencies*

- None
- State Fish and Game
  
- State Parks
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife

*Special Reviewing Agencies*

- None
- Santa Monica Mtns. Conservancy
- National Parks
- National Forest
- Edwards Air Force Base
- Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns. Area
  
- SCAQMD
- City of Hidden Hills
- City of Calabasas
- Calif. Historical Resources Information System

*Regional Significance*

- None
- SCAG Criteria
- Air Quality
- Water Resources
- Santa Monica Mtns. Area

*County Reviewing Agencies*

- Subdivision Committee
  
- DPW: Land Development Division, Traffic & Lighting, Geotechnical & Materials Engineer, Watershed Management, Environmental Programs, Flood Maintenance, Waterworks & Sewer?
  
- County Sheriff
- Fire Department
- Public Health: Environmental Hygiene, Environmental Health
- County Parks and Recreation
- County Library
  
- Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts

**Public agency approvals, which may be required:**

*Public Agency*

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Approval Required*

(e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

\_\_\_\_\_

**Lead agency name and address:**

County of Los Angeles  
Department of Regional Planning  
320 West Temple Street  
Los Angeles, California 90012

**Project sponsor's name and address:**

Forestar Real Estate Group, Inc.  
14755 Preston Road, Suite 710  
Dallas, Texas 75254  
Contact: John Polito; (805) 454-0764

**Contact person and phone number:** Alejandrina C. Baldwin, (213) 974-6433

## ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

IMPACT ANALYSIS SUMMARY MATRIX		No Impact				Potential Concern
		Less than Significant Impact				
		Less than Significant Impact w/Project Mitigation				
		Potentially Significant Impact				
Environmental Factor	Pg.					
1. Aesthetics	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Further evaluation of the visibility of the project from the surrounding area will be conducted; visual character; grading on a significant ridgeline
2. Agriculture/Forest	9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Air Quality	11	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project construction and operation
4. Biological Resources	13	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Removal of oak trees; potentially sensitive habitat and species; off-site unnamed dashed line stream; off-site wildlife corridor; encroachment into vertical buffer area of significant ridgeline.
5. Cultural Resources	16	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potential of encountering cultural resources during project grading.
6. Energy	18	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Increased demand for utilities; Utilities services are not currently in place on the project site
7. Geology/Soils	19	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Landslide; Slope stability; Grading; On-site soils
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	22	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project construction and operation
9. Hazards/Hazardous Materials	23	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Medical waste and Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFSZ)
10. Hydrology/Water Quality	26	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Storm water runoff; Mudflow conditions; Drainage pattern/increased runoff
11. Land Use/Planning	30	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consistency with land use plan and zoning code; approvals and permits for roadway improvements
12. Mineral Resources	32	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
13. Noise	33	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Roadway noise; Temporary construction noise
14. Population/Housing	35	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	258 units and five hospitality suites
15. Public Services	36	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Secondary access road; Fire flow requirements; Fire hazard zone; Some increased demand for Fire/Sheriff services
16. Recreation	37	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Increase demand for use of recreational facilities.
17. Transportation/Traffic	38	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Trip generation; access; circulation; alternative transportation
18. Utilities/Services	41	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Increased demand for utilities; Utilities services are not currently in place on the project site
19. Mandatory Findings of Significance	43	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biotic and visual resources; Cumulative impacts

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Department.)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Nooshin Paidar  
Signature

7/27/11  
Date

Alexandra C. Baldwin  
Signature

7/27/2011  
Date

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources the Lead Department cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the Lead Department has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an environmental impact report (EIR) is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced.)
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) processes, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15063(c)(3)(D).) In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures, which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 7) The explanation of each issue should identify: the significance threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and mitigation measures identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. Sources of thresholds include the County General Plan, other County planning documents, and County ordinances. Some thresholds are unique to geographical locations.
- 8) Climate Change Impacts: When determining whether a project’s impacts are significant, the analysis should consider, when relevant, the effects of future climate change on: (1) worsening hazardous conditions that pose risks to the project’s inhabitants and structures (e.g., floods and wildfires), and (2) worsening the project’s impacts on the environment (e.g., impacts on special status species and public health).

**1. AESTHETICS**

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) <b>Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, including County-designated scenic resources areas (scenic highways as shown on the Scenic Highway Element, scenic corridors, scenic hillsides, and scenic ridgelines)?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Both the Adopted and Proposed Scenic Highways Map of the General Plan Update Program designate a portion of U.S. Highway 101 (Highway 101) from Ventura County Line to Topanga Canyon Boulevard as a scenic highway. The Project site is visible from Highway 101 travel corridor. As proposed, the Project development would place the adult residential facility north and behind a designated significant ridgeline on the site to buffer the proposed facility from views along Mureau Road and Highway 101. Further evaluation of the visibility of the Project from Highway 101 and other public viewpoints to the south of Highway 101 is required to determine the significance of any impact. Analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

b) <b>Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The Project site is located in the northern Santa Monica Mountains in an area that contains several “Existing Official Trails on Public Lands” as designated on the County of Los Angeles “Trail Network Map.” The Backbone Trail exists approximately 800 feet to the east on the Mesivta School property and the Zuma ridge Trail, which connects to the Backbone Trail, is proposed along the southeast tip of the Project site. Further evaluation of the visibility of the Project from trails in the area is required to determine the significance of any impact. Analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

c) <b>Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, historic buildings, or undeveloped or undisturbed areas?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The Project site is presently undeveloped with scattered native and non-native plant species, including oak trees. The Project site is located in the northern flank on the Santa Monica Mountains and contains a ridgeline designated as significant in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan. Although the proposed Project would develop only about 9 acres of the 26.5-acre site and the visibility of the Project from Highway 101 would may be limited due to the elevation difference and location of the Project behind a ridgeline, further evaluation of the significance of these changes to the visual character of the site is required to determine the significance of any impact. Analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

The Project site is characterized by steep slopes, mountainous topography, ranges in elevation from 1,010 feet above msl in the southern portion of the site to 1,250 feet above msl in the northern portion of the site, and a significant ridgeline as identified in the Santa Monica Mountains Community Standards District (CSD). Construction of the proposed Project would result in approximately 630,420 cubic yards of on-site and 143,000 cubic yards of off-site grading and encroachment into the protected vertical buffer area for the significant ridgeline. Further evaluation of the visual changes associated with grading on the Project site is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- d) **Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features?**

Although the Project site is immediately bordered by undeveloped land on all sides, other nearby land uses include Mesivta School to the east, residential uses 500 feet to the northeast and 1,200 feet west, and Highway 101 to the south. Developed residential properties in the vicinity included scattered one- and two-story single-family dwellings.

