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

Project title: *"Calabasas Peak Motorway" / Project No. R2008-00258/ Case Nos. RCUP 201000025/ RVAR 200800008*
Environmental Case No. *RENV 200800097*

Project location: *Calabasas Peak Motorway, with access from Old Topanga Canyon Road, site located one mile south of Mulholland Highway in Calabasas Highlands area*
APN: *4436-001-036* **Thomas Guide:** *589-F2* **USGS Quad:** *Malibu Beach # 70*

Gross Acreage: *10.6 acres*

Description of project: *Application for a Variance to allow development of a three-level (6,000 sq. ft.) single-family residence with new driveway access, situated on the south side of Calabasas Peak Motorway which is a private road atop a designated significant ridgeline under the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District (SMMNA CSD). The proposed on-site/off-site driveway and most of the residence will be within 50 horizontal feet and 50 vertical feet of the significant ridgeline along the east to west Motorway, thereby requiring the Variance application per the CSD to allow development within the restricted building envelope. The maximum height of the proposed residence will be 35 feet above grade with proposed improvements consisting of a private driveway with fire department turnaround, a swimming pool, drainage devices, necessary retaining walls, and a private septic system. The driveway proposed for the residence connects to Calabasas Peak Motorway off-site to the north. In addition, approximately 1,800 linear feet of the existing dirt Calabasas Peak Motorway, which is currently a major riding and hiking trail situated atop the designated significant ridgeline, will be paved and widened to the Fire Department's required 20-foot width, beginning off-site at a distance of 690 feet from Old Topanga Canyon Road. The existing 15 foot riding and hiking trail easement on the north end of Calabasas Peak Motorway will be realigned and improved, but only a very small section of the trail will traverse through the project site's northeast corner as well as the Motorway. The project will connect to a new 277,000 gallon water tank, proposed on parcel APN 4436-001-037 to the north, that will serve the project site through a public water system that would tie in to the existing Waterworks District 29 New Summit Tank located on the north side of Old Topanga Canyon Road. The project also includes a request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) per CSD requirements for the proposed grading of approximately 3,334 c.y. of cut, of which 370 c.y. of cut and 10 c.y of fill is necessary for the Fire Department turnaround, with 614 c.y. to be retained for fill and the remainder exported. An alternative pad location is also depicted further south and down slope from the proposed pad location. The alternative is anticipated to create further environmental impacts than the proposed pad location.*

General plan designation: *Countywide General Plan – (R) Nonurban*
Community/Area wide Plan designation: *Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan (SMMNAP) – (N10) Mountain Lands 10 (1 dwelling unit/10 acres)*
Zoning: *A-1-10 (Light Agricultural, 10 Acres Min. Required Lot Area).*
Surrounding land uses and setting: *The project site is vacant, the significant ridgeline along Calabasas Peak Motorway and a riding/hiking trail traverses the site's northeast corner, and the site's northwest corner is within 50 feet of the significant ridgeline and Motorway; topography on site ranges from light to moderately sloped near proposed*

entrance from Motorway to very steep further south. On-site sensitive natural habitats consist of Coast Live Oak woodland and typical dry montane chaparral scrub dominated by mixed Chamise, Sumac, and Ceanothus. Surrounding land uses consist of vacant land to the west, east, northwest, and a single-family residence to the northeast.

Major projects in the area:

Project/Case No.	*Description and Status*
R2008-00116	*Single-family residence further to east (pending), identified as APN 4436-001-034*
R2008-00257	*Single-family residence to east (pending), identified as APN 4436-001-035*
R2008-00115	*Single-family residence to north (pending), identified as APN 4436-001-037*

Reviewing Agencies:

Responsible Agencies

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

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☒ City of Calabasas
- ☒ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- ☒ Local Tribal Rep.
- ☒ National Forest
- ☒ National Parks
- ☒ Las Virgenes MWD
- ☒ Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mountains Area
- ☒ So. Ctrl. Coastal Info Ctr.
- ☒ SCAQMD
- ☒ Ventura County
- ☒ MTA
- ☒ Las Virgenes USD

