

**Environmental Checklist Form (Initial Study)**  
County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning



**Proposed project title:** PM071073 /RENV200900061, RCDP200900002 and RCUP200900060.

**Lead agency name and address:** Los Angeles County, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 91020

**Contact Person and phone number:** Tyler Montgomery, Land Divisions Section, (213) 974-6433

**Proposed project sponsor's name and address:** Malitex Partners LLC, 3427 Clarendon Place, Thousand Oaks, CA 91360

**Proposed project location:** 5700 block of Murphy Motorway in the unincorporated community of Malibu.

**APNs:** 4465-004-013, 072, 075, and 080 USGS Quad: Point Dume

**Gross Acreage:** 88 acres for the proposed project site, plus improvements to Murphy Motorway/Winding Road within the City of Malibu.

**General plan designation:** N/A

**Community/Area wide Plan designation:** Malibu Local Coastal Plan - M2 (Mountain Land, M2 - 1 dwelling unit per 20 acres average), and 3 (Rural Land I - 1 dwelling unit per 10 acres average).

**Zoning:** A-1-1 (Light Agricultural – One Acre Minimum Required Lot Area).

**Description of proposed project:** The Project site is located on the 5700 block of Murphy Motorway within the unincorporated community of Malibu in the County of Los Angeles. The Project site is approximately 88.3 acres and is located within the Santa Monica Mountains, approximately 0.3 miles east of Kanan-Dume Road, north of the City of Malibu ("City") (see Figure 1, Regional Location and Project Vicinity Map). Access to the Project site is provided via Murphy Motorway (previously De Butts Terrace), a paved private road that begins at the County of Los Angeles boundary and is renamed Winding Way upon entering the City of Malibu. Winding Way intersects with State Highway 1 ("Pacific Coast Highway") to the south.

The Project site is currently undeveloped and in a largely natural state, comprised of rugged terrain with steep slopes. It includes an array of undisturbed native vegetation including coastal sage scrub, ceanothus chaparral and native grasses along with oak and walnut woodlands. A prominent ridgeline extends through the western portion of the Project site. Escondido Canyon is partially located in the eastern portion. The natural ridgeline overlooks a portion of Lower Escondido Canyon to the east and Ramirez Canyon to the west.

The Project proposes to subdivide the existing 88.3-acre site to create one ±73-acre open space parcel (Parcel 1) and three ±5-acre each single family parcels (Parcels 2, 3 and 4). The three single family parcels will be located in the western portion of the Project site. The single family pads are proposed atop the ridgeline. The remaining undeveloped portions of these parcels (approximately 10 acres) will be preserved

through a conservation easement proposed for dedication to a conservancy, which shall be named later. The open space parcel contains Escondido Falls and is proposed for dedication.

The three proposed building pads are located on the eastern portion of the ridgeline. The pads will vary in size as follows: 7,227 square feet (sf) (Parcel 2), 6,918 sf (Parcel 3) and 4,721 sf (Parcel 4). The single family homes are proposed to be less than 28 feet in height, which is under the 35-foot maximum height permitted under the Zoning Code; however the height of the proposed structures would exceed the ridge height. As such, the proposed structures would be clearly visible from the surrounding area, specifically Kanan Dume Road which is designated as a scenic highway in the LCP.

To meet Fire Department's water flow and pressure requirements, a 50,000 gallon underground water tank is proposed on the northernmost residential parcel (Parcel 4). To provide adequate Fire access, Murphy Motorway will be widened from 15 feet to 20 feet. Improvements to Murphy Motorway will extend approximately 1,300 linear feet. To construct the road, a series of retaining walls will be constructed along the western portion of the road. The height of the retaining walls will vary. Offsite retaining walls will vary from two to five feet. Onsite retaining walls will vary from nine to 14 feet. A combination fire/retaining wall is proposed along the western edge of the development envelope parallel with the access road to limit the project's proposed fuel modification zone from extending into the adjacent Ramirez Canyon ESHA (Environmentally Significant Habitat Area) to the west.

To develop the three residential pads, 8,900 cubic yards of cut and 8,900 cubic yards of fill is required. An additional 2,400 cubic yards of cut and 2,400 cubic yards of fill is proposed to construct the necessary improvements to Murphy Motorway. A total of 960 cubic yards of cut and 960 cubic yards of fill will occur within the County. The remaining 1,400 cubic yards of cut and 1,400 cubic yards of fill will occur within the City of Malibu. Development of the 50,000 gallon underground water tank will require excavation up to 2,000 cubic yards, which is included in the aforementioned cut and fill figures.

The Project site is proposed for annexation to the Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 29, whose water tanks are located immediately south of the Project site. Waterworks District No. 29 has included a minimum of five water service connections to the Project site providing adequate water supply availability. Water would be extended from existing neighboring connections. Annexation is pending final approval by the Los Angeles County Local Agency Formation Commission ("LAFCO"). Water meters are to be located along the access driveway for each parcel. The existing 6-inch water line will be replaced with an 8-inch water line. All existing public utility easements on-site would remain. Future easements shall be provided on Parcels 2, 3, and 4 for underground utility and access purposes.

The Project site is not currently served by a sewage system. The Project is planned to be served by individual on-site wastewater sewage dispersal systems.

Surrounding land uses and setting: The Project site is contiguous to the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area ("SMMNRA") to the west and partially to the southeast. Escondido Canyon is partially located in the eastern portion of the Project site and continues off site onto an adjacent parcel to the south which is owned and managed by the Mountains and Recreation Conservation Authority. The remaining southern boundary of the Project site is contiguous to the City of Malibu. Low density single-family residences are located to the east of the Project site. The majority of the properties located to the north and south is undeveloped and privately owned. Like the Project site, the surrounding area is comprised of rugged terrain with steep slopes and includes an array of undisturbed native vegetation including coastal sage scrub, ceanothus chaparral and native grasses, along with oak and walnut woodlands.

Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<i>Public Agency</i>	<i>Approval Required</i>
<u>California Coastal Commission</u>	<u>Coastal Development Permit</u>
<u>Los Angeles County Dept. of Public Works</u>	<u>Street improvement and access plans (potentially), sewer connection, Drainage Concept</u>

**Reviewing Agencies:**

*Responsible Agencies*

- None
- Regional Water Quality Control Board:
  - Los Angeles Region
  - Lahontan Region
- Coastal Commission
- Army Corps of Engineers
- Caltrans District 7

*Special Reviewing Agencies*

- None
- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- National Parks
- National Forest
- Edwards Air Force Base
- Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mountains Area
- City of Malibu
- SCAQMD
- Las Virgenes Municipal Water District
- Native American Tribal Representative
- Santa Monica/Malibu USD
- SCIC at CSU Fullerton

*Regional Significance*

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

*Trustee Agencies*

- None
- State Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- State Dept. of Parks and Recreation
- State Lands Commission
- University of California (Natural Land and Water Reserves System)
- US Fish & Wildlife Service

*County Reviewing Agencies*

- DPW:
  - Land Development Division (Grading & Drainage)
  - Geotechnical & Materials Engineering Division
  - Watershed Management Division (NPDES)
  - Traffic and Lighting Division
  - Environmental Programs Division
  - Waterworks Division (No. 29)

- Fire Department
  - Forestry, Environmental Division
  - Planning Division
  - Land Development Unit
  - Health Hazmat
- Sanitation District
- Public Health/Environmental Health Division: Land Use Program (OWTS)
- Sheriff Department
- Parks and Recreation
- Subdivision Committee
- Public Libraries

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this proposed project.