As proposed, the Project would develop an adult residential facility consisting of two structures, with a building footprint total of 104,963 square feet (Building A footprint area 45,157 square feet and Building B footprint area 59,806 square feet, three stories tall, and 35 feet above finished grade with subterranean parking on approximately 9 acres of the site. The remaining 17.5 acres would remain as natural and disturbed open space. As a part of the proposed Project, the applicant is requesting a Local Plan Amendment, Zone Change, and Specific Plan to establish a plan to allow the adult residential facility with an independent living component and assisted living units with kitchens, and dementia units. The proposed structures would comply with the maximum height limitations for structures under the existing zone and will encroach into the protected 50-foot vertical buffer zone for significant ridgelines within the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District. Further evaluation of Project impacts on the visual character of the area, including comparison with adjacent uses, is required. Analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

- e) **Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

The Project would introduce development in a mountainous area. The Project would develop an adult residential facility consisting of two structures three stories in height on approximately 9 acres in the northeastern portion of the 26.5-acre Project site over elevations that range from 1,000 feet above mean sea level (msl) to over 1,250 feet above sea level (msl). Primary access to the adult residential facility will be from Mureau Road onto a private driveway/fire lane. The location of the proposed structures, location of the access road and indoor and outdoor lighting for the Project would introduce a substantial source of new light on the 26.5-acre site, east and north of a significant ridgeline, and directly south and east of Crummer Canyon, which is, zoned Opens Space.

The location of the structures east and north of a significant ridgeline may screen views of the Project from the west and south. The proposed Project may not create substantial sun shadow on adjacent land uses. The proposed structures would consist of medium-colored exterior wall materials balanced with low reflective glass materials. In addition, the proposed Project does not include large expansive windows but rather multiple windows throughout the structures that may not create substantial glare.

Given the above, the Project would have a less than significant impact associated with shadow, and require additional analysis of light and glare issues. Analysis of these issues will be included in the EIR.

**2. AGRICULTURE/FOREST**

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) <b>Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The site is presently undeveloped land and is zoned as A-2-5 (Heavy-Agriculture-Five Acre Minimum Required Lot Area). However, the Project site is identified as "Other Land" on the Los Angeles Important Farmland 2008 map by the California Department of Conservation. Other Land includes low-density rural developments, areas not suitable for livestock grazing (such as brush, and wetlands), confined livestock or agricultural facilities, mines, small bodies of water, and vacant and nonagricultural areas surrounded by development. Due to the lack of historic agricultural use and agricultural resources at the Project site, the site is not considered Farmland. As such, the Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Source: California Department of Conservation. No further analysis is required.

b) <b>Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project site is zoned A-2-5 (Heavy Agriculture-Five Acre Minimum Required Lot Area), which is considered an agricultural zone and allows for adult residential facilities with a conditional use permit. The Project site is undeveloped and is not presently used for agriculture. The Project consists of a Local Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Conditional Use Permit, and a Specific Plan to allow an adult residential facility with an independent living component and assisted living units with kitchens, and dementia units. Additionally, the site is not under a Williamson Act Contract. No further analysis is required.

c) <b>Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220 (g)) or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526)?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project site is zoned A-2-5 (Heavy Agriculture-Five Acre Minimum Required Lot Area) and is not zoned as forestland. Therefore no impact would occur.

d) <b>Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project site is zoned A-2-5 (Heavy Agriculture-Five Acre Minimum Required Lot Area) and is not zoned as forestland. The project site contains 0.10-acre of walnut woodland, which may be considered "Forestland," as defined by Public Resource Code section 12220(g), but which will either be avoided or replaced resulting in no permanent loss of forestland. Therefore no impact would occur.

**e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?**

Although the Project site is immediately bordered by undeveloped land on all sides, the Project site is located north of Highway 101 with residential uses located to the west and northeast and the Mesivta School to the east. Agricultural uses and forestland are not located in the immediate area or on the Project site. No further analysis is required.

### 3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
<b>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Project construction would involve the use of heavy-duty construction vehicles, construction worker vehicles, and on-site stationary equipment, which may generate air pollutant emissions in excess of applicable emissions standards. In addition, fugitive dust emissions will be generated during grading and excavation of the site. Construction emissions would be short-term in nature, limited to the periods when construction activity is taking place. Therefore, construction emissions would not add to long-term air quality degradation. However, daily emissions from construction sources may exceed daily SCAQMD emissions thresholds for criteria pollutants. Further evaluation of potential air quality impacts associated with short-term construction activities is recommended to determine the significance of these impacts.

Occupancy and use of the Project would also increase traffic in the area and may result in an increase in emissions from stationary sources associated with natural gas and electrical consumption. Daily emissions from vehicular and stationary sources may exceed daily SCAQMD emissions thresholds for criteria pollutants. Further evaluation of the significance of these air quality impacts is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

<b>b) Violate any applicable federal or state air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation (i.e., exceed the State's criteria for regional significance which is generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential uses or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for nonresidential uses)?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Project construction and operation could result in increased emissions in excess of the state and federal significance thresholds. Further evaluation of Project compliance is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

<b>c) Exceed a South Coast AQMD or Antelope Valley AQMD CEQA significance threshold?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Project construction and operation could result in increased emissions in excess of the Air Quality management District (AQMD) significance thresholds. Further evaluation of Project compliance with local emissions standards is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- d) Otherwise result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?**

The Project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which is currently in nonattainment for several criteria pollutants. Operational activities associated with the proposed Project may result in a cumulative increase in air pollutant emissions. Further evaluation of the Project’s contribution to cumulative regional air quality impacts is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- e) Expose sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, hospitals, parks) to substantial pollutant concentrations due to location near a freeway or heavy industrial use?**

The proposed Project is an adult residential facility and is, therefore, considered a sensitive use. Additionally, the proposed Project site is located approximately 0.20 mile north of Highway 101. Further evaluation of potential impacts associated with Project proximity to the freeway is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?**

Grading and construction activities may result in short-term fugitive dust or other potential emissions. This Project is located 600 feet west of the Mesivta Private School. Further evaluation of the significance of this impact is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

**4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) <b>Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The following special-status plant species have been reported to occur in the vicinity of the Project site, as reported in the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB): Braunton's milk-vetch (*Astragalus brauntonii*), San Fernando Valley spineflower (*Chorizanthe parryi* var. *fernandina*), Santa Susana tarplant (*Deinandra mintbornii*), slender-horned spineflower (*Dodecabema leptoceras*), Agoura Hills dudleya (*Dudleya cymosa* ssp. *agourensis*), marcescent dudleya (*Dudleya cymosa* ssp. *marcescens*), Santa Monica dudleya (*Dudleya cymosa* ssp. *ovatifolia*), Conejo dudleya (*Dudleya parva*), Conejo buckwheat (*Eriogonum crocatum*), California Orcutt grass (*Orcuttia californica*), and Lyon's pentachaeta (*Pentachaeta lyonii*). A biological study will be prepared to identify the plant species that have the potential to occur on site.

The following special-status wildlife species have been reported to occur in the vicinity of the Project site, as reported in the CNDDDB database: arroyo toad (*Bufo californicus*), tidewater goby (*Eucyclogobius newberryi*), southern steelhead, Southern California ESU (*Oncorhynchus mykiss iridens*), coastal California gnatcatcher (*Poliophtila californica californica*), California red-legged frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*), bank swallow (*Riparia riparia*), Riverside fairy shrimp (*Streptocephalus woottoni*), and least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*). A biological study will be prepared to identify the animal species that have the potential to occur on site. Further evaluation of potential impacts to any sensitive biological resources present on the site is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

b) <b>Have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations DFG or USFWS? These communities include Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) identified in the General Plan, SEA Buffer Areas, and Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs) identified in the Coastal Zone Plan.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The Project site is located directly east and south of Crummer Canyon zoned O-S (Open Space), which is an Inter-mountain Range Wildlife Corridor and connects the Simi Hills to the Santa Monica Mountains. The Project site is not located in a Significant Ecological Area (SEA). SEA 12 (Palo Comado Canyon) is the closest SEA to the site and is located just south of Highway 101 and more than 1 mile to the west. Given the location and distance from SEA 12, development of the proposed Project would not result in an impact to the SEA. The Project site is relatively undisturbed and contains native biological resources. Further evaluation of biological resources present on the site and impact onto sensitive natural communities is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- c) **Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including marshes, vernal pools, and coastal wetlands) or waters of the United States, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

The Project site contains a total of 42 oak trees, coast live oak and valley oak trees. Additionally, a search of the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) CNDDDB was conducted in 2007 to identify special-status plant or animal species with a potential to occur in the Project vicinity. The database search included the Calabasas U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute quadrangle, in which the Project site is located, as well as the eight surrounding quadrangles.

No major drainage courses are identified on the Project site, as indicated on the Calabasas quad sheet. However, an unnamed dashed line stream is located east of the Project site and northwest of Mesivta School on the adjacent property. The proposed Project would include a secondary access road, which would cross this surface drainage. Further evaluation of the potential impacts to this drainage is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- d) **Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

Three potentially viable wildlife movement corridors are located between Simi Hills and the Santa Monica Mountains, all of which are within the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan: Liberty Canyon (about 5 miles to the west), Crummer Canyon (adjacent on the west and north), and Las Virgenes Creek/Ventura Freeway (slightly more than 1 mile to the west). The nearest corridor to the Project site is the adjacent Crummer Canyon to the west and north. Further evaluation of the potential for the proposed Project to impact wildlife movement in Crummer Canyon is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- e) **Convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, etc.)?**

The Project site contains a total of 42 oak trees, coast live oak and valley oak trees. (Does the site meet the definition of oak woodland?) Further evaluation of the potential for the proposed Project to impact oak woodland is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- f) **Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36) and the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16)?**

The Project site contains a total of 42 oak trees, 16 of which will be removed (four will be removed in the area of the building site and primary access road, eight will be removed for improvements to Mureau Road and the entrance to the Project site, and four will be removed in the areas that will be graded for the construction of the access roads). Further evaluation of the consistency of local policies and ordinances regarding oak trees and other species is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- g) **Conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan?**

See 4(a) through (f), above. Further evaluation is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

**5. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
<b>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in <i>State CEQA Guidelines</i> Section 15064.5?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The site is currently undeveloped and is vacant of buildings. Historical records search performed by W & S Consultants indicated that the Project site never served for much more than subsidiary grazing land for the ranches at its peripheries. No further analysis is required. Source: W & S Consultants, Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Terrace and Hidden Hills, Los Angeles County, California, June 2008. Further analysis whether grading activity may pose any potential impact to historic resources is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

<b>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to <i>State CEQA Guidelines</i> Section 15064.5?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Oak trees are located on the Project site. An archaeological records search was conducted for the Project site. No previously recorded archaeological sites are located within the Project site or vicinity. In addition, an intensive survey of the site confirmed the absence of cultural resources. Therefore, development of the Project site would not result in a significant impact to cultural resources. Source: W & S Consultants, Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Terrace and Hidden Hills, Los Angeles County, California, June 2008. However, if cultural resources are encountered during grading or construction of the Project, the following mitigation measure will reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during Project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 200-meter radius shall be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated to the satisfaction of the County, work in the area may resume.

There is a potential to impact archaeological resources due to grading activities that is significant and typically analyzed in EIR.

<b>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The Project site is located upon surface and subsurface rocks of the Modelo Formation, which has high potential to contain paleontological resources. Four paleontological sites with paleontological resources are known to exist in the Project area. Additionally, vertebrate fossil localities are known to be present nearby in the same Upper Modelo Formation that occurs in the Project area. Source: Eric Scott, Curator of Paleontology, San Bernardino County Museum, Paleontology Literature and Records Review, September 16, 2008, and Samuel A. McLeod, PhD, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, Paleontological Records Search, May 2008. As a result, subterranean excavation at the Project site could encounter paleontological resources. The following mitigation measure will reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

Monitoring of excavation in accordance with the site-specific paleontologic resource assessment shall be conducted by a qualified paleontologic monitor. Areas of concern include any undisturbed surface or subsurface sediments of the Modelo Formation. Paleontologic monitors shall be equipped to salvage fossils, as they are unearthed, to avoid construction delays, and to remove samples of sediments that are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates. Monitors may temporarily halt or divert equipment to allow removal of abundant or large specimens. In the event that paleontological resources are encountered, the qualified paleontologic monitor shall prepare all recovered specimens, both from the assessment and monitoring program, to a point of identification and permanent preservation, including washing of sediments to recover small invertebrates and vertebrates. In the event that paleontological resources are encountered and recovered, the qualified paleontologic monitor shall ensure that identification and curation of specimens into an established, accredited museum repository with permanent retrievable paleontologic storage occurs. The paleontologist must have a written repository agreement in hand prior to the initiation of mitigation activities.

**d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**                       

See 5(b) above. Based on records search and survey, the Project is not likely to disturb any human remains because the site does not include a formal cemetery or any known archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. In the event that human remains are discovered during grading/construction, all earth-disturbing work within a 200-meter radius shall be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated to the satisfaction of the County, work in the area may resume.

**6. ENERGY**

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) <b>Comply with Los Angeles County Green Building Standards? (L.A. County Code Title 22, Ch. 22.52, Part 20 and Title 21, Section 21.24.440.)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed Project would comply with the County Green Building Ordinance and would be designed in compliance with the County of Los Angeles Green Building Standards. Further, the Project would be developed in compliance with all state and local regulations related to energy conservation. Therefore, additional analysis is not required.

b) <b>Involve the inefficient use of energy resources (see Appendix F of the <i>State CEQA Guidelines</i>)?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed Project would comply with the County Green Building Ordinance and would be designed in compliance with the County of Los Angeles Green Building Standards. Further analysis of the Project features will be analyzed. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

**7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) **Be located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**

i) **Rupture of a known earthquake fault.**

The Project site is not located within a mapped Alquist-Priolo Earthquake fault zone. No active or potentially active faults are known to pass directly beneath the Project site. The closest historically recorded earthquake to have affected the site since 1800 was the 1994 Northridge earthquake, which had an epicenter that was located approximately 8.9 miles to the northeast of the site. No additional analysis of potential impacts related to this topic is required. Source: Leighton and Associates, Inc., Geotechnical Review, February 28, 2006. (See **(b)**, below, for Seismic Hazard concerns.)

ii) **Strong seismic ground shaking?**

The Project area is located in a seismically active area and therefore, there is the potential for strong seismic ground shaking to occur. Further analysis is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

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

The site is not located in an area mapped as being potentially susceptible to liquefaction. Groundwater was not encountered during field subsurface explorations and the historic high groundwater is deeper than 50 feet. Development of the Project on competent bedrock would result in less than significant impacts associated with liquefaction and other seismically induced settlement.

Given that historic high groundwater is deeper than 50 feet, the potential of groundwater impacting the proposed development is unlikely. However, localized wet conditions may be encountered off site in the main canyon immediately north of Mesivta School, which may have the potential to affect the secondary access road. Generally, the on-site soils are classified as having medium to high potential for volumetric change. For this reason, further evaluation of this topic is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR. Source: Leighton and Associates, Inc., Geotechnical Review, February 28, 2006.

**iv) Landslides?**





As indicated on the State of California Seismic Hazards Zones for the Calabasas Quadrangle, the Project is within an area where earthquake-induced landslides have been previously identified. A landslide has been mapped in the southwestern portion of the site, adjacent to Mureau Road. The anticipated maximum depth of this landslide is approximately 20 feet. Additionally, landslide debris was encountered during field subsurface explorations conducted by Leighton and Associates, Inc. Based on this information, further evaluation of potential impacts related to landslides is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR. Source: Leighton and Associates, Inc., Geotechnical Review, February 28, 2006.

**b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**





Grading would occur on the approximate 9-acre portion of the site where development is proposed, for the filling of the passive private park, for the primary access road off Mureau Road onto a private driveway/fire lane, and a new secondary emergency access off-site roadway connection on the eastern side of the Project site through three properties. This grading would involve the cut of approximately 386,710 cubic yards and fill of 386,710, the latter inclusive of the off-site grading of 143,000 cubic yards for the secondary access roadway. No earth materials would be exported from the site. The remaining 17.5 acres would remain as natural and disturbed open space. Development of the Project will involve grading of slopes over 25 percent. Given the amount of grading proposed, further evaluation of potential impacts related to grading is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

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





See 7(a)(iv), above. Further evaluation of the potential impacts is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

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





The existing on-site soils have a medium to very high potential for volumetric change. For this reason, further evaluation of this topic is required. This issues will be addressed in the EIR. Source: Leighton and Associates, Inc., Geotechnical Review, February 28, 2006.

**e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?**





Septic tanks are not proposed.

f) **Conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Section 22.56.215) or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element?**

The site consists of previously unpermitted disturbed land in the northern portion of the site (within the “bowl”) which will require remedial grading and crosses a County-designated significant ridgeline from the northwest to the southeast, which ranges in elevation from 1,000 feet above msl to over 1,250 feet above msl. As proposed, the Project would place the adult residential facility north and behind a significant ridgeline on the site to buffer the proposed adult facility from views along Mureau Road and Highway 101. The proposed Project would involve grading to improve an existing on-site dirt road that crosses the significant ridgeline for construction of the primary access roadway and the disturbance of slopes over 25 percent slope to the eastern side of the property for the construction of the secondary access road. Further evaluation of Project consistency with the Hillside Management Criteria is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

**8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<p>a) <b>Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment (i.e., on global climate change)? Normally, the significance of the impacts of a project's GHG emissions should be evaluated as a cumulative impact rather than a project-specific impact.</b></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed Project will generate emissions of GHGs; further evaluation of the significance of this impact is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

<p>b) <b>Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases including regulations implementing Assembly Bill (AB) 32 of 2006, General Plan policies and implementing actions for GHG emission reduction, and the Los Angeles Regional Climate Action Plan?</b></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed Project may generate emissions of GHGs; further evaluation of the significance of this impact is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

**9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

<b>Would the project:</b>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or use of pressurized tanks on site?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Project site is currently and has historically been undeveloped. In addition, the Project site was not identified in the Environmental Data Resources, Inc., (EDR) government database review. Also discussed therein, one site within 0.5 mile of the Project site was listed on the EDR as an open case. However, this site is located down gradient from the Project site and is not expected to have an impact on the Project site. The adult residential facility will produce hazardous and medical waste and other items and/or equipment used for the hygienic care and treatment of residents, which will be disposed of by a hazardous waste company. As such, no further analysis of this issue is required. Source: Applied Environmental Technologies Inc., Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Terrace at Hidden Hills, APN 2049-044-001 Los Angeles County, California, May 20, 2008; California Health and Safety Code, Title 22, Division 2 and 6.

<b>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed Project would involve the delivery, handling, disposal, and the storage of medical supplies and medical hazardous waste, which may include pressurized oxygen tanks. However, the Project would comply with all the applicable regulations contained in the Medical Waste Management Act, County of Los Angeles Municipal Code Title 11, Health and Safety, and Title 26, Building Code, and Title 32, Fire Code, which would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

<b>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 500 feet of sensitive land uses (e.g., homes, schools, hospitals)?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed Project would develop 258 units (151 units, consisting of 73 independent living units with kitchens, 54 assisted living units with kitchens and 24 dementia care units, and 107 independent living units) and 5 hospitality suites. Mesivta School is located approximately 600 feet to the east, and Crummer Canyon immediately to the west and north of the Project site. However, the proposed Project would comply with applicable regulations contained in the Medical Waste Management Act, County of Los Angeles Municipal Code Title 11, Health and Safety, and Title 26, Building Code, and Title 32, Fire Code, which would reduce potential hazard impacts to Mesivta School to a less than significant level. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

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

The Project site is currently and has historically been undeveloped. A site within 0.5 mile from the Project site is listed in the Spills, Leaks, and Investigation and Cleanup Cost Recovery Listing (SLIC). This listing is the Upper Las Virgenes Canyon Open Space Preserve (formerly Ahmanson Ranch) at 25343 Mureau Road. No information was included regarding the reason for the listing and the property is listed as "Case Open." However, the distance and the location of the property, down gradient, to the Project site preclude the property from having an impact on the Project site. Therefore, no further evaluation of this issue is recommended. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

The Project is not within an airport land use plan, within 2 miles of a public or private use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. In addition, the Project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport. No additional analysis is required.

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

The Project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area. No additional analysis is required.

- g) **Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

The Project site is currently undeveloped. Mureau Road would be widened along the frontage of the Project site. The primary access to the Project would be provided from Mureau Road onto a private driveway/fire lane and a new secondary emergency access roadway connection would be provided on the eastern side of the site. Therefore, the proposed Project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. During construction and infrastructure improvements, temporary road closure/blockage/detour may be necessary that may interfere with emergency response plans. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, because the project is located:**

The proposed Project would develop 258 units (151 units, consisting of 73 independent living units with kitchens, 54 assisted living units with kitchens and 24 dementia care units, and 107 independent living units) and 5 hospitality suites in the northern bowl like area of the Project site. Primary access is proposed from Mureau Road onto a private driveway/fire lane. A new secondary means of access is proposed by an off-site roadway connection on the eastern side of the Project site. The Project site is located in a "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)." In addition, the Los Angeles County Fire Department has classified the area as a Historical Wildfire Corridor. For this reason, further evaluation of potential impacts from fire events is required. Source: LA County Safety Element – Wildland and Urban Fire Hazards Map. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- i) in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4)?**

The Project site is located in a "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)." In addition, the Los Angeles County Fire Department has classified the area as a Historical Wildfire Corridor. For this reason, further evaluation of potential impacts from fire events is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR. Source: LA County Safety Element – Wildland and Urban Fire Hazards Map.

- ii) in a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?**

As stated above, the Project site is located in a high fire hazard area. Primary access will be provided from Mureau Road onto a proposed private driveway/fire lane. A secondary emergency access road is proposed that may provide the Project access for firefighting equipment and emergency vehicle access. This road would provide a second point of connection to Mureau Road. The secondary off-site access road would be subject to County fire code requirements including submittal of building plans to the Los Angeles County Fire Department for review and a fire technical report will be prepared for the proposed Project. Further evaluation of the adequacy of the proposed primary and secondary access is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- iii) in an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow hazards?**

The Project site does not currently have water service. However, the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District serves the Project area and would serve the Project site. There are no known water supply or pressure problems in the area. Fire flow requirements for the proposed Project would be determined by the Fire Department. Further analysis of water supply and fire flow standards is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- iv) in proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard (such as refineries, flammables, and explosives manufacturing)?**

The Project site is located north of U.S. Highway 101, in a rural area immediately surrounded by open space to the north and west. Other nearby land uses includes Mesivta School 600 feet to the east and residential uses 500 feet to the northeast. No potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses are in the Project area. However, given that the Project site is located within a Very High Fire Severity Zone; further evaluation of the potential the proposed development's potential of creating fire hazards is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

**10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

- a) **Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?**

The Project would comply with the State Regional Water Quality Control Board (SRWQCB) Basin Plan, County National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, and County Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan. The site is currently undeveloped and is proposed for development of two residential buildings and predominantly impervious surfaces over the 9-acre portion of the site. The Project site is part of the upper Las Virgenes Canyon/Malibu Creek watershed, which is the second largest watershed draining into the Santa Monica Bay and the watershed with the largest area of significant natural resources. The resulting runoff from impervious surfaces has been reported to be the largest single contributor to water pollution in the Santa Monica Bay. Upon completion of the Project, drainage patterns would continue to the south. The Project would involve the construction of a detention basin, which would be located in the southern portion of the Project site to the west of the private driveway/fire lane, and would be designed to ensure that post-development runoff volumes would not exceed current volumes. Within the detention basin, site runoff would be treated and then released down slope, and discharged to an existing drainage pipe at the southern end of the site. Given the changes to drainage associated with the proposed Project, further evaluation of the potential for the Project to result in water quality impacts is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- b) **Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?**

Water service to the Project site will be provided by the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, which eliminates the need for on-site water wells. The area is not known to have water quality problems; however, further analysis is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

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

The Project would comply with the SRWQCB and the County NPDES permit discharge requirements for construction activities. Grading and construction activities could potentially result in impacts to storm water runoff. Additionally, a secondary emergency access road would be located east of the Project site. The new off-site emergency access roadway connection would begin at the easterly side of the Project site and end at the beginning of the Mesivta School. As indicated above, an unnamed dashed line stream is located east of the Project site and northwest of the Mesivta School on the adjacent property. The proposed secondary access road would cross this surface drainage. Construction of the secondary access road could impact this drainage. As construction activities could result in impacts to this drainage, further evaluation is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

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

See 10 (c), above.

- e) **Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?**

The Project site is currently undeveloped. Development would occur on approximately 9 acres of the site with the remaining 17.5 acres to be preserved as open space. There are no drainage courses on the Project site. A secondary emergency access road is proposed as part of the Project, which would begin at the eastern Project boundary, travel northeast, and connect to the northern terminus of the existing access road for Mesivta School. As indicated above, an unnamed dashed line stream is located east of the Project site and northwest of the Mesivta School on the adjacent property. Construction of the secondary access road would cross this surface drainage. The Project would alter existing drainage patterns on the Project site and further evaluation of potential Project impacts related to the existing drainage pattern on site and the off-site drainage to the east during construction and operation of the proposed Project is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- f) **Generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality?**

See 10 (a), above.

- g) **Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52)?**

See 10 (a), above.

h) **Generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality?**                       

See 10 (a), above.

i) **Result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance?**                       

See 10 (a), above.

j) **Use septic tanks or other private sewage disposal system in areas with known septic tank limitations or in close proximity to a drainage course?**                       

Septic tanks are not proposed. No further evaluation is required.

k) **Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**                       

See 10 (a), above.

l) **Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map, or within a floodway or floodplain?**                       

The Project site is not located within a designated floodplain or flood hazard zone. No additional analysis of this topic is necessary. Source: <https://hazards.fema.gov/femaportal/wps/portal/> FEMA, Mapping Information Platform.

m) **Place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain?**                       

See 10 (l), above.

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

See 10 (l), above.

**o) Place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

The Project site is located in the Calabasas Quadrangle in an undeveloped area of the northern flank of the Santa Monica Mountains. According to the California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology Landslide Hazard Identification Map for the north half of the Calabasas Quadrangle, the northern half of the quad is designated as marginal to most susceptible for debris flow. A Landslide Hazard Identification Map does not currently exist for the southern portion of the quad, where the Project site is located. However, the Project area is of similar formation bedrock as the northern half of the quad. Therefore, there is a potential for debris flow in the Project area. Additionally, portions of the Project site contain steep topography over 25 percent slopes. Given the steep topography on the site and the potential for debris flow in the area, further evaluation of this topic is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR. Source: Jose Sanchez, Leighton and Associates, Inc., Project Manager, communication with Impact Sciences, 2008.

**11. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>a) Physically divide an established community?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Project site is currently undeveloped and is immediately surrounded by open space to the west and north. Residential uses are located 500 feet to the northeast and the Mesivta School is located 600 feet to the east of the Project site. Project implementation would not divide an established community. No further analysis is required.

<b>b) Be inconsistent with the plan designations of the subject property? Applicable plans include: the County General Plan, County specific plans, County local coastal plans, County area plans, County community/neighborhood plans, or Community Standards Districts.</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan designates the Project site as N5 Mountain Lands 5, which allows for the maximum residential density of one dwelling unit per 5 acres (a maximum of 5 dwelling units over the Project site). As indicated above, the adult residential facility proposes the development of 258 units (151 units, consisting of 73 independent living units with kitchens, 54 assisted living units with kitchens and 24 dementia care units, and 107 independent living units) and five hospitality suites on a 9-acre portion of the site. The proposed adult residential facility is an allowed use with approval of a local plan amendment, zone change, specific adoption of a specific plan, a conditional use permit, and variance. As a local plan amendment, zone change, specific plan, conditional use permit, and a variance are required, further evaluation of the consistency of the Project with the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan and Community Standards District is required.

<b>c) Be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The Project site is currently zoned A-2-5 (Heavy Agriculture-5 Acres Minimum Required Lot Area). An adult residential facility is permitted in the A-2-5 zone with approval of a conditional use permit. However, the proposed adult residential facility includes an independent living component of 180 units containing kitchens and 54 assisted living units containing kitchens, and 24 dementia care units. A local plan amendment, zone change, and specific plan have been proposed to allow for this development within an A-2-5 zone. In addition, a CUP is required for grading activities of more than 100,000 cubic yards, off-site grading of 143,000 cubic yards of fill, and over 5,000 cubic yards of grading within the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan; and a variance to allow development of structures within 50 vertical feet of a significant ridgeline. Further evaluation of the consistency of the Project with the zoning designation is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

**d) Conflict with Hillside Management Criteria, SEA Conformance Criteria, or other applicable land use criteria?**

The site has previously been disturbed for unpermitted use of equestrian facilities in the northern portion of the Project site, with a County-designated significant ridgeline crossing the property from the northwest to the southeast, which ranges in elevation from 1,000 feet above msl to over 1,250 feet above msl. As proposed, the Project would place the adult residential facility north and behind a significant ridgeline on the site to buffer the proposed adult facility from views along Mureau Road and Highway 101. The proposed Project would involve grading to improve an existing on-site dirt road that crosses the significant ridgeline for construction of the primary access roadway. Further evaluation of Project consistency with the Hillside Management Criteria is recommended. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

**12. MINERAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) <b>Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Project site is not located within a locally important mineral resource discovery site (per the Special Management Map of the General Plan and Figure 6.5 Natural Resource Ares of the 2008 General Plan Update Maps). No further analysis is necessary.

b) <b>Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project site is not located within a locally important mineral resource discovery site (per the Special Management Map of the General Plan and Figure 6.5 Natural Resource Ares of the 2008 General Plan Update Maps). No further analysis is necessary.

**13. NOISE**

Would the project result in:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) <b>Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the County noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08)_or the General Plan Noise Element?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Proposed Project may increase noise levels in excess of standards established by the County noise ordinance. Further evaluation is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

b) <b>Exposure of sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, hospitals, senior citizen facilities) to excessive noise levels?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed Project is an adult residential facility. Additionally, Mesivta School is located 600 feet to the east of the Project site and residential uses are located 500 feet to the northeast of the Project site. Crummer Canyon, which is zoned O-S (Open Space), is immediately to the west and north of the Project site. No other sensitive uses are located in the immediate Project area. Further evaluation is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

c) <b>A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Sources of noise associated with Project implementation are likely to include residential-type noise sources, which include people talking, doors slamming, stereos, domestic animals, and other noises associated with human activity; and adult residential facility associated noises including truck deliveries, emergency response vehicles, carpool/private transit bus service. Residential-type noise sources are not unique and generally contribute to ambient noise levels experienced in all residential areas. Noise levels for residential areas are typically between 48 to 52 A-weighted decibels (dB(A)) community noise equivalent level (CNEL).<sup>1</sup> However, further research to determine if the adult residential facility associated noises will create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety*, March 1974.

- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from amplified sound systems?

Short-term grading and construction activities may result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity, since they necessitate the use of haul trucks, heavy equipment, and power tools. The Project site is subject to noise from Highway 101, which would somewhat mask noise generated during Project construction. Further evaluation of construction-related noise is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

Sources of noise associated with Project operation would involve residential-type noise sources, which include people talking, doors slamming, stereos, domestic animals, and other noises associated with human activity; and adult residential facility type noises, which may include truck deliveries, emergency response vehicles, carpool/private transit bus service. Residential-type noise sources are not unique and generally contribute to ambient noise levels experienced in all residential areas. Noise levels for residential areas are typically between 48 to 52 dB(A) CNEL.<sup>2</sup> The Project site is also subject to noise from Highway 101, which would somewhat mask noise generated during Project operation. Further research of the temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

The Project is not located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of an airport or airstrip. No further analysis required.

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

The Project is not located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of an airport or airstrip. No further analysis required.

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety, March 1974.

**14. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Project site will take primary access from Mureau Road onto a private driveway/fire lane and proposes a new off-site emergency access roadway through two undeveloped properties to the east of the Project site. The Project site is near Highway 101 in an area served by existing utility infrastructure that contains residential uses 500 feet to the northeast and west of Crummer Canyon, which is immediately adjacent to the west and north of the Project site. The Project includes a request for a Local Plan Amendment, Zone Change, and Specific Plan allowing for an adult residential facility with an independent living component and assisted living units with kitchens, and dementia units for 258 total units (151 units, consisting of 73 independent living units, 54 assisted living units and 24 dementia care units, and 107 independent living units). Street improvements include the widening, restriping and shifting of a bicycle lane along Mureau Road. The adult residential facility will require the employment of a maximum of 80 employees to manage the facility, maintain the Project site, and provide care services. The Project will introduce development into an undeveloped area and may not extend major infrastructure that could induce additional growth. Further analysis is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

<b>b) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The Project proposes a local plan amendment, zone change, and specific plan allowing for an adult residential facility of 258 units (151 units, consisting of 73 independent living units, 54 assisted living units and 24 dementia care units, and 107 independent living units), 5 hospitality suites, and would employ a maximum of 80 employees. By year 2035, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Projects an increase of 10,962 people and 1,403 jobs for the unincorporated Los Angeles County area of the Las Virgenes Malibu Council of Governments (LVMCOG). SCAG Projections were calculated with current land use designations of N5 (Mountain Land 5) which yields a maximum density of five dwelling units on the Project site. Project implementation would exceed population Projections. Further analysis is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

<b>c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project site is undeveloped and dwelling units do not exist on site. No further analysis is required.

<b>d) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Project site is undeveloped and dwelling units do not exist on site. No further analysis is required.

**15. PUBLIC SERVICES**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

a) **Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:**

**Fire protection?**

                                                                

The nearest fire station is located approximately 1 mile west of the Project site on Las Virgenes Road (Fire Station #125). In addition, there is a fire station located approximately 1 mile east of the Project site on Calabasas Road (Fire Station #68). The Project will result in some increased demand for fire services in the Santa Monica Mountains North area. Fire flow requirements for the proposed Project would be determined by the Fire Department. Further analysis of the ability of the fire department to serve the Project is required to determine the significance of any impacts. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

**Sheriff protection?**

                                                                

The nearest sheriff station (Malibu/Lost Hills station) is located approximately 1.5 miles west of the site. The Project will result in some increased demand sheriff services in the Santa Monica Mountains North area. Further analysis of the ability of the Sheriff's Department to serve the Project is required to determine the significance of any impacts. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

**Schools?**

                                                                

The proposed Project is an adult residential facility and does not propose any residential uses that would generate students or demand for school services. No further analysis is necessary.

**Parks?**

                                                                

The proposed Project would increase demand for park services within the Project area. However, payment of park fees may mitigate any potential impacts to less than significant.

**Libraries?**

                                                                

The proposed Project would be served by the Los Angeles County Public Library system. The proposed construction of 258 units (151 units, consisting of 73 independent living units, 54 assisted living units and 24 dementia care units, and 107 independent living units) and five hospitality suites could increase the demand for local library services. As required by the Los Angeles County Municipal Code Section 22.72.060, payment of the library facilities mitigation fee would be required as part of the Project. Payment of the library facilities mitigation fee would reduce potential impacts to library services to less than significant. No further analysis is necessary.

**Other public facilities?**

                                                                

Not applicable.

**16. RECREATION**

- |   | <i>Potentially<br/>Significant<br/>Impact</i> | <i>Less Than<br/>Significant<br/>Impact with<br/>Mitigation<br/>Incorporated</i> | <i>Less Than<br/>Significant<br/>Impact</i> | <i>No<br/>Impact</i>     |
|---|---|--|---|--------------------------|
| a) <b>Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</b> | <input type="checkbox"/>                      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>                    | <input type="checkbox"/> |

As discussed above under Public Services –Parks, the proposed Project would mitigate potential impacts to parks through the payment of park fees. Further analysis is required on the available recreational facilities and the demands that may be placed on the existing resources. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- |  |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) <b>Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

The proposed Project would include on-site recreational amenities such as an outdoor lawn bowling area, tennis court, swimming pool, seating area, private passive park, and outdoor walkways. These recreational amenities would be located within the private facility and would be only for resident and visitor use. The development of the private passive park will require the grading of approximately 24,460 cubic yards of earthwork. Further evaluation of potential environmental impacts from the construction of on-site recreational amenities is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) <b>Is the project consistent with the Department of Parks and Recreation Strategic Asset Management Plan for 2020 (SAMP) and the County General Plan standards for the provision of parkland?</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

As described above in a. the proposed Project would include the payment of park fees and the inclusion of open space within the Project site, which would be consistent with the County General Plan standards. The proposed Project would include recreational facilities specifically for the residents of the adult residential facility. In addition to the recreational facilities for on-site residents, the Project would set aside a 20-foot trail easement, to be dedicated to the County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation, as depicted on County Map 4 – Ventura Freeway Corridor Hiking Trails in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with the SAMP and would result in less than significant impacts.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) <b>Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity?</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The proposed Project would dedicate a 20-foot trail easement, which runs through the Project site from the southeast to the northwest, to the Department of Parks and Recreation. Therefore, the proposed Project would not interfere with regional open space connectivity.

**17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel, and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? Measures of performance effectiveness include those found in the most up-to-date SCAG Regional Transportation Plan, County Congestion Management Plan, and County General Plan Mobility Element.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

While the proposed Project would develop 258 units (54 assisted living units and 24 dementia care units, and 180 independent living units) and five hospitality suites, the seven intersections studied in the Project traffic study are currently operating at an acceptable level of service (LOS) of C or better. All study intersections evaluated will operate at the LOS of C or better with Project implementation, ambient growth, and cumulative Projects. Access to the Project site would be provided from Mureau Road onto a private driveway/fire lane. Freeway access would be provided via Mureau Road to the Las Virgenes Road/Highway 101 interchange to the north and the Parkway Calabasas/Highway 101 interchange to the south. Given the general level of congestion at these interchanges and streets in the area, further evaluation of this topic is recommended. Source: Crain & Associates, Traffic Analysis for the Proposed Mureau Road Senior Residential Center Near Calabasas in Los Angeles County, October 2007.

b) Exceed the County Congestion Management Plan (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The proposed Project would generate a total of 24 AM peak hour trips and 39 PM peak hour trips. As a result, the Project would not add 50 or more peak hour trips to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips to a mainline freeway, which are the established CMP thresholds for analysis. Therefore, the Project would not exceed the Traffic Impact Analysis threshold for CMP highway system intersections or mainline freeways. The Project would generate approximately 762 daily vehicles trips. No further analysis of CMP intersections or mainline freeways is necessary.

- c) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the CMP, for designated roads or highways (50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link)?

See 17 (a) and (b), above.

- d) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

The Project site is not located within the vicinity of an airport. No further evaluation required.

- e) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

The Project includes several on- and off-site street improvements, including the proposed widening of Mureau Road with shifting of existing bicycle lane, widening and realignment of the private driveway/fire lane, the new off-site secondary emergency access road (for emergency vehicle use and possible evacuation). Potential line of sight issues could occur with residents exiting the site on to Mureau Road; however, the Project includes an acceleration lane for westbound traffic extending to the existing two lanes in the same westbound direction. Further evaluation of the significance of this potential impact is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- f) Result in inadequate emergency access?

The proposed Project would provide a new off-site secondary emergency access roadway connection exclusively for emergency vehicle and possible emergency evacuation use that would connect to Mureau Road. The proposed Project would be required to comply with applicable emergency vehicle access standards. Further evaluation of the adequacy of access to the Project is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

**g) Conflict with the Bikeway Plan, Pedestrian Plan, Transit Oriented District development standards in the County General Plan Mobility Element, or other adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?**

Adopted policies, plans, or programs supportive of alternative transportation that affect transportation planning in the vicinity of the Project site include the CMP for Los Angeles County and the Los Angeles County Bikeway Plan. Further evaluation of Project consistency with applicable policies, plans, and programs is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

**h) Decrease the performance or safety of alternative transportation facilities?**

See 17 (e), above.

**18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) <b>Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Project site is not currently served by a sewage system. The Project is located within the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District service area. The proposed Project would increase the amount of sewage treated by the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District at its treatment plant. Further evaluation is required to determine if the Project would result in an impact. This issue will be addressed in the EIR, as a sewer area study has been prepared, which was approved in June 2010.

b) <b>Create water or wastewater system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The Project site is not currently served by a sewage system. The Project is located within the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District service area. The proposed Project would increase the amount of sewage treated by the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District at its treatment plant. Further evaluation of the available capacity at this treatment plant is required to determine if the Project would result in an impact. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

c) <b>Create drainage system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The Project site is currently undeveloped. Development would occur on approximately 9 acres of the site with the remaining 17.5 acres preserved as natural and disturbed open space. There are no drainage courses on the Project site. A new off-site secondary emergency access roadway connection is proposed as part of the Project, which would begin at the eastern Project boundary, travel northeast, and connect to the northern terminus of the existing access road for Mesivta School. As indicated above, an unnamed dashed line stream is located east of the Project site and northwest of the Mesivta School on the adjacent property. Construction of the secondary emergency access road would cross this surface drainage. The Project would alter existing drainage patterns on the Project site and further evaluation of potential Project impacts related to the existing drainage pattern on site and the off-site drainage to the east during construction and operation of the proposed Project is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- d) **Have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses?**

The Las Virgenes Municipal Water District would be responsible for supplying water to the Project site. The residential and landscape components of the proposed Project would increase demand on public water supply services in the Santa Monica Mountains area. Further evaluation of Project impacts on public water supply is required to determine the significance of any impacts. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- e) **Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52) or Drought Tolerant Landscaping Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 21, Section 21.24.430 and Title 22, Ch. 21, Part 21)?**

Further evaluation is required of the drainage concept plan that is prepared in compliance with the low impact development requirements. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- f) **Create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

Utility services are not currently in place on the Project site, but are provided in the surrounding area. The residential components of the proposed Project would increase demand on utility services in the Santa Monica Mountains area. Further analysis of Project impacts on utility services is required to determine the significance of any impacts. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- g) **Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?**

Implementation of the proposed Project would increase demand on available solid waste disposal capacity in the County. Further evaluation is required to determine the significance of any solid waste impacts. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- h) **Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

Implementation of the proposed Project would increase demand on available solid waste disposal capacity in the County. Further evaluation is required to determine the significance of any solid waste impacts. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

**19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

- |  | <i>Potentially<br/>Significant<br/>Impact</i> | <i>Less Than<br/>Significant<br/>Impact with<br/>Mitigation<br/>Incorporated</i> | <i>Less Than<br/>Significant<br/>Impact</i> | <i>No<br/>Impact</i>     |
|--|---|--|---|--------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>           | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/>                    | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The Project site is located in an undisturbed area of the Santa Monica Mountains and could potentially impact sensitive plant and animal species, as discussed in **3. Biota (d)**, above. Additionally, the proposed Project would remove 16 oak trees, encroach into the protected zone of two oak trees, and could reduce the quantity of habitat for wildlife species. Therefore, the Project could have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the natural environment, substantially reduce the habitat of wildlife species, cause a wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. However, no important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory may be eliminated. Further evaluation of this issue is required. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

- |  |                                     |                          |                          |                          |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

The Project has possible environmental effects, which may be cumulatively considerable. A list of related Projects will be obtained during preparation of the EIR. The EIR will include an analysis of both individual and cumulative impacts for each environmental topic.

- |   |                                     |                          |                          |                          |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

The Project has possible environmental effects, which may be cumulatively considerable. A list of related projects will be obtained during preparation of the EIR. The EIR will include an analysis of both individual and cumulative impacts for each environmental topic.