Regional Significance

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

Trustee Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ State Dept. of Fish and Game
- ☒ State Dept. of Parks and Recreation
- ☐ State Lands Commission
- ☐ University of California (Natural Land and Water Reserves System)
- ☒ U.S. Fish and 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
  - Design Division
- ☒ Fire Department
  - Forestry, Environmental Division
  - Planning Division
- ☒ Sanitation District
- ☒ Public Health: Environmental Hygiene (Noise)
- ☒ Sheriff Department
- ☒ Parks and Recreation
- ☐ Subdivision Committee
- ☒ County Public Library

Public agency approvals which may be required:

Public Agency	*Approval Required*
State Fish and Game	If habitat is to be disturbed for a state sensitive species it may entail a "Take Permit" be issued from Fish and Game
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	If habitat is to be disturbed for a federal sensitive species it may entail a "Take Permit" be issued from USFWS.

Lead agency name and address:
County of Los Angeles
Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Project applicant's name and address:
Fred Farzan
Elite Brands, LLC
6505 Gayhart Street
Commerce, CA 90040
(323) 767-2600

Contact person and phone number. Rudy Silvas, (213) 974-6462

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

IMPACT ANALYSIS SUMMARY MATRIX		No Impact	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact w/ Project Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact	
Environmental Factor	Pg.					*Potential Concern*
1. Aesthetics	8	☐	☐	☐	☒	*Ridgeline, scenic resources impact*
2. Agriculture/Forest	9	☐	☒	☐	☐	
3. Air Quality	10	☐	☐	☒	☐	*Dust and diesel fumes during construction*
4. Biological Resources	11	☐	☐	☐	☒	*Oak woodland, wildlife migration impacts*
5. Cultural Resources	13	☐	☐	☐	☒	*Potential archaeological resources and oak woodland on site*
6. Energy	14	☐	☒	☐	☐	
7. Geology/Soils	15	☐	☐	☐	☒	*Landslide area, high runoff potential*
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	17	☐	☒	☐	☐	
9. Hazards/Hazardous Materials	18	☐	☐	☐	☒	*Very High Fire Hazard Zone (VHFHZ)*
10. Hydrology/Water Quality	20	☐	☐	☐	☒	*SUSMP for runoff, OWTS for septic, and water tank required*
11. Land Use/Planning	23	☐	☐	☐	☒	*New ridgeline community being created*
12. Mineral Resources	24	☐	☒	☐	☐	
13. Noise	25	☐	☐	☒	☐	*Noise during construction*
14. Population/Housing	26	☐	☐	☐	☒	*Project sets precedent for further ridgeline development*
15. Public Services	27	☐	☐	☐	☒	*Response timing for Fire and Sheriff*
16. Recreation	28	☐	☐	☒	☐	*Trail to be improved*
17. Transportation/Traffic	29	☐	☐	☐	☒	*Circulation system impacts on Motorway*
18. Utilities/Services	31	☐	☐	☐	☒	*Water tank requirements*
19. Mandatory Findings of Significance	33	☐	☐	☐	☒	*Ridgeline and scenic resources impacts, oak woodland, traffic, biota and safety impacts*

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Department.)
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Rudy Silvas — 8/10/11
Signature — Date

Mi Kim — 8/10/11
Signature — Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources the Lead Department cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the Lead Department has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced.)

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA processes, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15063(c)(3)(D).) In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

7) The explanation of each issue should identify: the significance threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, and; mitigation measures identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. Sources of thresholds include the County General Plan, other County planning documents, and County ordinances. Some thresholds are unique to geographical locations.

8) Climate Change Impacts: When determining whether a project's impacts are significant, the analysis should consider, when relevant, the effects of future climate change on : 1) worsening hazardous conditions that pose risks to the project's inhabitants and structures (e.g., floods and wildfires), and 2) worsening the project's impacts on the environment (e.g., impacts on special status species and public health).

