COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
320 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

# NEGATIVE DECLARATION

**PROJECT NUMBER:** *R2009-00171/RENV2009-00106/RCUP2009-00013/ROAK2010-00008*

**1. DESCRIPTION:**

*The project proposes to install wireless telecommunications equipment on an existing utility pole that currently contains cable and phone lines. The installation entails attachment of two (2) two-foot vertical directional antennas to two (2) six-foot (6') horizontal extension arms, one (1) microcell cabinet, and one (1) junction box. The project also includes one (1) eight-foot (8') ground rod to be installed underground two feet (2') from the existing pole. A six-inch (6") trench will be excavated between the ground rod and the existing pole. The existing 39-foot utility pole is located within the public right of way on the east side of Topanga Canyon Boulevard (State Highway 27) and adjacent to private residential properties. The extension arms and directional antennas will be located at the top of the utility pole, and the microcell and junction box will be located seven feet, six inches (7'-6") from the bottom (grade level) of the pole. The microcell and junction box will be attached vertically on the pole and will not extend outward. The height of the utility pole will not be increased and the new equipment will not extend above the height of the utility pole.*

**2. LOCATION:** *Topanga Canyon Boulevard right-of-way, Topanga, adjacent to APN:4441-026-015*

**3. PROPONENT:**

*Steve Gonzales*
*Cable Engineering Services*
*Prescott Communications, Inc.*
*10640 Sepulveda Blvd., Suite 1*
*Mission Hills, CA 91345*

**4. FINDINGS OF NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT:**

BASED ON THE INITIAL STUDY, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.

**5. LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS:**

THE LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS ON WHICH ADOPTION OF THIS NEGATIVE DECLARATION IS BASED IS: DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING, 320 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

**PREPARED BY:** Jeffrey A. Juarez

**DATE:** *May 25, 2010*

**STAFF USE ONLY**

PROJECT NUMBER: *R2009-00171*
CASES: *RENV2009-00106*
*RCUP2009-00013*
*ROAK2010-00008*

*** * * * INITIAL STUDY * * * ***

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**
**DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING**

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: *April 1, 2010* Staff Member: *Jeff Juarez*

Thomas Guide: *590, C3* USGS Quad: *Topanga*

Location: *Topanga Canyon Boulevard, Topanga (unincorporated Los Angeles County); adjacent to APN:4441-026-015*

Description of Project: *The project proposes to install wireless telecommunications equipment on an existing utility pole that currently contains cable and phone lines. The installation entails attachment of two (2) two-foot vertical directional antennas to two (2) six-foot (6') horizontal extension arms, one (1) microcell cabinet, and one (1) junction box. The project also includes one (1) eight-foot (8') ground rod to be installed underground two feet (2') from the existing pole. A six-inch (6") trench will be excavated between the ground rod and the existing pole. The existing 39-foot utility pole is located within the public right of way on the east side of Topanga Canyon Boulevard (State Highway 27) and adjacent to private residential properties. The extension arms and directional antennas will be located at the top of the utility pole, and the microcell and junction box will be located seven feet, six inches (7'-6") from the bottom (grade level) of the pole. The microcell and junction box will be attached vertically on the pole and will not extend outward. The height of the utility pole will not be increased and the new equipment will not extend above the height of the utility pole.*

Gross Acres: *NA*

Environmental Setting: *The project site is located in the Topanga Canyon area (Topanga) of the Malibu Coastal Zone portion of the Santa Monica Mountains. Topanga is characterized by steep canyons, winding roads, oak and riparian woodlands, and several creeks, including Topanga Canyon Creek, located west of Topanga Canyon Boulevard. The surrounding area of the project site contains gently sloping terrain. Land use in the area is primarily residential and open space, with land use density ranges of one dwelling unit per acre to one dwelling unit per five acres.*

Zoning: *NA*

General Plan: *NA*

Community/Area wide Plan: *Malibu Local Coastal Plan*

**Major projects in area:**

| PROJECT NUMBER | DESCRIPTION & STATUS |
|---|---|
| *NA* | *NA* |
| | |

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

## REVIEWING AGENCIES

Responsible Agencies

- [x] None
- [ ] Regional Water Quality Control Board
  - [ ] Los Angeles Region
  - [ ] Lahontan Region
- [ ] Coastal Commission
- [ ] Army Corps of Engineers
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]

Trustee Agencies

- [x] None
- [ ] State Fish and Game
- [ ] State Parks
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]

Special Reviewing Agencies

- [x] None
- [ ] Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- [ ] National Parks
- [ ] National Forest
- [ ] Edwards Air Force Base
- [ ] Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns. Area
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]