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics           | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions           | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture/Forest              | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials        | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                                    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources              | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Services                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils        |   |  |

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the proposed project have been made by or agreed to by the proposed 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 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 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 proposed project, nothing further is required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature (Prepared by)

01-07-2014  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Nooshii Paidar  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature (Approved by)

1/7/14  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## 1. AESTHETICS

	<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><b>Would the proposed project:</b></p> <p>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project site is located atop a significant ridgeline which is identified in the Malibu Local Coastal Plan (LCP) as a visual resource. The proposed development would be visible from Kanan Dume Road and potentially Pacific Coast Highway, both designated by the LCP as scenic highways. As such, a visual analysis will be prepared. (Source: Malibu Coastal Plan).

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

There are a number of trails located within the general proposed project vicinity. Due to the development site's visual prominence, it is possible that the proposed development would be visible from a nearby riding and/or hiking trail. As stated above, a visual analysis will be prepared. (Source: Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation).

<p>c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed pads would be located atop a west-facing slope of a visually prominent ridgeline. The height of proposed structures would exceed the ridge height and would be clearly visible from the surrounding area. This would impact views of the ridgeline from surrounding areas, particularly from Kanan Dume Road. Pacific Coast Highway is also designated as an eligible state scenic highway and may provide limited views of the proposed project site, which may also be an impact. Ocean views from surrounding areas are not likely to be impeded due to the unique elevation of the project site. To determine the level of impact to the above resources, a visual analysis will be prepared. (Source: Caltrans Scenic Highway Mapping System).

<p>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?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

See explanation under response 1.c. above. Although there are other single-family homes to the south in the City of Malibu, these are not located on a visually prominent ridgeline. A visual analysis will be prepared.

<p>e) Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project could create glare if large glass windows are used in the proposed structures. However, anti-reflective building materials will mitigate this potential impact. Impacts associated with new light sources would be mitigated through implementation of the County's rural outdoor lighting district ordinance (Chapter 22.44 Part 9).

**2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST**

	<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 proposed project:

a) 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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The proposed project site is classified as "Other Land" by the California State Department of Conservation. (Source: Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, California Department of Conservation).

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project site is zoned A-1-1 (light agricultural use, with a minimum lot size requirement of one acre). Per Section 22.24.070 of the Los Angeles County Code ("the Code"), single family residences are a permitted use in this zone. The proposed project is not located within a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area and there is no Williamson Act contract for the property. (Source: General Plan Special Management Areas [1980]; State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection: [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/LA\\_12\\_13\\_WA.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/LA_12_13_WA.pdf)).

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code § 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code § 51104(g))?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The proposed project site is not located near or within an area that is zoned as or for forestland or timberland. Therefore, no impacts would occur and further analysis on this topic is not required. (Source: National Forest Service and GIS Section; last update: 2008).

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The proposed project site is not located near or within an area that is zoned as forestland or timberland. Therefore, no impacts resulting from the loss of forestland would occur or be converted, and further analysis on this topic is not required. (Source: National Forest Service and GIS Section; last update: 2008).

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 forest land to non-forest use?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The unincorporated County does not have any land that is zoned only for forest or timberland uses and the proposed project site is not located in or in proximity to a National Forest area. The closest farmland (classified as “unique”) is located at Kanan Dume Road and Newton Canyon Road, approximately 2.5 miles east of the proposed project site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not convert farmland to non-agricultural land. No further analysis on this topic is required. (Source: Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, California Department of Conservation; National Forest Service and GIS Section; last update: 2008).

### 3. AIR QUALITY

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

Would the proposed project:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD)?

The proposed project falls under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), the agency responsible for monitoring air quality as well as planning, implementing, and enforcing programs designed to attain and maintain state and federal ambient air quality standards in the region. The SCAQMD implements a wide range of programs and regulations, most notably, the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The AQMP was adopted in 2003 and updated in 2007 to establish a comprehensive air pollution control program leading to the attainment of California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) in the South Coast Air Basin. The AQMP also addresses the requirements set forth in the California and Federal Clean Air Acts.

According to SCAQMD, if a project does not conform to a general plan, then it is not within the Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG) population and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) projections, which are the foundation for the AQMP. Because of the size and scope of the proposed project, projected emissions for both short-term construction and long-term operation are expected to fall below SCAQMD significance thresholds. Since construction and operation of the proposed project would not likely exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds, increase the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, neither cause or contribute to new air quality violations, delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the AQMP, the proposed project would not conflict with applicable regional plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the proposed project and impacts would likely be less than significant. (Source: SCAQMD 2007 AQMP: <https://aqmd.gov/aqmp/07aqmp/aqmp/Complete Document.pdf>; SCAQMD CEQA Significance Thresholds and Analysis: <http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/hdbk.html>; AVAQMD air quality plan: <http://www.avaqmd.ca.gov/index.aspx?page=3>).

- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or proposed projected air quality violation?

In Los Angeles County, the levels of ozone, particulate matter, and carbon monoxide continually exceed the Federal and California Ambient Air Quality Standards and the County is considered in "Non-Attainment" for these pollutants. The purpose of this question is to determine whether the proposed project would substantially contribute to or violate an existing air quality standard or existing air quality violation. A project contributes to an existing or projected violation when project emissions contribute to an existing non-attainment level pollutant or push the jurisdiction beyond a non-attainment threshold. Because of the size and scope of the proposed project, the project is not likely to substantially contribute to an existing violation.

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase

of any criteria pollutant for which the proposed project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

According to the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook, proposed projects that are within the emission thresholds identified above for construction and operation should be considered less than significant on a cumulative basis, unless there is other pertinent information to the contrary . As discussed previously, emissions associated with construction and operation of the proposed project would not exceed any of the SCAQMD-recommended significance thresholds and would not cause an individually significant impact. There is no other pertinent information that would suggest that the proposed project could have a cumulatively considerable net increase in emissions. Since both construction and operation emissions are below the thresholds of significance, the proposed project would result in a less than significant cumulative impact. (Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District, Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology, 2008).

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

The SCAQMD considers a sensitive receptor to be a receptor where it is possible that an individual could remain for 24 hours. Sensitive receptors are generally considered uses such as playgrounds, schools, senior citizen centers, hospitals, day-care facilities, or other uses that are more susceptible to poor air quality, such as residential neighborhoods. The proposed project would develop three single family homes atop a significant ridgeline surrounded by an existing residential area in the City of Malibu. Although the proposed project would temporarily subject the existing residential neighborhood to a minimal increase in construction related emissions, the concentrations are not likely to be substantial in concentration and a less than significant impact is likely to occur. (South Coast Air Quality Management District, Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology, 2008).

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

The proposed project consists of the construction of three single-family residences which would not reasonably cause operational-related odor nuisances. Nor is construction of the proposed project likely to result in a temporary odor nuisance. Refuse associated with operation of the proposed project will be disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a significant impact on air quality with respect to this criterion.

#### 4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

Would the proposed project:

- a) 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 Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?
- 

Development Area:

Based on information reported for the region, sensitive species present or likely to be present within the development area, are as follows. Observed species are indicated in bold.

- Sensitive animals: Trask Shoulderband (land snail); Quino checkerspot butterfly; Gertsch's Socalchemmis Spider; Santa Monica Mountains Grasshopper; Silvery legless lizard; Coastal Western Whiptail (lizard); San Bernardino Ringneck Snake; California Mountain Kingsnake; Coast Horned Lizard; Southern California Rufous-crowned Sparrow; Golden Eagle; Burrowing owl; White-tailed kite; American peregrine falcon; Loggerhead shrike; Coastal California Gnatcatcher, Allen's Hummingbird; Pallid Bat; Spotted Bat; Hoary Bat; Western Red Bat; Western Small-footed Myotis Bat; San Diego Desert Woodrat; American badger.
- Sensitive communities: Coastal Sage Scrub; California Walnut Woodland; Valley Needlegrass Grassland
- Sensitive plants: Braunton's Milk-vetch; **Catalina mariposa-lily**; Club-haired, Slender, and Plummer's mariposa-lily; Lewis' evening-primrose; Island mountain-mahogany; Parry's spineflower; Small-flowered morning-glory; Vernal barley; Decumbent goldenbush; **Southern California black walnut**; Coulter's goldfields; South coast branching phacelia; Fragrant pitcher-sage; Nuttall's scrub oak; Chaparral Ragwort.

Open-space area (additions):

The proposed open-space area may host additional sensitive species reported for the region, because the area is largely in its natural state and has diverse, sensitive habitats and watercourses. Sensitive species reported for the open-space area are in addition to those possible for the proposed development area. Species or habitats observed are in bold.

- Sensitive animals (open-space area additions): Monarch Butterfly; Southwestern Pond Turtle; Two-striped Garter Snake; Cooper's Hawk; Sharp-shinned hawk; Yellow warbler; Yellow-breasted chat; Bank Swallow; Least Bell's Vireo; Western Mastiff Bat; California leaf-nosed bat; Yuma Myotis (bat).
- Sensitive communities (open-space area additions): **Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest; Southern Riparian Forest; Southern Sycamore Alder Riparian Woodland.**

- Sensitive plants (open-space area additions): Western Spleenwort; Malibu baccharis; Round-leaved Filaree; Parry's Spineflower; Norris' beard moss; Santa Monica Dudleya; Many-stemmed Dudleya; Ocellated Humboldt Lily; White-veined Monardella; Peninsular Nolina; Lyon's Pentachaeta; Michael's rein orchid; **Sonoran Maiden Fern** (Source: California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB)).

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFG or USFWS?

The area proposed for development has been previously graded, and cleared of much vegetation. The site is located within a very high fire hazard severity zone, and is largely covered by landslide seismic hazard due to slopes. The proposed residence area is bordered on three sides by pristine native habitat, some of which requires vegetation removal per Fire Department's fuel modification requirements. The access road will also need to be variably widened for approximately 1,300 linear feet south of the project site boundary, within the City of Malibu.

The project site contains many sensitive natural habitats.

Proposed residence area: (1) The development site may be a **native grassland** or even may have been a rare vernal wetland area before grading. Analysis will determine if it meets the County criterion of 10% relative cover of native grasses and native forbs for a native grassland. The grassland will be removed for the proposed residences. (2) The development area will require fuel modification in the sensitive **coastal sage scrub** chaparral (CSS) on the Ramirez Canyon side as well as the CSS on the Escondido Canyon side under standard policies of fuel modification to a distance of 200 ft. from structures. (3) The access road widening will possibly remove or encroach into the root zone of mature southern California black walnut trees from the highest area of a **walnut woodland** on one of the main tributaries of Escondido Canyon in the project area. (4) The headwater **riparian habitat** of this tributary will also be affected by the road improvements. (5) Because the project site is currently natural, and is adjacent and intervenes between large conserved areas, it is critical for the wildlife and plants of the greater Santa Monica Mountains to their **connection** with the many sensitive and unique wetland areas of the Escondido Canyon Watershed. (See d. below for more detail on this aspect.) The conversion of the road from dirt to pavement will impact the connective wildlife and plant movement in the region, which currently use the road and proposed house area to connect from the ridgelines to the habitats in the creek of Escondido Canyon and its tributaries. **Wildlife tends not to use paved roads, and native plants do not use paved roads.**

Proposed open space area: The area proposed for open space should specify conservation only. (6) The open space parcel 4465-004-013 has the **ESHA** (Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area) of Escondido Creek and Falls and also an ESHA of Sensitive Habitat (Oak Woodland) in the parcel 4465-004-013 southern area. The ESHA areas would not be developable under the County policies (resource-dependent uses would be permitted), but other areas could be developed. Sensitive habitat types known to be in the open space area that could be impacted by development are riparian areas such as **Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest; Southern Riparian Forest; Southern Sycamore Alder Riparian Woodland**, as well as **Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS)**. Under California Coastal Commission (CCC) policies, the CSS would be considered ESHA, but could be developed with mitigation. (7) The **150-ft. falls** is a highly unique habitat that has not been examined in detail. It does support a wall of **maidenhair ferns** at the base of the lowest level and may have other unique and/or rare vegetation and wildlife areas. **Rocky cliff areas that extend both east and west from the falls are unique, rare habitats that may also harbor rare vegetation and wildlife.**

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally or state protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, and drainages) or waters of the United States, as defined by § 404 of the federal Clean Water Act or California Fish & Game code § 1600, et seq. through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

The proposed development site is on a significant ridgeline and must be prepared with sufficient catchment facilities to prevent runoff from impacting the multiple drainages influenced by the project. Runoff from residences and the access road will have trash, sediment, cleaning chemicals, petrochemicals, pesticides, fertilizer, and other pollutants from habitation suspended or dissolved in the runoff water. The runoff should be actively filtered to preserve water and habitat quality in the areas downstream. The residence area and much of the main driveway will drain to a tributary of Ramirez Canyon on federal land. The access road may directly influence headwaters of one of the several tributaries of Escondido Canyon that begins with willows and other riparian plants just across the access road from the proposed main driveway of the project. Runoff from the access road will influence this tributary and the tributary into which it feeds along the road project's entire length. Escondido Canyon and Falls (ESHA) is a blue-line stream, nearly perennial on the far eastern side of the proposed project in a lot proposed for dedicated open space. This is a jurisdictional area for California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife and may also be a federal jurisdictional area. No development is proposed near, adjacent, or within the main eastern drainage, but its water quality will be influenced by runoff from the access road into tributaries.

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?

Drainages and ridgelines are often wildlife movement areas or corridors, so there is potential for wildlife to travel along the drainages, ridgelines, and roads of the proposed project site. Currently, the Escondido Creek and tributaries are a direct link between the natural habitat of the proposed project site and the public open space to the west and to the south. Some sign was seen from coyote, deer, raccoon, fox, possible mountain lion during the biologist's visits on 2 February 2010 and 25 April 2013 along the Murphy Motorway (DeButts Terrace) and paths to the Escondido Canyon from the residential area indicating use as a movement corridor. Paths leading off Murphy Motorway connect wildlife and plants between the ridgeline open areas and the open space elsewhere in the proposed project vicinity. Paving (widening from 15' to 20') the Murphy Motorway (DeButts Terrace) section as currently required by County Fire Department may deter wildlife movement. The proposed project will likely be able to implement mitigation measures to offer sufficient habitat area around the proposed residential area and the access road to allow wildlife movement to continue in all directions by using cover of locally native plantings and perhaps extending the walnut woodland and facilitating movement on the drainage that heads up near the residence area main drive entry. The project is bordered on the west side by a large block of federal land, which will be conserved in the natural state. An adjacent area south of the project area (but not immediately adjacent to the access road) is currently owned by Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority, a joint powers arm of the State that will conserve or even restore their parcel(s). The southern border of the proposed open space provides a permanent wildlife and plant connection to the Escondido Canyon watercourses from the ridgelines. The connectivity of the project development area is critical to connecting the federal area to Escondido Canyon, since all the remaining borders of Murphy Motorway and DeButts Terrace are

privately owned.

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, southern California black walnut, etc.)?

The project parcels contain a number of unique native trees including oak woodlands, Southern California Black Walnut woodlands, and sycamore-alder woodlands. Many of the riparian Coast Live Oaks are present within the proposed open space lot, which meet the State's definition of "oak woodland." If the open space or parts of the open space are developed, then these oak woodlands could be impacted. There are some smaller oak trees in the area slated for development which may need to be removed. These may also meet the State's definition of oak woodlands. The access road to the proposed project site is adjacent to several Southern California Black Walnut Trees, and the walnut woodland extends downslope to the nearest drainage. Since this road needs to be widened to 20 feet, some of these trees may be impacted. There needs to be careful siting of the access road to avoid as many walnuts as possible, planting to enhance the wildlife corridor habitat, and control of the road runoff. These should be required as mitigation measures.

f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215), and Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.44, Part 6)?

See response 4.b and 4.e, above. If oak trees of five inches or greater diameter are encroached upon or removed, an oak tree permit may be required pursuant to Chapter 22.56 Part 16 of the County Code and PRC §21083.4. There are no wildflower reserve areas on site, but the proposed residence area does have clusters of a sensitive plant, Catalina mariposa-lily (*Calochortus catalinae*), and scattered other wildflower species. Much of the project area proposed for open space is also proposed for inclusion in the Santa Monica Mountains SEA. The SEA program allows development with focused biological review. For a discussion of ESHAs (a kind of SERA) influenced by the project, see b.(6) above.

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

The project does not conflict with a federal Habitat Conservation Plan, as no listed species have been identified on the project parcels. Further, it does not directly conflict with specifics of a known State, regional, or local habitat conservation plan. Connectivity of the permanently conserved areas of habitat in the federal parklands of the Santa Monica Mountains Recreation Area is a long-range goal of the Recreation Area, and the residence area and access road are critical for this function as discussed in parts b,d,e. above.

**5. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

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

Would the proposed project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?

The project site is not, nor does it contain, a known historical resources as prescribed in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?

No known archaeological resource as defined in Public Resources Code §21083.2(g). Although Escondido Falls is located onsite no development is proposed on or near this area.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?

The proposed project site is located atop a visually prominent significant ridgeline, overlooking the Pacific Ocean. The proposed project site is also located adjacent to the Escondido Canyon and Falls. Because of the site's unique features, paleontological resources may be present. As such, the South Central Coastal Information Center will be consulted.

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

See Responses above.

**6. ENERGY**

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

Would the proposed project:

a) Conflict with Los Angeles County Green Building Ordinance (L.A. County Code Title 22, Ch. 22.52, Part 20 and Title 21, § 21.24.440) or Drought Tolerant Landscaping Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 21, § 21.24.430 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52, Part 21)?

                                                                

Compliance with the Los Angeles County Green Building Ordinance and Drought Tolerant Landscaping Ordinance will be determined at the construction phase. Compliance with the Los Angeles County Drought Tolerant Landscaping Ordinance will be confirmed prior to final map clearance. The proposed project would be developed in compliance with all state and local regulations related to energy conservation. Therefore, no impact would occur and additional analysis is not required.

b) Involve the inefficient use of energy resources (see Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines)?

                                                                

The purpose of this question is to determine whether the proposed project would be designed in such a way that it uses/consumes energy efficiently. Per Appendix F of the CEQA guidelines, the goal of conserving energy implies decreasing overall per capita energy consumption, decreasing reliance on fossil fuels such as coal, natural gas and oil, and increasing reliance on renewable energy sources. The proposed project would make use of energy efficient lighting fixtures and LED bulbs. This would reduce the net amount of energy that the proposed project would require compared to standard building materials. Again, the Green Building Ordinance, as well as Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and the State of California Green Code, requires applicable projects to provide energy saving features. The CALGreen's mandatory measures establish a minimum for green construction practices. For these reasons, the project would have a less than significant impact.

## 7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	<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 proposed project:

a) 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, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known active fault trace? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

                                                                

The proposed project is not located in an active or potentially active fault zone, seismic hazards zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. However, the Malibu Coastal Fault is approximately one mile southeast of the proposed project site (Earthquake Fault Zone Map – Point Dume Quadrangle). A geotechnical report will be prepared. (Source: California Department of Conservation Earthquake fault maps: [http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/ap/ap\\_maps.htm](http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/ap/ap_maps.htm), California Department of Conservation Seismic Hazard Zone map: <http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/MapProcessor.asp?Action=Download&Location=SoCal>).

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

                                                                

See response 7.a.i, above. Ground motion caused by an earthquake is likely to occur at the site during the lifetime of the development due to the proximity of the Malibu Coastal Fault and for the fact that the entirety of Los Angeles County is part of the seismically active region of Southern California. The structural engineering of all proposed project structures will be required to comply with all applicable seismic engineering required by the Building Code. A geotechnical report will be prepared.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading?

                                                                

The project is not located in a mapped liquefaction hazard area. A geotechnical report will be prepared to determine whether liquefaction could pose a threat to the proposed project site. (Source: California Geological Survey Alquist-Priolo maps, 1974-2007).

iv) Landslides?

                                                                

The proposed project area is located in a landslide zone. Surrounding bedrock landslides are probable and surrounding earthquake induced landslide areas are located around and within the proposed project pad locations (State Seismic Hazard Zones Map). A large landslide is mapped by the United States Geological Service (USGS) offsite adjacent to the northwest corner of the property. A very small portion of this landslide encroaches on the northwest corner of the property. The structural engineering

of all proposed structures will be required to comply with all applicable seismic engineering standards enforced by LA County Division of Building & Safety and a geotechnical report will be prepared to determine the risk of landslides. (Source: California Geological Survey (CGS) Seismic Hazard Zone Maps, 1997-2005; County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning, County of Los Angeles General Plan, Safety Element, Plate 5, Landslide Inventory).

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

The proposed project includes development of three single family homes atop an undeveloped ridgeline. In addition to grading for the proposed building pads, offsite improvements are required to widen the access road. Because these improvements will replace undeveloped area with impermeable surfaces soil erosion and loss of topsoil may occur. The proposed project site is also located within a high fire hazard severity zone and thus requires vegetation clearance. The applicant will be required to comply with all applicable NPDES and low-impact development building requirements affecting site drainage to the satisfaction of LA County Division of Building & Safety. This should be addressed in the geotechnical report.

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

Further geotechnical studies will be prepared for the proposed offsite access road improvements and any geotechnical impacts will need to be mitigated. Additional soil remediation may affect the earthwork volume and may increase the volume of import or export. If the earthwork volume to be exported exceeds 10,000 cubic yards, a haul route permit will be required. If a haul route is necessary as part of this project, the haul route must be clearly disclosed in the environmental documents and the existing pavement sections along said haul route must be analyzed to determine if the structural integrity of the roadway will be compromised with hauling activities. Appropriate mitigation to bring the structural section of the roadway to an acceptable level must also be disclosed. As an alternative, the environmental document can indicate that the analysis will be completed prior to hauling commencing and that reconstruction of the roadway may need to occur. The geotechnical report will analyze whether the proposed grading and structures will affect the geological stability of the site or adjacent properties.

**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 proposed project would cause minor disturbance to the existing soils that are beneath the proposed project site including the above-noted surface demolition, site drainage improvements, and storm water management trenching work. The applicant would submit expansive soil data as part of any geotechnical report.

**e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?**

The proposed project includes three onsite wastewater treatment systems (OWTS). GeoConcepts, Inc.,

prepared a preliminary report, dated December 14, 2009 treatment systems. Three borings were logged to determine the feasibility of installing three OWTS. Preliminary findings indicate that the site is suitable for septic systems. This should also be addressed in the geotechnical report.

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

                

Hillside management areas are mountainous and foothill terrain having a natural slope of 25% or more. The intent and purpose of the Hillside Management Ordinance is to ensure, to the extent possible, that development in hillside areas maintains the natural topography, resources and amenities of the hillside management areas, while allowing for limited controlled development therein. In rural areas, projects that exceed the low density threshold based on the methodology prescribed in Section 22.56.215.A of the Code, are required to file an application for a conditional use permit. The low density threshold for the proposed project is four. Because only three residential lots are proposed, the project does not exceed the low density threshold and therefore the requirements of the ordinance do not apply.

The proposed project involves developing three single family homes at the top of a significant ridgeline. Development of the proposed pad areas will require approximately 8,900 c.y. of cut and 8,900 c.y. of fill. Required improvements to the access road involve approximately 2,050 c.y. of cut and 2,400 c.y. of fill. Because of the prominence of the ridgeline, these homes would be highly visible from Kanan Dume Road to the west. As such, the proposed project would conflict with the following Conservation and Open Space Element policies:

- Policy No. 16 – “Protect the visual quality of scenic areas including ridgelines and scenic views from public roads, trails and key vantage points” (II-29).
- Policy No. 24 – “Manage development in hillside areas to protect their natural and scenic character and to reduce risks from fire, flood, mudslides, erosion and landslides” (II-30).

For a further discussion of land use related policies, see Section 11, Land Use and Planning.

**8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

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

Would the proposed project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?                       

Construction of the proposed proposed project would result in one-time emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs). These emissions, primarily carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), and nitrous oxide (N2O), are the result of fuel combustion by construction equipment and motor vehicles. The other primary GHGs (hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride) are typically associated with specific industrial sources and are not expected to be emitted by the proposed proposed project. It is generally the case that an individual proposed project is of insufficient magnitude by itself to influence climate change or result in a substantial contribution to the global GHG inventory. The proposed project’s estimated net GHG emissions would have a less than significant impact on the environment. (Source: California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, CEQA & Climate Change: Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Proposed projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act, (2008) 35).

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?                       

The Los Angeles Regional Climate Action Plan is a method for measuring and forecasting GhG emissions for the unincorporated areas of the County. It is comprised of three phases (1) GhG Inventory, (2) Measure Development and Quantification, (3) Climate Action Plan (CAP) Development. Phase I was completed in August 2012 and Phase II was completed in October 2012. Phase III builds on Phase II to identify additional GHG reduction measures and/or revise the measures identified in Phase II as well as implementation. This will be the final CAP document that will be presented to the Board of Supervisors for approval and is on track to be completed by the end of 2014. The project should analyze consistency with the CAP as appropriate.

The proposed project is required to comply with the County of Los Angeles green building, low impact development (LID), and drought-tolerant landscaping ordinances. Therefore, the new buildings will be constructed to exceed Title 24 (2005) by at least 15 percent. The new buildings will be installed with high efficiency toilets. Landscaped areas would be installed with smart irrigation controllers and would contain at least 7 trees, at least 5 of which would be drought tolerant. The incorporation of these features in the proposed project design will ensure that the proposed project reduced GHG emissions consistent with the County of Los Angeles green building, LID, and drought-tolerant landscaping ordinances.

## 9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

Would the proposed project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

The three-lot residential project does not include the routine transportation, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or the use of pressurized tanks. During the construction phase of the project, the project may include minimal use of hazardous materials, such as solvents, paints, lubricants, and oils, which will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

- 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?

The proposed project could use hazardous materials such as paints, cleaning agents, aerosol cans, landscaping-related chemicals, and common household substances such as bleaches during construction activities on the proposed project site. All uses and storage of these materials would be subject to federal, state, and local laws pertaining to the use, storage and transportation of these hazardous materials. Most of the hazardous materials indicated above are allowed to be disposed of at the local Class II and Class III landfills that serve the proposed project site. Since the proposed project would be required to abide by federal, state, and local laws pertaining to the use, storage, and transportation of these materials, the likelihood of an accidental release occurring and creating a significant hazard to the public would be minimal. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No further analysis is required on this topic.

- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses?

Sensitive land uses are generally considered uses such as playgrounds, schools, senior citizen centers, hospitals, day-care facilities, or other uses that are more susceptible to poor air quality, such as residential neighborhoods. The only sensitive use within one-quarter mile of the project site is residential use to the south of the project boundary in the City of Malibu. The proposed project would not include the storage of large quantities of hazardous materials or pressurized tanks. Consequently, there would be no impacts. Further analysis on this topic is not required.

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

The proposed project site is not located on a parcel of land that has been included on a list of hazardous

materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Since the proposed project site is not located on a site that is listed as a hazardous materials site, there would be no impacts. Further analysis on this topic would not be required. (Source: California Department of Toxic Substances Control: <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>).

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

The proposed project is not within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public or private use airport. In addition, the proposed 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 proposed project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the proposed project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the proposed project area?

Anacapa View Estates, Camp 8 (LA County Fire Department), Hughes Aircraft Company and Malibu Administrative Center (LA County) are all private airstrips within the general project vicinity. However, development of the three proposed single family homes would not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the proposed project area. No additional analysis is required. (Source: FAA Database: [http://www.faa.gov/airports/airport\\_safety/airportdata\\_5010/menu/contacts.cfm?Region=&District=&State=CA&County=LOS%20ANGELES&City=&Use=&Certification](http://www.faa.gov/airports/airport_safety/airportdata_5010/menu/contacts.cfm?Region=&District=&State=CA&County=LOS%20ANGELES&City=&Use=&Certification)).

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

The Office of Emergency Management is responsible for organizing and directing the preparedness efforts of the Emergency Management Organization of Los Angeles County. The OEM is the day-to-day Los Angeles County Operational Area coordinator for the County. The emergency response plan for the unincorporated areas of the county is the Operational Area Emergency Response Plan (OAERP), which is prepared by OEM. The OAERP strengthens short and long-term emergency response and recovery capability, and identifies emergency procedures and emergency management routes in the County. The county has also prepared a Local All Hazards Mitigation Plan to be in compliance with federal law and to be eligible for disaster funding. Figure 9.7 of the Safety Element of the draft General Plan depicts the County's fire disaster routes and Figure 9.9 depicts the County's designated Disaster routes. These figures identify the routes that emergency responders are likely to take when responding to an emergency scenario, the routes that residents will be funneled toward to exit an area affected by a disaster, and the field facilities that will be used by emergency responders to coordinate their activities. The proposed project would be located along or near a disaster response route and would not impede emergency responders from using the route or displace an emergency response field facility. (Source: Draft General Plan, Safety Element, Figures 9.7 and 9.9; County Operational Area Emergency Response Plan (OAERP) - [http://file.lacounty.gov/bc/q2\\_2006/cms1\\_043521.pdf](http://file.lacounty.gov/bc/q2_2006/cms1_043521.pdf)).

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

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

The proposed project site is located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The proposed project will be in compliance with all applicable fire safety standards including fuel modification. (Source: California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection - Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP), CALFIRE, County of Los Angeles Fire Department; Last update: March, 2012).

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

Currently, access to the site does not meet Fire Department requirements. However, the proposed project includes paving and widening Murphy Way out to 20 feet. As such, access should meet County standards as proposed.

**iii) within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?**                                                                               

Public water service is proposed pending annexation to Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 29, whose water tanks are immediately south of the proposed project site. Fire hydrant spacing and locations and water flow must be reviewed and approved by the LA County Fire Department.

**iv) within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard?**                                                                               

The proposed project site is predominantly surrounded by rural undeveloped land. The very high fire hazard severity zone extends for miles beyond the project site and covers the majority of the Santa Monica Mountains and Malibu Coastal Zone. The majority of surrounding developed land uses are residential. These uses do not present a great potential for dangerous fire hazard; however, wildfires may occur in this area due to its highly natural state.

**i) Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?**                                                                               

The proposed residential use does not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard.

**10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

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

Would the proposed project:

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

In unincorporated Los Angeles County, the proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements of the Low-Impact Development Ordinance, as well as the requirements of the County's MS4 Permit (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System), in order to control and minimize potentially polluted runoff. Since the project is required to comply with these requirements through the required Drainage Concept/Water Quality Plan from Public Works, the proposed project would not impact any nonpoint source requirements.

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)?

Private water wells are not proposed. Public water service is proposed pending annexation to Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 29, whose water tanks are immediately south of the proposed project site. The proposed project will replace natural permeable terrain with paving and other impermeable surfaces. The proposed project will also require grading and retaining walls for the proposed project pads as well as the access road. Therefore, groundwater recharge will change as a result of the development. Department of Public Works will require a drainage study to ensure compliance with the County's new MS4 permit. Part of these requirements will be to manage stormwater onsite through the approved Drainage Concept and Water Quality Plan. Thus, groundwater supplies will not be substantially depleted.

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 proposed project will replace natural permeable terrain with paving and other impermeable surfaces. The proposed project will also require grading and retaining walls for the proposed project pads as well as the access road. Therefore, the existing drainage pattern will change as a result of the development. Department of Public Works will require a Drainage Concept/Water Quality Plan to show the extent of drainage impacts and provide mitigation acceptable to the County and to ensure compliance with the new MS4 permit.

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 responses 10.c and 10.d, above. Because of the proposed project site's elevation, onsite flooding will not occur. However, grading and paving requirements to the access road could increase runoff rates offsite. Department of Public Works will require a Drainage Concept/Water Quality Plan to show the extent of drainage impacts and provide mitigation acceptable to the County.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

As part of the MS4 permit requirements, Department of Public Works will require stormwater to be managed onsite. However, offsite impacts caused by the required road improvements will need to be examined so that additional runoff does not adversely impact existing or planned drainage systems or add to urban runoff pollutants. Department of Public Works will require a Drainage Concept/Water Quality Plan to show the extent of drainage impacts and provide mitigation acceptable to the County.

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

See responses 10.c and 10.d, above. Best management practices required through implementation of MS4 requirements will ensure compliance with NPDES permits and water quality standards.

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)?

The proposed project will be designed to comply with LA County LID standards. LID requirements will be a part of the approved Drainage Concept/Water Quality Plan prior to tentative map approval.

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

The proposed project is located approximately 1.25 miles from the Pacific Ocean within the Malibu Creek Watershed which drains to the Santa Monica Bay. The subject drainage area is located within a State Water Resources Control Board-designated Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS No. 24: Mugu Lagoon to Latigo Point Area). The proposed project increases the impervious surfaces for both on and off site which could result in non-point source discharges into this area. The grading and paving required for the access road will also likely increase urban runoff. Department of Public Works will require a Drainage Concept/Water Quality Plan to show the extent of drainage impacts and provide mitigation acceptable to the County and to ensure compliance with the new MS4 permit. Project is also required to comply with the State Regional Water Quality Board requirements.

i) Use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas

with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course)?

All parcels on the proposed project site would be served by individual on-site sewage dispersal systems that must be approved by the Department of Public Health. This will be analyzed in the geotechnical report.

j) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

See responses above. No other water quality impacts are expected to occur.

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

There is a 100-year floodplain area alongside Escondido Canyon Creek per L.A. County Safety Element – Plate 6; however, no proposed development will occur within the flood hazard zone. Therefore, the proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard zone.

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

There is a 100-year flood plain area alongside Escondido Canyon Creek, per L.A. County Safety Element – Plate 6; however, no proposed development will occur within this area. Therefore, the proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard zone.

m) 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?

There is a 100-year flood plain area alongside Escondido Canyon Creek but no dam inundation area near the proposed project location, per L.A. County Safety Element – Plate 6. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death as a result of dam or levee failure.

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

The proposed project site is not located in an area subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow. There would be no impact caused by or to this proposed project.

**11. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

	<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 proposed project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

The proposed project is located in proximity to existing residences to the south in the City of Malibu.

b) Be inconsistent with the applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans?

The proposed project conflicts with a number of policies within the Malibu Coastal Plan. A complete policy analysis will be conducted.

c) Be inconsistent with the County zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject property?

The subject property is zoned A-2-5, heavy agricultural with a 5-acre minimum lot size. Single family homes are a permitted use in this zone. The proposed project would create three single family lots with a net acreage greater than five acres per lot. Construction of the single family homes is not proposed at this time; however, the exhibits provided do not show that the proposed project conflicts with other applicable standards in the County zoning ordinance. Compliance with other standards will be confirmed at the time that construction is proposed; therefore, as it pertains to the zoning ordinance, the project does not conflict.

d) Conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria?

The proposed project site is not located in a Significant Ecological Area. The proposed project is located in a hillside management area; however, the hillside management ordinance does not apply unless the proposed development exceeds the low density threshold as prescribed in Section 22.56.215 of the Code.

**12. MINERAL 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>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the proposed project:

a) 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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site is not located within a known mineral resource area and no mineral resources are known from the proposed project site.

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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The proposed project site is not located within a Mineral Resource Zone and there are no known designated locally-important mineral resources located on the proposed project site or in the vicinity of the proposed project site. Therefore, no impact to mineral resources would occur.

**13. NOISE**

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

Would the proposed project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies?

Title 12 Chapter 12.08 (“Noise Control Ordinance”) of the Los Angeles County Code allows a maximum exterior noise level of 45 decibels (dB) between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. (nighttime) and 50 db from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. (daytime) in Noise Zone II (residential areas). Title 12 Chapter 12.12 (“Building Construction Noise Ordinance”) precludes construction activities on Sundays and between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 6:30 a.m. The current General Plan Noise Element (“Noise Element”) does not provide standards for interior and exterior noise and is mainly concerned with noise generated by transportation. The proposed project site is not near a noise-generating site (airport, freeway, industrial site) and would not result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the County Noise Ordinance, the General Plan Noise Element, or the Community Plan Noise Element.

- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

The proposed project site is located in the unincorporated community of Malibu, in a rural residential community. There are no schools, hospitals, or senior citizen facilities within 1,000 feet of the project site. The project will conform to the County’s noise ordinances discussed above.

- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the proposed project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project, including noise from parking areas?

The development of three single family residences and widening of the access road would not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the proposed project vicinity. The only increase in noise levels would be caused by construction of the homes and associated road improvements; however these impacts would be temporary in nature. Therefore, proposed project noise impacts would be less than significant.

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

The proposed project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during site preparation and construction. However, this impact will be temporary and comply with the County noise ordinances.

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

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

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

Anacapa View Estates, Camp 8 (LA County Fire Department), Hughes Aircraft Company and Malibu Administrative Center (LA County) are private airstrips within the general project vicinity. However, development of the three proposed single family homes would not expose new residents to excessive noise levels to the distance of the airports to the proposed project site and limited use frequency. (Source: FAA Database:  
[http://www.faa.gov/airports/airport\\_safety/airportdata\\_5010/menu/contacts.cfm?Region=&District=&State=CA&County=LOS%20ANGELES&City=&Use=&Certification](http://www.faa.gov/airports/airport_safety/airportdata_5010/menu/contacts.cfm?Region=&District=&State=CA&County=LOS%20ANGELES&City=&Use=&Certification)).

## 14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	<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 proposed project:

- 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)?

The proposed project will take access from Murphy Motorway/De Butts Terrace, an existing road within the City of Malibu and a private dirt road within the proposed project site. The road will not be improved beyond the proposed project and would not increase any new access to parcels to the north. Utilities would be slightly extended from existing neighboring utility connections. Therefore, the proposed project potential to induce further growth is less than significant.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

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

- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

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

- d) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population proposed projections?

The proposed project is located on one legal lot. Because one lot is proposed for dedicated restricted use, the proposed project would result in a net increase of two buildable lots. However, the proposed project would not cumulatively exceed official regional or local population proposed projections, due to its scale.

**15. PUBLIC SERVICES**

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

a) Would the proposed 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 County Fire Station (Station 71-Division VII-Battalion 5-West) is 2.1 miles from the proposed project site. It is not anticipated that the demand for fire protection services from the proposed three residential units would result in new demand for physical or staff resources associated with fire protection.

**Sheriff protection?**

The nearest L.A. County Sheriff's Station is the Malibu/Lost Hills station located 8 miles north in the City of Calabasas. The proposed three homes would be located approximately 900 feet from existing homes that are currently served by this same Sheriff Station in Calabasas. It is not anticipated that the demand for sheriff protection services from the proposed three residential units would result in new demand for physical or staff resources associated with sheriff protection.

**Schools?**

The project site is included within the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District. Considering the scale of the proposed project, the three single family lots are not expected to create a capacity problem for the School District.

**Parks?**

The proposed project has a Quimby obligation of 1.71 acres or \$5,825 in in-lieu fees. The Department of Parks and Recreation will require the applicant/developer to pay the in-lieu fees to meet the park obligation of this project (see Park Obligation Report dated July 1, 2010). The in-lieu fee amount is subject to change depending upon when the project is first advertised for public hearing. This is because the representative land values used to calculate the fees are adjusted annually based on changes in the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Per the County's Quimby Ordinance, the fees shall be used only for the purpose of acquiring local park land or developing new or rehabilitating existing recreational facilities to serve the park planning area which includes the proposed project.

**Libraries?**

Library facilities mitigation fee is required for this proposed project, which will result in a less than significant impact on libraries resources.

**Other public facilities?**

There are no other known public services in the proposed project area that would be impacted by the proposed project.

16. RECREATION

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Would the proposed 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?

The proposed three single-family residential units would be an incremental increase in the need for recreational facilities but would not reasonably result in or accelerate their physical deterioration.

b) Does the proposed project include neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project includes dedication of an approximate 73-acre open space parcel proposed for dedication to a public agency, which would be used primarily for passive recreation through trail usage. The size of the project would not require the construction or expansion of neighborhood/regional parks or recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

c) Would the proposed project interfere with regional open space connectivity?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The County does not currently have an approved open space plan. The proposed project would create an approximate 73-acre open space parcel proposed for dedication to a public agency. The proposed project would not bisect or eliminate any public trails; however, there is a proposed National Park Service (NPS) Murphy Motorway Trail within the project site. As stated in the previously submitted Trail Report (see Trail Report dated July 8, 2010), the Department of Parks and Recreation requests a sixty foot non-motorized, multi-use (hiking, bicycling and equestrian) trail easement for the Murphy Motorway Trail dedicated to the County.

**17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

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

Would the proposed project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures 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?

                                                                

The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The growth proposed by the project is accounted for in the Baseline Growth Forecast of the 2008 Southern California Association of Governments' Regional Transportation Plan ("RTP"), which provides the basis for developing the land use assumptions at the regional and small-area levels which build the 2008 Regional Transportation Plan Alternative. The proposed access is not designed to encourage non-motorized travel such as pedestrian and/or bicycle paths. The closest bus stop is located at Pacific Coast Highway/Paradise Cove (Bus #534 Washington/Fairfax Transit Hub -- Stop ID No. 4241).

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program (CMP), 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?

                                                                

The congestion management program requires that detailed analyses be conducted for any location where the proposed project is anticipated to add 50 or more total trips during either the weekday AM or PM peak hours. The trips generated by the proposed project would fall considerably under the established threshold; therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.

c) 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 proposed project site is not located near enough to a public or private airstrip whereas the proposed development would encroach into air traffic patterns. Therefore, there would be no impact.

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

                                                                

The proposed project will take access off of Murphy Motorway, which is a winding narrow road. The road

will be widened and graded so that it complies with Fire access requirements; however, the meandering design will largely remain the same. There would be a temporary increase in construction related traffic which could temporarily impact vehicular access for the surrounding residences. As such, traffic mitigation may need to be incorporated into the project construction phase to mitigate hazards during construction.

**e) Result in inadequate emergency access?**

The proposed project includes widening and grading offsite and onsite access. Grades will not exceed 20 percent. The proposed project design will require fire equipment access within 150 feet of all structures. There would be no impact from the proposed project. As such, the proposed project emergency access requirements will be implemented consistent with the standards of Los Angeles County Fire Department.

**f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?**

Kanan Dume Road (proposed) and Pacific Coast Highway (existing) are designated as Class III bike paths in the 2012 Master Plan of Bikeways. Construction and occupation of the three single family homes located off of Murphy Motorway would not impede the use of these facilities or reasonably decrease the performance or safety of such facilities with the incorporation of mitigation measures to address construction related hazards (see response 4d). There are no transit overlay districts or pedestrian facilities within the project vicinity. The closest bus stop is located at Pacific Coast Highway/Paradise Cove (Bus #534 Washington/Fairfax Transit Hub -- Stop ID No. 4241. Access to and use of this facility would not be impacted by the proposed project. Therefore, there will be no impact from the proposed project.

## 18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

Would the proposed project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards?

The purpose of this question is to gauge whether wastewater from the proposed project would comply with the wastewater treatment requirements of either regional water quality control board. The proposed project site is not currently served by a sewage system. The proposed project would utilize individual on-site waste water treatment systems (OWTS). The proposed project would be required to comply with Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) of the State of California and issued by the local Regional Water Quality Control Board in order to receive construction permits. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

- 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?

The proposed project is planned to be served by OWTS. Per the Preliminary Geologic and Soils Engineering Investigation (GeoConcepts, Inc. 2008, June 16, 2008), percolation testing for seepage pits indicates that percolation rates exceed the minimum Uniform Plumbing Code requirements. Thus, there will be a less than significant impact, because any wastewater generated by the proposed project would not be routed through any municipal wastewater treatment system. The proposed project site is pending annexation to County Waterworks District No. 29, for which the County has indicated an adequate supply of water exists for the three new single-family residences.

- c) 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?

The proposed project site is currently undeveloped. Development would occur on approximately 5 acres of the proposed project site with the remaining 83 acres preserved as natural and disturbed open space, 73 acres of which would be dedicated public open space. It would also include widening and paving Murphy Motorway. It is unclear whether runoff will be contained on site, run into a stream, or into a public drainage system. However, the proposed project would need to comply with the County's Low Impact Development standards to manage stormwater and improve groundwater infiltration. This should be further analyzed.

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

uses?

The proposed project site is pending annexation to, and would be serviced by, the Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 29, whose water tanks are immediately south of the proposed project site. Annexation is pending final approval by LAFCO. The Waterworks District No. 29 has included a minimum of five water service connections to the properties, so adequate water supply is available and will not interfere with groundwater supplies or recharge.

e) 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 proposed project site, but are provided in the surrounding area. The residential components of the proposed project would slightly increase demand on utility services in the Santa Monica Mountains area. The project would be subject to the County's green building ordinance which would require energy efficient measures; therefore a less than significant impact would occur.

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

The proposed project would slightly increase demand on available solid waste disposal capacity in the County. However, because of the scale of the proposed project, there would be a less than significant impact on landfill capacity.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

The proposed project must comply with the Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP). In addition, all projects must also comply with other solid waste diversion documents required by the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939). These are compiled by the Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Task Force and include the following: Source Reduction and Recycling Element, Household Hazardous Waste Element, Nondisposal Facility Element and Countywide Siting Element. The proposed project will be required to obtain approvals and building permits, will be consistent with all applicable solid waste regulations, and will result in a less-than-significant impact.

**19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

	<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) Does the proposed 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 proposed project would create three single-family lots atop a significant ridgeline located east of Kanan Dume Road, a scenic highway. The impact from developing these lots has the potential to significantly degrade the visual environment. The project would also introduce development into a natural area that provides habitat to a number of plants and animals. Although it is not likely that project impacts would 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, each of these should be examined further.

b) Does the proposed project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project does not achieve short-term goals to the disadvantage of long-term goals. The proposed use and density complies with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, but does not contribute to any short term goals related to housing, economic development or the environment. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.

c) Does the proposed project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a proposed project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past proposed projects, the effects of other current proposed projects, and the effects of probable future proposed projects)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Potential significant impacts are site-specific. There are no impacts that are cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.

d) Does the proposed project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project would not threaten the health, safety or welfare of human beings. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on human beings.