1. AESTHETICS

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, including County-designated scenic resources areas (scenic highways as shown on the Scenic Highway Element, scenic corridors, scenic hillsides, and scenic ridgelines)?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Project will impact the natural view of the designated scenic significant ridgelines on site. Travelers along the Calabasas Peak Motorway and on the riding and hiking trail will see the impacts to ridgeline, and possibly travelers going north on Old Topanga Canyon Road will see the impacts as well from a vantage point to the south of site.

b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Calabasas Peak Motorway is a major riding and hiking trail along the scenic significant ridgeline, and will remain with project proposal. Improvements will be visible from trail.

c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, historic buildings, or undeveloped or undisturbed areas?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Scenic resources of site to be disrupted. Project would require 3,334 c.y. of cut, including 370 c.y. of cut and 10 c.y. of fill for required Fire Department turnaround, with 614 c.y. to be retained for fill and the rest to be exported. Total grading quantities for improvement to Calabasas Peak Motorway, for the subject parcel and three additional new residences proposed to the west, east, and northwest, total 5,924 c.y. of cut and 791 c.y. of fill, and are not part of the calculations for grading on site for pad, driveway and turnaround construction. Grading is required for the section of the Motorway through the subject parcel's northeast corner. The grading and alteration of topography would involve some slopes in excess of 25%, some possibly in excess of 50%, and grading within 50 feet of significant ridgelines. Fuel modification requirements will impact native vegetation.

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?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Visual character and quality will be disrupted. Proposed residence would be slightly larger in bulk and height than existing single family residence atop ridge at 1,540 feet to northeast of project pad location. Three additional residences (separate projects) proposed north and to east of subject parcel.

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

Proposed project has the potential to result in new source of light which could increase nighttime lighting in the immediate vicinity, visible from surrounding areas below and to south of the significant ridgeline.

2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Project site is not mapped as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Site listed as "Other Land".

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

Project is a proposal for a single family residence, does not conflict with existing zoning for A-1-10 (Light Agricultural – 10 Acres Min. Required Lot Area), and the site has not been utilized for agricultural use other than equestrian trail through site.

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

Subject site is not located within forest land or area zoned for forest land.

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

Site is not within forest land area.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Subject parcel not designated farmland or forest land, designated Mountain Lands under SMMNAP. Proposed single family residence does not conflict with agriculturally zoned parcel.

3. AIR QUALITY

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

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Project not anticipated to conflict or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plan.				
b) Violate any applicable federal or state air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation (i.e. exceed the State's criteria for regional significance which is generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential uses or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for nonresidential uses)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
The project proposes one single-family residence. Even cumulatively with three other single family residences (separate projects) proposed to east and north of project site, project unlikely to exceed Federal or State's regional significance criteria.				
c) Exceed a South Coast AQMD or Antelope Valley AQMD CEQA significance threshold?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Project is single family residence, but cumulative with three other single family residences (separate projects) proposed east and north of project site, project unlikely to exceed SCAQMD significance threshold.				
d) Otherwise result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Unlikely project would result in net increase of any criteria pollutant, even cumulatively with three additional residential units (separate projects) proposed to east and north of subject parcel.				
e) Expose sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, hospitals, parks) to substantial pollutant concentrations due to location near a freeway or heavy industrial use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
The project is not considered a sensitive use as defined and is not located near a freeway/heavy industrial use.				
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Project could generate large quantities of dust during grading, will be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws during such activities for air quality control. Project grading for 3,334 c.y. of cut, including 370 c.y. of cut and 10 c.y. of fill for Fire turnaround, 614 c.y. to be retained for fill and the rest exported, plus additional grading for segment of access road through site. Once developed, the project is not anticipated to create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
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 Game (DFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?	☒	☐	☐	☐

There is a potential for a substantial adverse effect. Project site has possibilities for any associate of Chamise-dominated Chaparral, Coast Live Oak woodland, and wildflowers of sandstone outcrops: Sta. Monica Shieldback Katydid; Monarch Butterfly, Sta. Monica Grasshopper; Coastal Western Whiptail, San Bernardino Ringneck Snake; CA Mountain Kingsnake; Coast Horned Lizard; Southern CA Rufous-crowned Sparrow, Golden Eagle, Burrowing Owl; Allen's Hummingbird; Pallid Bat, Spotted Bat; Hoary Bat, Western Red Bat; CA Leaf-nosed Bat; Western Small-footed Myotis; San Diego Desert Woodrat; American Badger; CA Walnut Woodland, Valley Needlegrass; Braunton's Milk-vetch; Brewer's Calandrinia; several Mariposa Lilies; Peirson's Morning-glory; Island Mountain-mahogany; Parry's Spineflower; Santa Susana Tarplant; Slender-horned Spineflower; several Dudleyas; Palmer's Grapplinghook; Mesa Horkelia; Southern California Black Walnut (OBSERVED); Peninsular Nolina; Lyon's Pentachaeta; White Rabbit-tobacco; Salt Spring Checkerbloom; Sonoran Maiden-fern

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

Project has potential to impact Coast Live Oak Woodland near central area of parcel, and other sensitive natural communities on site. Site is located on south side of the ridgeline along Calabasas Peak Motorway. The majority of the site is a moderate to steep hillside, with the Coast Live Oak Woodland mixed with other native plants including scrub oaks. The site contains typical dry montane chaparral scrub dominated by mixed Chamise, Sumac, and Ceanothus. Project site not in SEA.

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

Project site is not within a federally protected wetland. Discharge of runoff off-site into any streambeds will be evaluated in EIR.

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

Project site is in an area that may provide for open space linkage. Calabasas Peak Motorway may be considered a wildlife corridor.

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

Grading and fuel modification for the project's pad location may impact Oak Woodland area and other sensitive flora and fauna on site. Grading would remove native chaparral.

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

The site is chiefly covered by native chaparral, Coast Live Oak woodland with Coast Live Oaks located primarily in central portion of parcel.

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

Project conflicts with SMMNAP for protection of ridgelines, the natural setting, habitat preservation, habitat linkages, hillside development. Project exceeds Environmental Thresholds and Appropriate Levels of Development of SMMNAP.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Construction activities for the Proposed Project could have the potential to uncover buried archaeological resources.

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

Project site contains a significant ridgeline in northeast corner, is within 50 feet of ridgeline in northwest corner, and Coast Live Oak woodland. Significant paleontological location to north of parcel near Old Topanga Canyon Road; other artifacts may be present on site.

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

Project site within 50 feet of significant ridgeline in northwest corner which will be impacted with grading and construction.

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

Although no record of human remains on site, the EIR will address mitigation measures to handle the discovery of any unknown remains that may be uncovered.

6. ENERGY

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Comply with Los Angeles County Green Building Standards?(L.A. County Code Title 22, Ch. 22.52, Part 20 and Title 21, § 21.24.440.)	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Proposed Project would be subject to the County and State building codes that mandate incorporation of energy conservation measures, which would ensure the efficient use of energy. Project must comply with County Green Building Standards.

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

The EIR shall address the use of energy, its consumption and conservation as related to the project.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Be located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault.	☐	☐	☒	☐
Project site is not located in an active fault zone or seismic hazards zone (Seismic Hazard Zone Map – Malibu Beach Quad)				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☒	☐	☐	☐
Site is indicated to be in an Earthquake induced - landslide hazard zone. Source: State of California Seismic Hazard Zones Map, Malibu Beach Quadrangle – October 17, 2001. This is an indication of strong seismic ground shaking.				
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Site is not indicated to be in a liquefaction hazard zone. Source: State of California Seismic Hazard Zones Map, Malibu Beach Quadrangle – October 17, 2001.				
iv) Landslides?	☒	☐	☐	☐
Site is indicated to be in an Earthquake induced - landslide hazard zone. Source: State of California Seismic Hazard Zones Map, Malibu Beach Quadrangle – October 17, 2001. Potential from landslide damage during quake is high.				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☒	☐	☐	☐
Rapid runoff and erosion potential is high. Compliance with LID standards, NPDES and SUSMP required.				
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☒	☐	☐	☐
Landslide potential during a quake is very high. Project review by Soils and Engineering at Public Works required to analyze full impact potential.				
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?

Public Works to set forth any requirement for the applicant on expansive soil during grading plan check.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Reports for feasibility of septic system must be submitted to Environmental Health Services and Public Works for review of the Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS) for residence.

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?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Project is not consistent with Hillside Management Criteria of the SMMNAP. Residence is proposed within 50 feet horizontal and 50 feet vertical of significant ridgeline, with top pitch of roof protruding 21.3 feet above ridgeline, thereby requiring Variance per SMMNA CSD.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Generate greenhouse gas (GhGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment (i.e., on global climate change)? Normally, the significance of the impacts of a project's GhG emissions should be evaluated as a cumulative impact rather than a project-specific impact.	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Proposed Project would be subject to the County and State building codes that mandate incorporation of energy conservation measures, which would ensure the efficient use of energy and GhG reduced emissions which could come from fireplaces or other emission sources. Project, considered cumulatively with three additional residences proposed (separate projects) to the north, and to the east, in addition to existing residences in area, not likely to have a significant impact on the environment with GhG emissions. Project and surrounding new residences proposed (separate projects) must comply with County Green Building Standards which reduce carbon footprint and GhG emissions.

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases including regulations implementing AB 32 of 2006, General Plan policies and implementing actions for GhG emission reduction, and the Los Angeles Regional Climate Action Plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Residential project, considered cumulatively with residences proposed in surrounding area (separate projects), would not likely conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GhGs.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or use of pressurized tanks on-site?	☐	☒	☐	☐
Precautionary measures must be taken to store any hazardous materials used during construction.				
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
Hazardous materials used in construction or for road paving must be properly stored on site in the appropriate type of container to prevent leakage of fumes, soil contamination, or from spilling into the drainage course.				
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 500 feet of sensitive land uses (e.g., homes, schools, hospitals)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
During construction, all hazardous materials be properly handled, stored and transported on and off site.				
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Site is not likely on list of hazardous materials site.				
e) For a 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 project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Project site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport.				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

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

Project too small to interfere with response or evacuation plan.

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

Project will require road widening and paving by Fire Department, new water tank required on parcel to north for water pressure to fight fires, fuel modification plan, and safety features built into new structures.

i) in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4)?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Project is in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, out of control fires burning up ridge have potential to cut off emergency access and escape.

ii) in a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Improvements to Calabasas Peak Motorway will allow quicker and safer access, but out of control fire burning up ridge area is a high threat.

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

New 277,000 gallon Waterworks District 29 water tank is required to be placed on parcel to north, APN 4436-001-037, for fire flow and pressure requirements to serve project site.

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

Heavy foliage surroundings, but no refineries or other flammable uses nearby.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☒	☐	☐	☐

SUSMP is required for approval and compliance with NPDES, reports for feasibility of septic system must be submitted to Environmental/Public Health Services for review of the Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS) for residence. Area may be subject to septic tank limitations.

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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Project to be served by Waterworks District 29, with emplacement of a 277,000 gallon water tank on site to the north, with connection to service tanks through water line emplaced underneath Calabasas Peak Motorway during improvements, which would connect to service tanks on north end of Calabasas Peak Motorway and Old Topanga Canyon Road intersection. No groundwater/well water use proposed.

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?	☐	☒	☐	☐

SUSMP required to be approved, NPDES compliance, LID standards compliance. Drainage pattern will be altered with new construction in order to control high erosion and siltation both on and off site. Topanga Canyon Creek located just under 0.5 miles to the southeast, running north to south parallel to Old Topanga Canyon Road, with a tributary just beyond 0.5 miles to the south running along Zuniga Road west to east. EIR will address any potential impacts to the creeks.

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?	☐	☒	☐	☐

SUSMP required to be approved, NPDES compliance, LID standards compliance. Drainage pattern will be altered with new construction in order to control high runoff and flooding both on and off site. Topanga Canyon Creek located just under 0.5 miles to the southeast, running north to south parallel to Old Topanga Canyon Road, with a tributary just beyond 0.5 miles to the south running along Zuniga Road west to east. EIR will address any potential impacts to the creeks.

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

SUSMP required to be approved, NPDES and LID compliance required.

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

SUSMP required to be approved, NPDES and LID Compliance required.

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)?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Project will be designed to comply with requirements set forth under LID Ordinance.

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

Will be addressed with SUSMP and proper mitigation measures identified in the EIR. Project required to comply with NPDES and LID standards.

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

Designated areas to be verified in EIR, but all runoff to be controlled and addressed in SUSMP, compliance required with NPDES. All mitigation measures required to be addressed in EIR.

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

Reports for feasibility of septic system must be submitted to Environmental/Public Health Services for review of the Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS) for residence. Area may be subject to septic tank limitations.

k) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☒	☐	☐

A SUSMP must be approved that will protect water quality. All necessary mitigation measures to be identified in EIR.

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

Not within designated federal Flood Hazard Boundary, floodway or floodplain zone.

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

Structures not proposed within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway or floodplain.

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

Project proposes a 270,000 gallon water tank to be placed on parcel to the north, atop highest point of ridgeline on site with an 8 foot block retaining wall for tank pad support. Safety issue of tank will be addressed in EIR.

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

Project site is in a landslide prone area, mudflow potential high during construction due to steep slopes. Mitigation measures for project development and construction to be addressed in EIR.

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Physically divide an established community?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Project for single family residence, cumulatively in view of three additional residences (separate projects) proposed on ridgeline parcels to the east and north of subject parcel, is in essence creating a new ridge top community. It will be separate from the surrounding community.

b) Be inconsistent with the plan designations of the subject property? Applicable plans include: the County General Plan, County specific plans, County local coastal plans, County area plans, County community/neighborhood plans, or Community Standards Districts.	☒	☐	☐	☐

Proposed residence appears consistent with SMMNAP designation of N10-Mountain Lands 10 (1 du/10 acres) in that proposal is for one unit on subject parcel which is 10.6 gross acres. Cumulatively, in view of the three additional single-family residences (separate projects) to the east and north, all residential structures proposed, including on subject parcel, do not fall into a clustered pattern which if implemented could reduce disturbances to the topographic, vegetative and biological settings. Project conflicts with policies of the SMMNAP and the SMMNA CSD. Variance and Conditional Use Permit are required for pad location, driveways, structure height, grading quantity more than 5,000 cubic yards, all impacting significant ridgeline.

c) Be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Proposed residence is consistent with existing zoning designation of A-1-10 (Light Agricultural – 10 Acres Min. Required Lot Area).

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

Project is not consistent with Hillside Management Criteria of the SMMNAP. Residence is proposed within 50 feet horizontal and 50 feet vertical of significant ridgeline, with top pitch of roof protruding 21.3 feet above ridgeline, thereby requiring Variance per SMMNA CSD.

12. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is not located in a Mineral Recovery Zone. Source: General Plan Special Management Areas map.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is not located in a Mineral Recovery Zone. Source: General Plan Special Management Areas map.

13. NOISE

Would the project result in:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the County noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08) or the General Plan Noise Element?	☐	☒	☐	☐
Noise will be generated temporarily during construction period. Mitigation measures will be addressed in EIR to keep noise to a minimal level.				
b) Exposure of sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, hospitals, senior citizen facilities) to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
No schools, hospitals or senior citizen facilities in surrounding vicinity.				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas?	☐	☐	☒	☐
No substantial permanent increases in noise levels are expected from passing automobiles.				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from amplified sound systems?	☐	☒	☐	☐
Noise will be generated temporarily during construction period. Mitigation measures will be addressed in EIR to keep noise to a minimal level.				
e) For a 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 project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Project is not within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of an airport.				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.				

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
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)?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Growth inducement due to improvement of access road and the proposed water system will increase ridgeline development which this project is a part of.

b) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	☒	☐	☐	☐

The project proposes one single family residence. Cumulatively, in view of the three additional residences proposed (separate projects) on parcels to the east and north, the overall development may slightly increase the overall population projections for a rural area.

c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Site is currently vacant and project proposes one residence.

d) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Site is currently vacant and the project proposes one single family residence.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Fire protection? *The nearest County fire station # 68 is located 2.1 miles to the northwest in the City of Calabasas, station # 69 is located at 401 S. Topanga Canyon Blvd., Topanga, approximately 4.5 miles southeast from the project site which may have response time problems. Narrow windy roads must be traversed to reach site.*	☒	☐	☐	☐
Sheriff protection? *Although area appears to be a low crime rate area, nearest Sheriff station is Malibu Lost Hills at 27050 Agoura Rd., Calabasas, approximately 5 miles to the northwest, which could have response time issues. Patrol cars would have to traverse narrow windy roads to reach site.*	☒	☐	☐	☐
Schools? *Potential for very slight capacity increase at district level, Las Virgenes Unified School District. Potential for slight capacity increase at individual private schools that serve the project site. Not likely to be a significant increase.*	☐	☐	☒	☐
Parks? *Project not likely to increase impact level to parks.*	☐	☐	☒	☐
Libraries? *Library mitigation fees will be required.*	☐	☒	☐	☐
Other public facilities? *No others appear to be impacted.*	☐	☐	☐	☒

16. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Project, along with cumulative impact of three additional residences (separate projects), not likely to significantly impact existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Project does not require any new recreational facilities.

c) Is the project consistent with the Department of Parks and Recreation Strategic Asset Management Plan for 2020 (SAMP) and the County General Plan standards for the provision of parkland?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The EIR will reflect the project's consistency with County Parks and Recreation SAMP for 2020. Unlikely that project, considered cumulatively with three residences to be constructed adjacent to project (separate projects) would be inconsistent with SAMP for 2020.

d) Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The project, although it proposes to realign and improve the exiting riding and hiking trail through the site to the satisfaction of County Parks and Recreation, will allow the continued use of a riding and hiking trail through the site's northeast corner and north of it. Calabasas Peak Motorway is also used as a wildlife corridor and new construction may disrupt its use for wild animals. The EIR will describe the potential impacts to regional open space connectivity and mitigation measures necessary to reduce the impact to less than significant.

17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

The Project, considered in conjunction and cumulatively with three additional single-family residences proposed (separate projects) to the east and north of project site, along with existing single family residence and riding and hiking trail traffic has the potential to cause an impact to the circulation system atop the Calabasas Peak Motorway.

b) Exceed the County Congestion Management Plan (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Single-family residential project along with three residential projects proposed in adjacent area (separate projects) are not likely to exceed CMP Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds.

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

The project proposes one single family residence which would not exceed the CMP thresholds, not even cumulatively with additional three residences proposed to the east and north.

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

Project has no impact or bearing on air traffic.

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

Project proposes one single family residence that will require widening of the existing access road (Calabasas Peak Motorway) to Fire Department requirements. Riding and hiking trail to be improved along north end of Calabasas Peak Motorway, ssection of trail located on site's northeast section. Over this subject parcel, trail does not appear to create any hazards for ingress and egress from site.

f) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Although the project is a proposal for a single family residence with associated fire access improvements to County Fire Department standards and requirements, access road is now gated. Also, visitors for the proposed single family residence during a large gathering would create a problem for emergency access with parking on the shoulder of the access road. Additional three adjacent residences proposed have the potential to create the same problem during large gatherings. The EIR will address the emergency access issue.

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

Project over this subject parcel not likely to conflict with bikeway and pedestrian plan. Riding and hiking trail improvements must meet County Parks and Recreation requirements. EIR will address requirements and all mitigation measures necessary to ensure trail is realigned and improved correctly.

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

Project not likely to have an impact on any alternative transportation facilities.

18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Project is proposed to be on Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS).				
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Project is proposed to be on OWTS.				
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
SUSMP required to be approved.				
d) Have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses?	☒	☐	☐	☐
The project will require a 277,000 gallon water tank on site to the north for water service from Waterworks District 29. The tank will also serve the other three residential units proposed in adjacent locations (separate projects). A will serve service letter will be required from Water Works District 29.				
e) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52) or Drought Tolerant Landscaping Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 21, § 21.24.430 and Title 22, Ch. 21, Part 21)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
Project will be required to comply with LID requirements. The EIR will address requirements and measures necessary for compliance.				
f) Create energy utility (electricity, natural gas,	☐	☒	☐	☐

propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Utilities will have to be provided to serve undeveloped site upon ridgeline. The EIR will address the provision of utility services and any mitigation measures necessary to reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

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

The project, along with the cumulative impact of three additional residential units proposed nearby (separate projects), will have a slight increase to landfill capacity but likely not significant. The EIR will address the impact of the project to land fill capacity.

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

The project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes for solid waste disposal.

19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Project impacts to significant ridgeline, viewshed, biota impacts, traffic circulation, potential oak woodland impacts and large watertank emplacement have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment.

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

The Project, along with three other residential units proposed (separate projects) along the Calabasas Peak Motorway and significant ridgeline, has the cumulative potential for further ridgeline development and related impacts associated with such development.

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

The 277,000 gallon water tank proposed atop of the ridgeline's highest peak on parcel to north, with a surrounding earthquake induced landslide area and above the proposed residence and three surrounding residences proposed (separate projects), may create an unpredictable hazardous situation despite the best engineering efforts. Also, traffic circulation atop the Motorway could be dangerous if vehicles are parked upon it during large gatherings which could cause access problems in the event of an emergency.