Regional Significance

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

County Reviewing Agencies

- [ ] Subdivision Committee
- [ ] DPW:
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]

| **IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX** | | ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Less than Significant Impact/No Impact | | | |
| | | | | Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation | | |
| | | | | | Potentially Significant Impact | |
| **CATEGORY** | **FACTOR** | Pg | | | | Potential Concern |
| HAZARDS | 1. Geotechnical | 5 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 2. Flood | 6 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 3. Fire | 7 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 4. Noise | 8 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| RESOURCES | 1. Water Quality | 9 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 2. Air Quality | 10 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 3. Biota | 11 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 4. Cultural Resources | 13 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 5. Mineral Resources | 14 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 6. Agriculture Resources | 15 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 7. Visual Qualities | 16 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| SERVICES | 1. Traffic/Access | 17 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 2. Sewage Disposal | 18 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 3. Education | 19 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 4. Fire/Sheriff | 20 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 5. Utilities | 21 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| OTHER | 1. General | 22 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 2. Environmental Safety | 23 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 3. Land Use | 24 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec. | 25 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 5. Mandatory Findings | 26 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |

**Environmental Finding:**

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

☒ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

☐ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

☐ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant".

☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The Addendum EIR is required to analyze only the factors changed or not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: _____ Date: 5/25/10
Jeff Juarez

Approved by: _____ Date: 5-25-10
Paul McCarthy

☐ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filling fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

## HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? |
| b. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)? *The project site is located in an area containing occurrence of landslide.* |
| c. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability? *The project site is located in an area having high slope instability.* |
| d. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction? *The project site is located in an area prone to liquefaction.* |
| e. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard? |
| f. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%? *No grading is proposed as part of this project, only minor trenching will occur.* |
| g. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? |
| h. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other factors? |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Sections 308B, 309, 310, and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

*The project site is located in an area known to have geotechnical problems. However, because the project proposes to install wireless communications equipment on an existing utility pole that is located on flat terrain, and because no grading is proposed and only minor trenching will occur, the project will likely not impact nor be impacted by geotechnical factors.*

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No Impact

## HAZARDS - 2. Flood

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?<br>*A major drainage course is located in the surrounding area of the project site: Topanga Canyon Creek is approximately 120 feet west of the utility pole. This project will in no way affect this drainage course.* |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone? |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions? |
| d. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off?<br>*The proposed project entails installation of wireless communications equipment on an existing utility pole, and does not propose any grading.* |
| e. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?<br>*No grading or alteration of existing drainage courses or patterns is proposed.* |
| f. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Section 308A ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)
☐ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## HAZARDS - 3. Fire

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)? |
| b. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?<br>*The project site is within the Santa Monica Mountains, a high fire hazard area. The project site is accessible by Topanga Canyon Boulevard.* |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?<br>*The project site does not contain any dwelling units.* |
| d. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? |
| e. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)? |
| f. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard? |
| g. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other factors? |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☐ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☐ Fire Regulation No. 8
☐ Fuel Modification / Landscape Plan

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## HAZARDS - 4. Noise

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)? |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity? |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project? |
| d. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project? *An increase in temporary noise levels could be generated by the wireless equipment installation activities, however this increase is expected to be minor.* |
| e. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other factors? |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ Noise Control (Title 12 – Chapter 8) ☐ Uniform Building Code (Title 26 - Chapter 35)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells? |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system? |
| | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations *or* is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course? |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies? |
| d. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies? *The proposed project will not increase stormwater runoff in the area.* |
| e. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other factors? *The proposed wireless telecommunications equipment will not impact water quality in any way: no grading will occur, runoff will not be increased, and drainage in the area will not be affected.* |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ Industrial Waste Permit
☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269
☐ Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5
☐ NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**
☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **water quality** problems?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)? |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use? |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance?<br>*Traffic will not be affected by this project; no local emissions will be generated by this project.* |
| d. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions? |
| e. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? |
| f. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? |
| g. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?<br>*No emissions will be generated by the wireless telecommunications equipment.* |
| h. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other factors?<br>*The proposed wireless telecommunications equipment will not impact air quality in any way.* |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Project Design ☐ Air Quality Report

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **air quality**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 3. Biota

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the project site located within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?<br>*The project site is located within a Sensitive Environmental Resource Area (SERA) containing oak woodlands and savannahs. The immediate area of the project site is disturbed, contains both native and non-native vegetation, and Topanga Canyon Boulevard is right adjacent to the existing utility pole; the surrounding area contains residential development and open space. Because no grading is proposed and only minor trenching will occur, the project will not likely impact the SERA. Topanga Canyon Creek (a designated ESHA) is approximately 120 feet west of the utility pole. The project will in no way affect this drainage course.* |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?<br>*No grading or vegetation clearance is proposed as part of this project.* |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is a drainage course located on the project site that is depicted on USGS quad sheets by a dashed blue line or that may contain a bed, channel, or bank of any perennial, intermittent or ephemeral river, stream, or lake?<br>*A USGS drainage course is located in the surrounding area of the project, but not in the immediate area of the utility pole. The project will not impact this local drainage course.* |
| d. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g. coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)?<br>*The surrounding area of the project site is characterized by oak woodlands and savannahs. There is a potential to impact one nearby oak tree due to proposed minor trenching (see 3.e, below).* |
| e. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?<br>*A mature oak tree is located along the east side (northbound) of Topanga Canyon Boulevard and approximately 50 to 60 feet south of the existing utility pole. The pole is located well outside of the oak tree's protected zone. An oak tree report (dated July 29, 2009) prepared for this project indicates that the proposed trenching to install power conduit between the subject utility pole and a second existing utility pole located further south will pass beneath the edge of the dripline on the westerly side of the tree, and concludes that the overall anticipated impact will be minimal given the distance from the trunk to the dripline. An Oak Tree Permit application has been submitted to allow for this minor encroachment, and the project will be required to comply with all requirements of the permit to ensure protection of this oak tree.* |
| f. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)? |

g. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ ERB/SEATAC Review ☒ Oak Tree Permit

*The proposed project was reviewed by the Environmental Review Board (ERB) on May 17, 2010, and it concluded that the project is in compliance with the policies and standards of the Malibu Local Coastal Plan. The project will be subject to the requirements of the oak tree permit.*

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, **biotic** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity? *The surrounding area of the project site contains one USGS drainage course, oak woodlands and savannahs, and one oak tree located approximately 50 to 60 feet from the existing utility pole. This project will have no affect on the drainage course, and only minimal impact to the nearby oak tree due to minor trenching adjacent to the dripline of the tree.* |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources? |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites? |
| d. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5? |
| e. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? |
| f. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other factors? |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Phase 1 Archaeology Report

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical**, or **paleontological** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 5. Mineral Resources

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other factors? |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

---

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use? |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? |
| d. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other factors? |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

---

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?<br>*Topanga Canyon Boulevard is not a designated scenic highway and it is not located in an area designated as a scenic corridor.* |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail? |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features?<br>*The Topanga area contains extensive residential development.* |
| d. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?<br>*The project will not increase the height of the utility pole, and the new equipment will not extend above the height of the pole. The proposed 6-foot horizontal extensions will be similar in length to the pole's existing horizontal supports. The proposed antennas are not particularly bulky and are not likely to be noticeable. The project proposes to match the color of the wireless equipment to the utility pole. Overall, the project will produce minimal or no visual or aesthetic impacts on the surrounding residential uses, nor on travelers along Topanga Canyon Boulevard.* |
| e. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems? |
| f. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)? |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**
☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**
☐ Visual Report ☐ Compatible Use

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Does the project contain 25 dwelling units or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)? |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions? *The existing utility pole is located in the Topanga Canyon Boulevard right of way. However, the proposed equipment will not extend out over the boulevard and will not block visibility of the road.* |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions? |
| d. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area? |
| e. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded? |
| f. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)? |
| g. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other factors? |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**
☐ Project Design ☐ Traffic Report

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**
☐ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **traffic/access** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant? |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site? |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other factors? |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## SERVICES - 3. Education

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project create capacity problems at the district level? |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site? |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project create student transportation problems? |
| d. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand? |
| e. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other factors? |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Site Dedication ☐ Government Code Section 65995 ☐ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

*The proposed project does not entail new residential development that would increase demand for services.*

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site? |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area? |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other factors? |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Fire Mitigation Fee

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells? |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs? |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane? *The existing utility pole contains cable and phone service lines, which will not be impacted by the proposed wireless equipment. The proposed equipment will be placed on the pole at required minimum distances to avoid interference or disruption of current service lines.* |
| d. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)? |
| e. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)? |
| f. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other factors? |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ Water Code – Ordinance No. 7834

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities** services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources? |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community? |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land? |
| d. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other factors? |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site? |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site? |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?<br>*The project proposes new wireless communications equipment on an existing utility pole and is not anticipated to adversely affect the residential area located within 500 feet of the project site.* |
| d. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site or is the site located within two miles downstream of a known groundwater contamination source within the same watershed? |
| e. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment? |
| f. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? |
| g. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment? |
| h. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip? |
| i. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? |
| j. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors? |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**
☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?<br>*The existing utility pole is located within the Topanga Canyon Blvd. public right of way.* |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property? |
| c. | | | | Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria: |
| | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Hillside Management Criteria? |
| | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | SEA Conformance Criteria? |
| | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other? |
| d. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project physically divide an established community? |
| e. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other factors? |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)? |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? |
| d. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)? |
| e. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents? |
| f. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? |
| g. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other factors? |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment,** or **recreational** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, 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? |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Does the project have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? |

## CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact