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

Project title: Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District Vineyard Ordinance / R2015-02310-(3)/ RADV201500007

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

Contact Person and phone number: Anita Gutierrez, (213) 974-6422

Project location: Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District as identified on the map following Section 22.44.133 of Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code.

APN: Various
USGS Quad: Thousand Oaks, Calabasas, Canoga Park, Triunfo Pass, Point Dume, Malibu Beach, Topanga

Gross Acreage: 21,176 acres

General plan designation: N/A

Community/Area wide Plan designation: OS, OS-P, OS-DR, OS-W, N20, N10, N5, N2, N1, U2, U4, U8, C, CR, P, TC

Zoning: Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District: R-1, RPD, A-1, A-2, C-2, C-3, CPD, C-M, C-R, M-1, M-2, MPD, O-S, R-R, I-T

Description of project:
The proposed project would amend the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District CSD by adding a definition of vineyards, adding new development standards for the development and operation of vineyards in all zones within the CSD, adding development standards for all new water wells, and requiring a Conditional Use Permit for all new water wells as either a primary or accessory use within the CSD. The proposed CSD amendment may also require all vineyards to be subject to a discretionary review.

Title 22 is the Planning and Zoning Section of the Los Angeles County Code. CSD's are established as supplemental districts to provide a means of implementing special development standards contained in a specific community or to provide a means of addressing special problems that are unique to certain geographic areas within the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. The Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD was established in August 20, 2002 to implement the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan.

The proposed amendment to the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD will be applied to all zones in the CSD and would set the following development standards:

Definitions:

1. "Synthetic substances" are those that are formulated or manufactured by a chemical process or by a process that chemically changes a substance extracted from naturally occurring plant, animal, or mineral sources, except that such term shall not apply to substances created by naturally occurring biological processes.

2. "Vineyard" is a type of crop that includes a plantation of grapevines, typically producing table grapes or grapes used in winemaking.

3. "Wildlife-permeable fencing" means fencing that can be easily bypassed by all species of wildlife found within the Santa Monica Mountains, including but not limited to deer, coyotes, bobcats, mountain lions, ground rodents, amphibians, reptiles and birds, and shall be subject to the following standards:

   A. Fences shall be split-rail or flat-board with no more than three horizontal rails or boards.

   B. The bottom edge of the bottom horizontal rail or board shall be no lower than 18 inches from the ground.

   C. There shall be a minimum two-foot gap between each rail or board.

   D. Except where a different height is stated, the top edge of the topmost rail or board shall be no higher than 48 inches from the ground.

   E. Fence material shall be of wood or an alternative material that gives the appearance of wood, such as wood composite or recycled material or some other similar material that gives the appearance of wood.

   F. Fence posts shall not be hollow at the top or have holes drilled into them near the top.

   G. Fences shall not be barbed.

   H. The top of the fence shall not contain spikes of any manner.

4. "Tailwater" means excess surface runoff draining from an irrigated field under cultivation.

Development Standards for Vineyards:

A. New and existing vineyards shall comply with all of the following minimum best management practices, limitations, and conditions:

1. Vineyards shall be prohibited on slopes of 50 percent or greater.

2. Vineyards shall be prohibited on Significant Ridgelines.

3. Applicants for vineyards shall provide proof of legal access for any new development that is not accessed directly from a public roadway.

4. Applicants for vineyards shall be required to provide a visual simulation of the vineyard(s) as seen from public roads, parks, and trails.

5. Applicants for vineyards shall conduct a site survey to determine the presence of sensitive and rare plant and/or animal species. Vineyards shall be sited and designed to avoid or minimize impacts to or removal of sensitive and rare species, as determined by the site survey.

6. The use of pesticides, including rodenticides, fumigants, and other synthetic substances, are permitted only where necessary to protect or enhance the habitat itself such as for the eradication of invasive plant species or habitat restoration, where there are no feasible alternatives that would result in fewer adverse effects to the habitat value of the site, or for the protection of public health, safety, and welfare as directed by the Department of Public Health or Agricultural Commissioner.

7. Integrated Pest Management (IPM) techniques shall be used to prevent and control pests in a manner that avoids harm to other organisms, air, soil, and water quality. The following biological, cultural, and mechanical/physical controls may be used to prevent crop pests, weeds, and diseases:

    a. Soil and crop nutrient management practices;

    b. Sanitation measures to remove disease vectors, weed seeds, and habitat for pest organisms;

    c. Cultural practices that enhance crop health, including selection of plant species and varieties with regard to suitability to site-specific conditions and resistance to prevalent pests, weeds, and diseases;

    d. Application of non-synthetic biological, botanical, or mineral inputs;

    e. Augmentation or introduction of predators or parasites of the pest species;

f. Development of habitat for natural enemies of pests;

g. Non-synthetic controls such as lures, traps, and repellents;

h. Mulching with fully biodegradable materials;

i. Mowing of weeds or hand weeding and mechanical cultivation;

j. One or more owl boxes shall be provided for every 40 vineyard acres. Kestrel boxes and raptor perches shall be provided. Bat and/or blue bird boxes shall be installed for insect control; and

k. Vineyards shall implement measures to minimize blue-green sharpshooter populations. Diseased vines shall be removed as soon as detected. Yellow sticky traps shall be used to monitor blue-green sharpshooter populations in and along vineyards adjacent to riparian habitat. If trap counts increase sharply after several successive warm days or if more than one sharpshooter per vine is observed, only those vines bordering sharpshooter breeding habitat shall be treated.

8. Only drip irrigation, micro-sprinklers, or similar types of non-aeration, micro-irrigation shall be used. The use of reclaimed water or "gray water" for any approved agricultural use is required where feasible. The development shall conserve water, reduce water loss to evaporation, deep percolation, and runoff, remove leachate efficiently, and minimize erosion from applied water by implementing a managed irrigation system that includes all of the following components:

   a. Irrigation scheduling.

   b. Efficient application of irrigation water.

   c. Efficient transport of irrigation water.

   d. Use of runoff and re-use of tailwater.

   e. Management of drainage water.

9. A comprehensive water audit that includes total water used throughout the year shall be prepared at the end of each calendar year and submitted to the Director.

10. Vineyards shall provide a buffer of at least 100 feet in width from the outer edge of the canopy of riparian vegetation associated with a stream/drainage course. Where riparian vegetation is not present, the buffer shall be measured from the outer edge of the bank of the subject stream. Vegetation removal, vegetation thinning, or planting of non-native or invasive vegetation shall not be permitted within buffers. Banks of water courses shall have vegetated buffer strips adjacent to the water way. A row of trees and shrubs that shades part or the entire water course shall be planted outside the buffer strip.

11. If fencing is installed, only wildlife-permeable fencing shall be used around the perimeter of the area on which crops are grown. Such fencing shall comply with all other applicable development standards, including those in Section 22.44.133.F.2.d.

12. Permanent or no-till cover vegetation shall be planted or resident vegetation shall be maintained between crop rows. The species of ground cover shall foster cycling of resources, promote ecological balance, conserve biodiversity, and control pests by providing for flowering plants, habitat, and shelter for pollinators, insects, other arthropods, spiders, bats, raptors and other pest predators. The species of ground cover shall be non-invasive and appropriate to the site, including those species found on the Plant List for the Santa Monica Mountains maintained by the Director and the Approved Plant List for fuel modification and firewise landscapes maintained by the Fire Department. The grower shall seek advice from an appropriate cover crop specialist for site-specific recommendations.

13. Hedgerows, shrubs, and grasses with native and, if appropriate, non-native flowering plants shall be maintained throughout the property to preserve habitat for wildlife and pest predators. Natural nesting sites and perches, such as oak trees, shall be maintained.

14. Tillage practices shall be limited to those that maintain or improve the physical, chemical, and biological condition of soil, prevent soil compaction, and minimize soil erosion to the maximum extent feasible. To minimize soil disturbance, soil compaction, and dust pollution, plowing or

harrowing the land, also known as tillage, shall be avoided to the maximum extent feasible. Where feasible, tillage shall be eliminated to lower the rate of organic matter breakdown. If tillage is necessary, a tillage plan shall be developed that incorporates measures to minimize soil disturbance and loss of organic matter.

15. Stockpiled soils shall be protected from erosion by using tarps and jute netting to cover the pile.

16. Crop areas shall be designed utilizing the principles of low-impact development pursuant to Section 12.84.410 et seq., so that runoff from the crop area, from both irrigation and stormwater, is maintained on-site.

17. A site-specific Nonpoint Source Pollution (NPS) Prevention Plan shall be developed and shall include a Land Use Inventory, a Watershed Survey, water quality monitoring, and adoption of Best Management Practices to protect waters of the state.

18. Site development shall implement measures to minimize runoff and the transport of sediment and nutrients, and to control erosion. Measures include, but are not limited to, bioretention facilities, dry wells, filter/buffer strips, bioswales, cisterns, cover crops, setbacks from stream areas, vegetation along roads and ditches, and infiltration trenches. Where filter or buffer strips cannot absorb sheet flow runoff volumes, vegetated swales shall be designed to convey runoff to selected water retention facilities. For example, a filter strip can be positioned across a vineyard slope between sections of crops to reduce sediment movement by sheet flow, or a vegetated swale can intercept runoff at a break in slope at the bottom of a hillside and attenuate and filter the flow before it reaches a stream or drainage course. Vineyard rows should be oriented to minimize water flow down the rows and with consideration made for side-slope minimization, to prevent erosion.

19. An engineered drainage system shall be installed and maintained if the erosion potential for the vineyard is high.

20. Runoff shall be diverted, with a berm or other such measure, around the storage or disposal area for waste, crop residues, waste by-products, fertilizers, oils, soil amendments, and any other agricultural products or materials utilized in the planting and growing of crops, to prevent contamination of surface waters.

21. Site-appropriate measures for roads, such as rolling dips or water bars, shall be implemented to prevent erosion. Roads shall be kept to a minimum around vineyards adjacent to aquatic habitats, and repairs shall be made to any poorly functioning road drainages or waterway crossings.

22. Ditches shall be managed to prevent erosion, downcutting, and sedimentation, such as by installing an adequate amount of vegetated ditch relief culverts. Culverts shall be properly sized, positioned, and managed to prevent erosion during high flow events, such as by incorporating energy dissipaters into outflows.

23. Anti-dust strategies that do not rely on water applications or increase the amount of impervious surface shall be implemented. Strategies include planting wind barriers such as trees and hedgerows comprised of locally-indigenous vegetation, planting locally-indigenous perennial grasses and shrubs along roadsides and ditch banks, utilizing mulches and/or compost beneath the crop, vegetating non- crop areas with locally-indigenous species, and applying appropriate non-toxic materials along roadways, such as gravel, sand, porous paving materials and mulches.

24. No burning shall be done in the vineyard.

25. Waste and waste byproducts must be contained on the area on which crops are grown, and disposed of in a manner that does not negatively impact natural resources.

26. Waste, compost, oils, non-synthetic chemicals, manure, fertilizers, and other similar materials shall be stored: (1) in a sealed area, either inside a structure or in a covered container with an

impervious bottom surface; and (2) at least 200 feet away from any stream/natural drainage course, or any underground water source used for human consumption.

27. The total amount of hazardous materials onsite and hazardous waste generated shall be monitored, tracked, and recorded.

Conditional Use Permit for Water Wells:

1. A Conditional Use Permit is required for new water wells as either a primary or accessory use.

Development Standards for New Water Wells:

A. Water wells, geologic testing

1. Access for geologic testing (or percolation or well testing) shall use existing roads or track-mounted drill rigs where feasible. Where there is no feasible access, a temporary access road may be permitted when it is designed to minimize length, width and total grading to only that necessary to accommodate required equipment. All such temporary roads shall be restored to the maximum extent feasible, through grading to original contours, revegetating with native plant species indigenous to the project site, and monitoring to ensure successful restoration. All percolation testing shall take place out of any future planned road access.

2. When a water well is proposed to serve a project, the applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the County, that the proposed well will not have significant adverse individual or cumulative impacts on groundwater, streams, or natural resources. For a well location in close proximity of a stream, drainage courses, and similar surface water conveyance, a groundwater assessment must be performed by a qualified professional to ensure surface water will not adversely impact groundwater quality. The applicant shall be required to do a test well and provide data relative to depth of water, geologic structure, production capacities, degree of drawdown. To approve a well the County must find, based on substantial evidence, that it will not cause significant adverse impacts, either individually or cumulatively, on environmental resources.

Surrounding land uses and setting: The Santa Monica Mountains North Area is the unincorporated portion of the Santa Monica Mountains west of the City of Los Angeles and north of the Coastal Zone boundary. The area is bound by the City of Los Angeles to the east, the Coastal Zone to the south, and

Ventura County to the north and west, excluding the cities of Agoura Hills, Westlake Village, Hidden Hills, and Calabasas.

The Santa Monica Mountains North Area is characterized by steep mountains, rolling hills, canyons, streams, and oak woodlands. Much of the area is rural and undeveloped. The majority of the area is zoned for residential and agricultural use. Limited commercial areas are concentrated along primary transportation routes such as the Ventura Freeway (US 101) and portions of Topanga Canyon Boulevard.

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

Public Agency	*Approval Required*
N/A	N/A

Major projects in the area:

Project/Case No.	*Description and Status*
R2015-01420/ZCR 201500521	Agricultural/Vineyard on property with existing single family residence. On hold.
R2015-01356/PP 201500420	Expansion of existing vineyard. On hold.
R2015-00789/PP 201500249	Orchards/Vineyards. On hold.
R2015-00788/PP 201500250	Establishing use of orchards/vineyards and two 750 square foot accessory structures. On hold.
R2015-00788/PP 201500248 and PP201500251	Establishing the use of orchards, a 66' by 55' solar panel field, two 16,000 gallon water tanks, a water well, one 750 square foot accessory structure, two 18' by 18' proposed gazebos, a 67' by 24' swimming pool, and a 35' by 70' open shade structure. On hold.
R2015-00787/PP 201500247	Orchards/Vineyards, 16,000 gallon water tank and well, and 2 accessory structures. On hold.
R2015-00763/PP 201500232	Development of orchards/vineyards. On hold.
R2015-00604/ZCR 201500225	Vineyards only. On hold.
R2015-00487/PP 201500146	Establish vineyard, an 83' by 45' solar panel field, water tanks and a water well. On hold.
R2014-03686/ZCR 201401539	New vineyard. On hold.
R2014-03683/ZCR 201401536	New vineyards. On hold.
R2014-03684/ ZCR 201401537	New vineyard. On hold.
R2015-00762/ PP 201500231	Single family residence with 1095 square foot attached lower garage and vineyard. On hold.
R2014-03685/ ZCR 201401538	New vineyard. On hold.
R2014-03672/ ZCR 201401531	New vineyard. On hold.
R2014-03589/ ZCR 201401504	New vineyard. On hold.
R2014-03588/ZCR 201401503	On hold.
R2014-03590/ZCR 201401505	New vineyard. On hold.
R2014-03548/ZCR 201401491	New vineyard. On hold.
R2014-03549/ZCR 201401492	New vineyard. On hold.
R2015-00043/ZCR 201500020	Vineyard, water wells, solar panel, and water tanks. On hold.
R2006-02842/ZCR 201500278	On hold.
R2014-03546/ZCR 201401489	Vineyard. On hold.
R2014-03546/ZCR 201401488	Vineyard, water wells, solar panel, and water tanks. On hold.

Reviewing Agencies:

Responsible Agencies

- ☐ None
- Regional Water Quality Control Board:
  - ☒ Los Angeles Region
  - ☐ Lahontan Region
- ☐ Coastal Commission
- ☐ Army Corps of Engineers

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- ☐ National Parks
- ☐ National Forest
- ☐ Edwards Air Force Base
- ☒ Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mountains Area
- ☐

Regional Significance

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

Trustee Agencies

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

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☒ DPW:
  - Land Development Division (Grading & Drainage)
  - Geotechnical & Materials Engineering Division
  - Watershed Management Division (NPDES)
  - Environmental Programs Division
  - Waterworks Division
- ☒ Fire Department
  - Forestry, Environmental Division
  - Planning Division
  - Land Development Unit
- ☐ Sanitation District
- ☒ Public Health/Environmental Health Division: Land Use Program (OWTS), Drinking Water Program (Private Wells), Toxics Epidemiology Program (Noise)
- ☐ Sheriff Department
- ☐ Parks and Recreation
- ☐ Subdivision Committee
- ☒ Agricultural Commissioner

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Population/Housing
☐ Agriculture/Forest	☐ Hazards/Hazardous Materials	☐ Public Services
☐ Air Quality	☐ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Recreation
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Land Use/Planning	☐ Transportation/Traffic
☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Utilities/Services
☐ Energy	☐ Noise	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance
☐ Geology/Soils		

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.

Maya Faraj — 8/26/2015
Signature (Prepared by) — Date

8/26/15
Signature (Approved by) — 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

a.) The proposed Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD amendment would define vineyards as a use, establish development standards for vineyards, require a CUP for water wells as a primary or accessory use, and establish development standards for new water wells. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review.

Portions of the Mulholland Highway Scenic Highway lie within the CSD area (two segments of Mulholland Highway, from Pacific Coast Highway to Kanan Dume Road and from west of Cornell road to east of Las Virgenes Road, were designated as a County Scenic Highway by the California Department of Transportation). The Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan (SMMNAP) also designates four scenic routes within the CSD area: Ventura Freeway, Mulholland Highway, Las Virgenes Road, and Kanan/Dume Road. In addition, the SMMNAP identifies the following roads as "routes with scenic qualities": Agoura Road, Chesebro Road, Cornell Road, Old Topanga Canyon Road, and Topanga Canyon Boulevard.

In addition to scenic highways, unincorporated Los Angeles County identifies ridgelines of significant aesthetic value that are to be preserved in their current state. This preservation is accomplished by limiting the type and amount of development near them. There are several "Significant Ridgelines" in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area designated by the CSD.[1]

There are also scenic areas in neighboring cities, such as Dry Creek Canyon Park in the City of Calabasas, Abrams Open Space area in the City of Agoura Hills, and the Las Virgenes Reservoir and Open Space area in the City of Westlake Village.

The SMMNAP contains several policies requiring the protection of scenic resources, such as:

"IV-29 Maintain and enhance the visual quality of vistas along the unincorporated portions of identified scenic routes and routes with scenic qualities, including:

Scenic routes:

- Ventura Freeway
- Mulholland Highway
- Las Virgenes Road
- Kanan-Dume Road

Routes with scenic qualities:

- Agoura Road
- Chesebro Road
- Cornell Road
- Old Topanga Canyon Road
- Topanga Canyon Boulevard

IV-30 Regulate the alteration of the natural landscape and terrain to ensure minimal visual disruption of existing settings.

IV-31 Preserve in their natural state, topographic features of high scenic value, including significant canyon walls, geological formations, creeks, and waterfalls. Preserve the area's hillside backdrop in its present state to the extent feasible and control the design of development on ridgelines so that it will not interfere with significant scenic views.

IV-32 Ensure that any alteration of the natural landscape from earth-moving activity, as well as new development, blends with the existing terrain of the site and surroundings."

The proposed CSD amendment would set new requirements and development standards for vineyards and water wells, which are both currently permitted uses in the CSD area. The proposed CSD amendment would not grant entitlements to any project, including such projects that would cause impacts to views from scenic highways or corridors or impacts to scenic resources such as Significant Ridgelines. Further, the proposed amendment would not cause existing scenic resources to be reclassified. Future development projects would continue to be required to avoid or mitigate visual impacts to scenic resources in compliance with SMMNAP scenic resource protection policies.

[1] GIS-NET3 "Significant Ridgelines" layer accessed 8/10/2015.

In addition, the proposed vineyard development standards, such as prohibiting vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent and requiring buffers from streams/drainage courses, may prevent or minimize impacts to scenic resources. These requirements may prevent or reduce alteration of the natural landscape and terrain and help to preserve topographic features of high scenic value, thereby minimizing visual disruption within scenic areas. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed amendment would have less than a significant impact on scenic vistas.

b.) There are several existing and proposed trails that run through the CSD area.[2] The existing trail system in the CSD area is comprised primarily of regional trails, including those operated by the County and other public agencies, as well as those on private lands.[3] Existing trails in the CSD area include the Hacienda Trail, Coyote Canyon Trail, and the Peter Strauss Ranch Loop Trail. Proposed trails in the area include the Zuma Ridge Trail and the Paramount Ranch Connector Trail.

Policy VI-17 of the SMMNAP requires that new development respect viewsheds and view corridors from trails to the greatest extent possible.

The proposed CSD amendment would set new requirements and development standards for vineyards and water wells, which are both currently permitted uses in the CSD area. Further, the proposed CSD amendment would not grant entitlements to any project, including such projects that would be visible or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail. Future development projects would still be required to avoid or mitigate visual impacts to views from trails, in compliance with SMMNAP recreation and trails policies.

In addition, the proposed vineyard development standards, such as prohibiting vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent and requiring buffers from streams/drainage courses, may prevent or minimize impacts to scenic views visible from trails. These requirements may prevent or reduce alteration of the natural landscape and terrain and help to preserve topographic features of high scenic value, thereby minimizing visual disruption to views from trails. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed amendment would have less than a significant impact on views from trails.

c.) Other scenic resources in the CSD area (aside from scenic highways and Significant Ridgelines) include the area's natural features, such as the rolling hillsides, canyons, and oak woodlands that make up the landscape. Further, the CSD area is not heavily urbanized and contains a considerable number of vacant and undeveloped parcels. As the CSD area is characterized by mountainous terrain, it would include areas that could be subject to Hillside Management Area (HMA) Ordinance.

The SMMNAP contains several policies requiring the protection of scenic resources, including trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, such as:

"IV-30 Regulate the alteration of the natural landscape and terrain to ensure minimal visual disruption of existing settings.

IV-31 Preserve in their natural state, topographic features of high scenic value, including significant canyon walls, geological formations, creeks, and waterfalls. Preserve the area's hillside backdrop in its present state

[2] GIS-NET3 "Trail" and "Trail – Santa Monica Mtns. (NPS)" layers, accessed 8/6/2015.
[3] Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan. Adopted 2000.

to the extent feasible and control the design of development on ridgelines so that it will not interfere with significant scenic views."

"IV-35 Preserve and, where feasible, restore tree communities--especially oak and sycamore woodlands--and savannas as important elements of the area's scenic character."

"Vl-15 Require that new developments use architectural and siting features which are compatible with adjacent existing and planned developments, and include the following:

- compatibility with prominent design features existing in the immediate area (i.e., trees, land-forms, historic landmarks);
- compatibility with existing structures; and
- the natural environment (i.e., hillsides, washes, native vegetation, community landscaping)."

The SMMNAP also contains policies that require the protection of hillside management areas, such as:

"IV-9 New development projects shall be designed to protect significant natural features, and to minimize the amount of grading.

IV-10 In areas over 25% slope, use special architectural and design techniques to ensure that development conforms to the natural land form, such as split level foundations, variable setbacks, and structures which blend with the natural environment in shape, materials and colors."

"IV-13 Ensure that the overall project design/layout of hillside developments adapts to the natural hillside topography and protects ridgelines and natural-appearing views from surrounding vantage points such as highways, parklands and overlooks. Overall, emphasize fitting the project into its hillside setting rather than altering the hillside to fit the project."

The Hillside Management Ordinance (Los Angeles County Code Title 22, Section 22.56.215) is designed to protect designated hillsides from incompatible development. The County of Los Angeles designates two hillside management areas, one urban and one non-urban with both designations applying to properties that have hillsides with a 25 percent grade or greater. The ordinance protects these resources by requiring almost all development on properties with either the urban or non-urban designation to obtain a conditional use permit with the intent of preserving the remaining natural topography.

The proposed CSD amendment would set new requirements and development standards for vineyards and water wells, which are both currently permitted uses in the CSD area. Further, the proposed CSD amendment would not grant entitlements to any project, including such projects that would substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. Future development projects would still be required to avoid or mitigate impacts to scenic resource, in compliance with SMMNAP's policies as well as the County's Hillside Management Ordinance.

In addition, the proposed vineyard development standards, such as prohibiting vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent and requiring buffers from streams/drainage courses, may prevent or minimize impacts to scenic resources such as trees and rock outcroppings. These requirements may prevent or reduce alteration of the natural landscape and terrain and help to preserve topographic features of high scenic value, thereby minimizing visual disruption to views from trails. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed amendment would have less than a significant impact on views from trails.

d.) The SMMNAP contains policies to ensure that new development does not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the area, such as:

"IV-10 In areas over 25% slope, use special architectural and design techniques to ensure that development conforms to the natural land form, such as split level foundations, variable setbacks, and structures which blend with the natural environment in shape, materials and colors."

"IV-12 Discourage the use of manufactured slopes in excess of ten vertical feet (10'), and require that any such slopes be land-form graded."

"IV-14 Prohibit skyline development and require that structures be located sufficiently below ridgelines so as to preserve unobstructed views of a natural skyline.

IV-15 Require that structures within hillside development areas be sited in a manner that will:

> a. fit into the hillside's contour and relate to the form of the terrain;
>
> b. retain outward views from the maximum number of units while maintaining the natural character of the hillside; and
>
> c. preserve vistas of natural hillside areas and ridgelines from designated public places, including streets and highways."

"Vl-14 In addition to considering the mass and scale of the entire development or structure, restrict the total square footage of and grading for rural structures to a size that maintains the area's open character, and is compatible with the open space characteristics of the surrounding hillsides. Within antiquated subdivisions, limit the mass, scale, and total square footage of structures and grading to a size which is compatible with the size of the parcel upon which the structure is placed so as to avoid a crowded appearance in the built environment.

Vl-15 Require that new developments use architectural and siting features which are compatible with adjacent existing and planned developments, and include the following:

- compatibility with prominent design features existing in the immediate area (i.e., trees, land-forms, historic landmarks);
- compatibility with existing structures; and the natural environment (i.e., hillsides, washes, native vegetation, community landscaping).

Vl-16 Require that new developments provide a transition to surrounding development, for example:

- the bulk of new structures should relate to the area's environment and to the adjacent development;
- setbacks from streets and adjacent properties should relate to the scale of the structure, the function of the street, and the intended character of the development, and should encourage pedestrian scale and uses; and
- multi-story residential structures should be made less imposing by using exterior profile designs that complement the contours of the land; variances from height restrictions shall generally not be permitted."

"Vl-20 Limit structure heights in suburban and rural areas to ensure compatibility of new development with the respective characteristics of the surrounding settings and sites."

The proposed CSD amendment would not grant entitlements to any project, including such projects that would substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the CSD area. Future development projects

would continue to be required to avoid or mitigate impacts to visual character and quality, in compliance with SMMNAP policies.

The proposed vineyard development standards may affect the height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features of vineyards developed in the future. In particular, the standards prohibiting vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent, requiring buffers from streams/drainage courses, requiring site development measures that prevent runoff, and requiring the planting of certain types of vegetation to control pests and prevent dust, may affect the appearance of future vineyards. In general, such standards are likely to prevent or minimize the impacts to visual character and quality. Prohibiting vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent and requiring buffers from streams/drainage courses may help in preserving these features in their natural state, reducing land alteration, and minimizing development that is incompatible with the surrounding natural environment. Further, the use of vegetated swales to control runoff, and/or locally indigenous vegetation to control pests and dust, would help ensure that future vineyards blend better within their surrounding natural environment. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant.

Therefore, the proposed amendment would have less than a significant impact on existing visual character and quality of the CSD area.

e.) The SMMNAP contains policies to ensure that development does not create new sources of substantial shadows, light, or glare degrade the existing visual character or quality of the area, such as:

"IV-37 Preserve the quality of the night skies and visibility of stars by controlling lighting along area roadways, thereby reducing visual intrusion."

"Vl-13 In addition to maintaining low densities within rural areas, require the provision/protection of the features that contribute to rural character and rural lifestyles, including, but not limited to…

- a lack of night lighting and existence of dark skies, enhancing the visibility of stars at night;

Vl-14 In addition to considering the mass and scale of the entire development or structure, restrict the total square footage of and grading for rural structures to a size that maintains the area's open character, and is compatible with the open space characteristics of the surrounding hillsides. Within antiquated subdivisions, limit the mass, scale, and total square footage of structures and grading to a size which is compatible with the size of the parcel upon which the structure is placed so as to avoid a crowded appearance in the built environment.

Vl-15 Require that new developments use architectural and siting features which are compatible with adjacent existing and planned developments, and include the following:

- compatibility with prominent design features existing in the immediate area (i.e., trees, land-forms, historic landmarks);
- compatibility with existing structures; and the natural environment (i.e., hillsides, washes, native vegetation, community landscaping).

Vl-16 Require that new developments provide a transition to surrounding development, for example:

- the bulk of new structures should relate to the area's environment and to the adjacent development;
- setbacks from streets and adjacent properties should relate to the scale of the structure, the function of the street, and the intended character of the development, and should encourage pedestrian scale and uses; and

- multi-story residential structures should be made less imposing by using exterior profile designs that complement the contours of the land; variances from height restrictions shall generally not be permitted."

"Vl-20 Limit structure heights in suburban and rural areas to ensure compatibility of new development with the respective characteristics of the surrounding settings and sites."

"Vl-26 Exterior lighting--except that needed for safety--is discouraged. Require that new exterior lighting installations use low intensity directional lighting and screening to minimize light spillover and glare onto residential neighborhoods and park lands, thereby preserving—to the extent consistent with public safety--a natural night sky. Street lights shall be permitted only where required for safety."

The proposed CSD amendment would not grant entitlements to any project, including such projects that would adversely affect day or nighttime views by creating new sources of substantial shadows, light, or glare. Future development projects would continue to be required to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts to day and nighttime views, in compliance with SMMNAP policies.

The proposed vineyard development standards may affect the height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features of vineyards developed in the future. In particular, the standards prohibiting vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent, requiring buffers from streams/drainage courses, requiring site development measures that prevent runoff, and requiring the planting of certain types of vegetation to control pests and prevent dust, may affect the appearance of future vineyards.

In general, such standards are likely to prevent or minimize the impacts to day or nighttime views. Prohibiting vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent and requiring buffers from streams/drainage courses may reduce the bulk and scale of development, limiting projects' impacts on shadows or glare. Further, the use of natural materials in vineyard development, such as vegetated swales to control runoff and/or locally indigenous trees and cover crops to control pests and dust, would help future vineyards blend better with their natural surroundings, and reduce the shadows and glare from such projects.

The proposed CSD amendment, however, would not alter existing requirements for "Exterior Lighting" i.e., that exterior lighting be low intensity, directional, and/or screened to prevent glare or direct off-site illumination. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed amendment would have less than a significant impact on day and nighttime views in the CSD area.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code § 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code § 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

a.) The proposed Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD amendment would define vineyards as a use, establish development standards for vineyards, require a CUP for water wells as a primary or accessory use, and establish development standards for new water wells. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review.

Per the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), there is a small area of Unique Farmland in the southwest area of the CSD, which overlaps the Coastal Zone boundary. There is also a small sliver of Prime Farmland that stretches over the Coastal Zone into the CSD area, near the southernmost tip of the

City of Calabasas (this area is located within the unincorporated area near, but not within the City of Calabasas).[4] The proposed amendment would not convert the identified Prime or Unique Farmlands to non-agricultural uses. It would establish development standards for vineyards, which is an agricultural use. These new requirements, however, are intended to reduce the impacts of vineyards, not prevent their development.

The proposed amendment would prohibit vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent and require that vineyards provide buffers from streams and drainage courses. The mapped Unique Farmland in the CSD area does contain areas with slopes over 50 percent as well as streams. As such, the proposed amendment may limit or prevent vineyard development in these areas, in order to prevent negative environmental impacts such as soil erosion and polluted runoff from entering streams. However, these restrictions on vineyard development would not prohibit other crops from being grown in areas with slopes over 50 percent or near streams/drainage courses. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not limit or eliminate the productive use of farmland in the CSD area. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant.

Further, the CSD amendment would not grant entitlements to any project and would not revise, replace, or attempt to supersede standard requirements for future projects to ensure compliance with the County Code and General Plan policies for avoiding or mitigating significant impacts to state-designated Farmland. Therefore the proposed amendment would have a less than significant impact on state-designated farmlands.

b.) The proposed Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD amendment would apply to all zones, including agricultural zones. Currently, all zones in the CSD area, except for the I-T Zone, allow vineyards, which are permitted as "crops" under Title 22 standards of the Los Angeles County Code. Crop uses are currently permitted through either a site plan review or a discretionary review, depending on the underlying zone. Water wells are permitted in all zones in the CSD area through either a site plan review or discretionary review.

The proposed amendment would define vineyards as a use separate from other crop uses, and would establish development standards specific to vineyards. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review. If the permit requirements for vineyards remain the same as for other crops, then a CUP would be required for vineyards in the R-1 and RPD zones, and a site plan review would be required for all other zones (except for the I-T zone). Further, the proposed vineyard development standards are intended to reduce the impacts of vineyards, but not prevent their development. Moreover, the proposed vineyard requirements would not restrict other crop uses from being developed, or place additional development standards on any other crop uses. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant.

The proposed amendment would also require a CUP for water wells as a primary or accessory use, and would establish development standards for all new water wells. This would require individual projects that propose water wells to analyze impacts to water supply and usage, but would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use.

Agricultural Opportunity Areas (AOAs) are a County-level identification tool that identifies areas where commercial agriculture is taking place and/or is believed to have a future potential based on the presence of prime agricultural soils, compatible adjacent land uses, and existing County land use policy. There are no

[4] GIS-NET3, "Farmland" layer, accessed 8/6/2015

AOAs located in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD.[5] Therefore, there would be no impacts to AOAs as a result of the implementation of the proposed amendment.

The only Williamson Act contract lands in the County are located on Catalina Island and held by the Catalina Island Conservancy as set asides for open space and recreational purposes. Therefore, there are no agricultural Williamson Act contracts in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD. As such, there would be no impacts to Williamson Act contract lands as a result of the implementation of the proposed amendment.

Therefore, the proposed amendment would have a less than significant impact on agricultural zoning, AOAs, or a Williamson Act contract.

c. and d.) Within the CSD area, there is no land designated as forest land, timberland, or timberland production zones, nor does any portion of the CSD fall within a National Forest Area or within a Watershed Zone (as designated by Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code). Therefore, there would be no impact to forest land, timberland, or timberland production zones from the implementation of the proposed amendment.

e.) As noted, there are small areas of Unique and Prime Farmlands within the CSD area.[6] The proposed amendment would not convert these state-designated farmlands to non-agricultural uses. The proposed amendment would, however, prohibit vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent and require that vineyards provide buffers from streams and drainage courses. The Unique Farmland identified in the CSD area does contain drainage courses and slopes over 50 percent. As such, the proposed amendment could limit or prevent vineyard development in these areas. However, restrictions on vineyard development would not prohibit other crops from being grown in areas with slopes over 50 percent and/or near streams/drainage courses, including those areas located within the mapped Unique Farmland areas.

Further, the CSD amendment would not revise, replace, or attempt to supersede requirements for future projects to comply with the County Code and General Plan policies for avoiding or mitigating significant impacts to state-designated Farmland. There are no AOAs or Williamson Act contracts in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD.[7] Therefore, there would be no impacts to AOAs or Williamson Act contract lands as a result of the proposed amendment.

The proposed CSD amendment would establish new vineyard development standards that would apply to all zones where vineyards are permitted (all zones except for I-T zone). Currently vineyards are permitted as a "crop" use through either a site plan review or a discretionary review, depending on the underlying zone. The amendment would define vineyards as a use separate from other crop uses, and would establish development standards specific to vineyards. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review. If the permit requirements for vineyards remain the same as for all other crops, then a CUP would be required for vineyards in the R-1 and RPD zones, and a site plan review would be required for all other zones (except for the I-T zone).

The proposed vineyard development standards would be intended to reduce the impacts of vineyards, but not prevent their development. Moreover, the proposed vineyard requirements would not restrict other crop uses from being developed, or place additional development standards on any other crop uses. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant.

---

[5] GIS-NET3, "Agricultural Opportunity Area" layer, accessed 8/6/2015
[6] GIS-NET3, "Farmland" layer, accessed 8/6/2015
[7] GIS-NET3, "Agricultural Opportunity Area" layer, accessed 8/6/2015

The new requirements proposed for water wells in the CSD area would require individual projects to analyze the impacts of the proposed wells, but would not prevent or restrict agricultural uses or result in the conversion of state-designated farmland to non-agricultural use.

In addition, the proposed vineyard and water well requirements would apply only to new development in the CSD area. As such, the proposed amendment would not affect existing agricultural land or agricultural uses.

Within the CSD area, there is no land designated as forest land, timberland, or timberland production zones, nor does any portion of the CSD fall within a National Forest Area or within a Watershed Zone (as designated by Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code). Therefore, there would be no impact to forest land, timberland, or timberland production zones from the implementation of the proposed amendment.

Therefore the proposed amendment would have a less than significant impact on state-designated Farmlands, existing agricultural lands and uses, and forest lands.

3. AIR QUALITY

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 either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) 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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

a., b., c., d., and e.) The air pollutants that are regulated by the Federal and California Clean Air Acts fall under three categories, each of which are monitored and regulated:

- Criteria air pollutants;
- Toxic air contaminants (TACs); and,
- Global warming and ozone-depleting gases.

In 1970, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) identified six "criteria" pollutants they found to

be the most harmful to human health and welfare. They are:

- Ozone (O_3);
- Particulate Matter (PM);
- Carbon Monoxide (CO);
- Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2);
- Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2); and,
- Lead (Pb).

The Federal government and the State of California have established air quality standards designed to protect public health from these criteria pollutants. Among the federally identified criteria pollutants, the levels of ozone, particulate matter, and carbon monoxide in Los Angeles County continually exceed federal and state health standards and the County is considered a non-attainment area for these pollutants.

In response to the region's poor air quality, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) & the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) were created. The SCAQMD and the AVAQMD are responsible for monitoring air quality as well as planning, implementing, and enforcing programs designed to attain and maintain state and federal ambient air quality standards in the region. The SCAQMD implements a wide range of programs and regulations, most notably, the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The SCAQMD jurisdiction covers approximately 10,743 square-miles and includes all of Los Angeles County except for the Antelope Valley, which is covered by the Antelope AVAQMD. The proposed project is located in the SCAQMD.

The proposed project would amend the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District (CSD) by adding a definition of vineyards and new development standards for the development and operation of vineyards in all zones within the CSD, adding development standards for all new water wells, and requiring a Conditional Use Permit for all new water wells as either a primary or accessory use within the CSD. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review. The proposed project would not directly induce any new development within the community as current regulations allow the use of vineyards.

Currently, all zones in the CSD area, except for the I-T Zone, allow vineyards, which are permitted as "crops" under Title 22 standards of the Los Angeles County Code. Crop uses are currently permitted through either a site plan review or a discretionary review, depending on the underlying zone. The proposed amendment would define vineyards as a use separate from other crop uses, and would establish development standards specific to vineyards. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review. If the permit requirements for vineyards remain the same as for all other crops, then a CUP would be required for vineyards in the R-1 and RPD zones, and a site plan review would be required for all other zones (except for the I-T zone).

The proposed amendment would also establish development standards intended to reduce the impacts of vineyard development, such as prohibiting the use of pesticides, rodenticides, fumigants, and other synthetic substances, requiring pest management practices that avoid harm to other organisms, air, soil, and water quality, and requiring anti-dust strategies that do not use water or increase impervious services such as planting wind barriers or utilizing mulch and/or compose beneath the crop. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant.

The proposed project is within the SCAQMD and would not obstruct the implementation of adopted air quality plans, such as the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) which is implemented by the SCAQMD.

Additionally, the proposed project is consistent with the Countywide General Plan which is consistent with SCAG's population and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) projections, which are the foundation for the AQMP.

The proposed project will not re-zone parcels to allow for more intense uses, and new development standards are not expected to induce new development, the proposed project would not result in a change to the physical environment that would result in an increase in automobile use and thus air pollutants in the project area. Additionally, the amendments would not result in the development of any uses, including industrial facilities, which would emit non-attainment or criteria pollutants into the atmosphere. As such, the proposed project would not violate any applicable federal or state air quality standard or substantially contribute to an existing air quality violation, exceed any SCAQMD threshold, or otherwise result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to federal and state air quality standards.

Sensitive receptors are uses such as playgrounds, schools, senior citizen centers, hospitals or other uses that are more susceptible to poor air quality. AQMD Rule 402, which states "A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. The provisions of this rule shall not apply to odors emanating from agricultural operations necessary for the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals."

The proposed project would establish new development standards which will prohibit the use of pesticides, rodenticides, fumigants, and other synthetic substances; integrate pest management techniques in a manner that avoids harm to air quality; limit tillage practices to minimize soil disturbance and dust pollution; include anti-dust strategies that do not rely on water applications or increase the amount of impervious surface. The new development standards would not modify existing regulations in such a way that new development would be induced in the area. Thus, there would be no expected increase in automobile trips or new construction that would increase pollutant concentrations. Further, the proposed project would not rezone any parcels within the community and therefore the proposed project is not expected to increase exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and so result in less than significant impacts

4. 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 Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFW or USFWS?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally or state protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, and drainages) or waters of the United States, as defined by § 404 of the federal Clean Water Act or California Fish & Game code § 1600, et seq. through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees	☐	☐	☒	☐

(junipers, Joshuas, southern California black walnut, etc.)?				
f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215), and Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.44, Part 6)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

a.) The proposed Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD amendment would define vineyards as a use, establish development standards for vineyards, require a CUP for water wells as a primary or accessory use, and establish development standards for new water wells. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review.

Biological resources are identified and protected through various federal, state, regional, and local laws and ordinances. The federal Endangered Species Act and the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) state that animals and plants that are threatened with extinction or are in a significant decline will be protected and preserved. The State Department of Fish and Wildlife created the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), which is a program that inventories the status and locations of rare plants and animals in California.

One of the County's primary mechanisms to conserve biological diversity is an identification tool and planning overlay called Significant Ecological Areas (SEA). SEAs are ecologically important land and water systems that are valuable as plant and/or animal communities, often integral to the preservation of threatened or endangered species, and conservation of biological diversity in the County. These areas also include nearly all of the wildlife corridors in the County, as well as oak woodlands and other unique and/or native trees. Sensitive biological resources in the Coastal Zone are known as Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs). ESHAs are defined in the Coastal Act as areas "in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem and which could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments.

The Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD contains known sensitive or endangered species as identified by the State's Fish and Wildlife Department, as well as the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. [8] Further,

[8] GIS-NET3 "CA Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB)" and "Critical Habitat (USFWS)" layers accessed 8/10/2015.

there are five identified Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD:

- SEA No. 3A (Buffer) - Zuma Canyon
- SEA No. 3B (Buffer) - Zuma Canyon
- SEA No. 4 - Upper La Sierra Canyon
- SEA No. 6 - Las Virgenes
- SEA No. 12 - Palo Comado Canyon

The Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan also contains policies that require the protection of sensitive species, such as:

"IV-3 Require development designs that protect and preserve significant, viable habitat areas and habitat linkages/wildlife corridors in their natural condition.

a. Require buffers or other measures adequate to protect such areas.
b. Within designated habitat areas of rare, threatened or endangered species, prohibit disturbance of protected biotic resources.
c. Within the following areas, preserve plant communities which contribute to animal reproduction (including plant diversity, faunal resting areas, foraging areas and food sources), or when unavoidable, require the replacement of such plant communities so as not to result in a measurable reduction in the reproductive capacity of sensitive plant and animal communities:
    - riparian areas and wetlands subject to state and federal regulations (such as blue line streams on USGS quadrangles);
    - riparian woodlands, Sycamore-alder riparian woodlands, Southern and Valley oak woodlands and California walnut woodlands; and
    - animal habitat linkages/wildlife corridors.
d. Where plants listed as 'special' or 'of concern' by the California Natural Diversity Database (California Department of Fish and Game) are present, require that new development not result in a net reduction in the number of these plants. Maintenance of the number of plants may be accomplished by replacement in another part of the site or off-site in the appropriate habitat, with a monitoring program approved through the Conditional Use Permit process--which includes a requirement for at least one season of successful reproduction (i.e., producing seed that germinates the following year, assuming the weather cooperates) before any disturbance of the existing habitat is permitted--to ensure the survival of the species in the replacement habitat."

The proposed amendment would add vineyard development standards that may prevent or reduce impacts to sensitive species such as requiring vineyards to provide buffers from streams/drainage course, prohibiting pesticides and requiring integrated pest management practices, and requiring site development measures such as bioswales to reduce runoff. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant.

The proposed CSD amendment would not provide entitlement for any projects, including those projects that could affect sensitive plant or animal species. The amendment would not include any changes to SEA areas or SEA conformance criteria, nor would it revise, replace, or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with the County Code and SMMNAP policies regarding sensitive species.

Future projects that are subject to CEQA and are located in an SEA or State-recognized sensitive vegetation habitat would require review by one of the Department of Regional Planning's technical advisory bodies, unless specifically exempted by Title 22 or State CEQA exemptions. Projects located in an SEA would be reviewed by the Significant Ecological Area Technical Advisory Committee (SEATAC). Future projects would still be required to analyze site specific impacts to sensitive species through surveys and/or other documentation, and to mitigate these impacts through appropriate measures. Therefore, the CSD amendment would have a less than significant impact on sensitive species, including those identified by CDFW or USFWS.

b.) There are five identified Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD:

- SEA No. 3A (Buffer) - Zuma Canyon
- SEA No. 3B (Buffer) - Zuma Canyon
- SEA No. 4 - Upper La Sierra Canyon
- SEA No. 6 - Las Virgenes
- SEA No. 12 - Palo Comado Canyon

In addition, the CSD area contains known State-recognized sensitive vegetation habitat. [9] Sensitive plant species have been identified in the CSD area and are inventoried within the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB).

The proposed CSD amendment would add vineyard development standards that may prevent or reduce impacts to SEAs and sensitive habitat areas such as wetlands, by requiring vineyards to provide buffers from streams/drainage course, prohibiting pesticides and requiring integrated pest management practices, and requiring site development measures such as bioswales to reduce runoff. Further, the proposed development standards for water wells may help to prevent or reduce impacts to sensitive habitat areas, because applicants would have demonstrate that the proposed wells would not have significant adverse individual or cumulative impacts on groundwater, streams, or natural resources in order to get the wells approved. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant.

The proposed CSD amendment would not provide entitlement for any projects, including those projects that could affect sensitive habitat areas or SEAs. The amendment would not include any changes to SEA areas or SEA conformance criteria, nor would it revise, replace, or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with the County Code and SMMNAP policies regarding sensitive habitat areas.

Future projects that are subject to CEQA and are located in an SEA or State-recognized sensitive vegetation habitat would require review by one of the Department of Regional Planning's technical advisory bodies, unless specifically exempted by Title 22 or State CEQA exemptions. Projects located in an SEA would be reviewed by the Significant Ecological Area Technical Advisory Committee (SEATAC). Future projects would still be required to analyze site specific impacts to sensitive habitats through surveys and/or other documentation, and to mitigate these impacts through appropriate measures. Therefore, the CSD amendment would have a less than significant impact on sensitive natural communities, including those identified by CDFW or USFWS.

[9] GIS-NET3 "CA Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB)" layer accessed 8/10/2015.

c.) Section 404 of the Clean Water Act defines wetlands as "those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas."

The Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) issues Section 404 permits under the CWA, and generally takes jurisdiction over navigable waters or tributaries thereof within streams and rivers to the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM), as defined by erosional cues, sedimentation, and changes in vegetation. In addition to streams and rivers, the USACE takes jurisdiction over wetlands, defined as "those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs and similar areas."

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) issues Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreements, and regulates activities that will "substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow of any river, stream or lake; substantially change or use any material from the bed, channel, or bank of, any river, stream, or lake; or deposit or dispose of debris, waste, or other material containing crumbled, flaked, or ground pavement where it may pass into any river, stream, or lake." CDFW jurisdiction typically extends to the top of bank of streambeds or lakes, or to the outward limit of riparian vegetation, whichever encompasses the larger area.

The Regional Water Quality Control Board issues Section 401 Water Quality Certifications, and regulates the discharge of waste within any region that could affect waters of the State, under authority of the provisions of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Waters of the State are defined as any surface water or groundwater, including saline waters, within the boundaries of the State (Water Code Section 13050). Prior to the issuance of a CWA Section 404 permit by USACE, a Section 401 Certification must be obtained from the RWQCB.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has identified several wetlands in the CSD area, including riverine, lake, freshwater pond, freshwater emergent, and freshwater forested/shrub wetlands.[10] Further, there are several streams and creeks in the CSD area, as well as Malibou Lake.[11] SMMNAP policies require the protection of water bodies and wetland areas, such as:

"IV-3 Require development designs that protect and preserve significant, viable habitat areas and habitat linkages/wildlife corridors in their natural condition…

…c. Within the following areas, preserve plant communities which contribute to animal reproduction (including plant diversity, faunal resting areas, foraging areas and food sources), or when unavoidable, require the replacement of such plant communities so as not to result in a measurable reduction in the reproductive capacity of sensitive plant and animal communities:

- riparian areas and wetlands subject to state and federal regulations (such as blue line streams on USGS quadrangles);
- riparian woodlands, Sycamore-alder riparian woodlands, Southern and Valley oak woodlands and California walnut woodlands; and
- animal habitat linkages/wildlife corridors…"

[10] USFWS Wetlands Mapper GIS-NET: http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html, accessed 8/10/2015.
[11] GIS-NET3 "River, Channel, or Stream" layer accessed 8/10/2015.

"IV-6 Buffer zones shall be established adjacent to areas of important preserved biological resources, including natural streams and drainages. Such buffer zones shall be of an adequate width so as to protect biological resources from grading and construction activities, as well as from the long-term use of adjacent lands, the need for extensive lighting, and increased erosion and runoff, including winter stream flows. Permitted land modification activities within preservation and buffer areas are to be limited to those that are consistent with the maintenance of the reproductive capacity of the identified resource. The land uses and design of development adjacent to a vegetative preservation area, as well as activities within the designated buffer area, shall not disturb natural drainage patterns to the point that preserved vegetative resources receive too much or too little water to permit their ongoing health."

IV-18 New development shall be sited and designed to minimize the increase in run-off into the watershed that results in downstream pollution and increased size of flood plains in coastal lagoons-as required by Regional Water Quality Control Board and Los Angeles County regulations.. All new development shall incorporate best management practices (BMPs)--as updated periodically with new technology--to reduce runoff and erosion, such as the following:

- Minimizing new road and driveway lengths and the size of parking areas and other paved surfaces;
- Maximizing the use of pervious surfaces wherever public safety and adequate access can be achieved;
- Designing residential streets for minimum required pavement widths consistent with the provision of adequate, safe access;
- Using permeable materials for private sidewalks, driveways, and interior roadways;
- Promoting the use of shared driveways;
- Using efficient irrigation practices such as drip irrigation, installing timers, etc.;
- Using reclaimed water and graywater on site wherever possible, and
- Providing stormwater retention basins on site wherever feasible"

"IV-20 Minimize disturbance of natural drainages and avoid the channelization of streams for flood control purposes. New developments should avoid straightening or modifying streams or stream banks to the greatest extent possible, unless the project design results in better habitat protection, slower water flows and stabilized natural streambanks without channelization or hardening.

IV-21 The County will cooperate with local and State transportation departments to implement BMPs to promote infiltration of runoff from roads and highways and to reduce flow into natural streams and creeks.

IV-22 New development projects shall include strict provisions to prevent sediments and silts from entering and impacting storm drains and waterways or create the need for channelization of streams, including the incorporation of pervious surfaces and other BMPs."

"IV-27 Require setbacks from natural streams and drainages which are adequate to protect them from development impacts in high storm flows."

The proposed CSD amendment would add vineyard development standards that may prevent or reduce impacts to water bodies and wetlands, such as by requiring vineyards to provide buffers from streams/drainage course and to implement site development measures to reduce runoff. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant.

Further, the proposed development standards for water wells may also help to prevent or reduce impacts to water bodies, by requiring that applicants to demonstrate that the proposed wells would not have significant adverse individual or cumulative impacts on groundwater, streams, or natural resources.

The proposed CSD amendment would not provide entitlement for any projects, including those projects that could affect water bodies or wetlands. The amendment would not include any changes to water bodies or wetland areas, nor would it revise, replace, or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with the County Code and SMMNAP, or other State and federal policies and regulations regarding water bodies and wetlands. Future projects subject to CEQA would still be required to analyze site specific impacts to wetlands and water bodies through surveys and/or other documentation, and to mitigate these impacts through appropriate measures. Therefore, the proposed amendment would have a less than significant impact on federally or state protected wetlands or waters of the United States.

d.) There are five identified Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD:

- SEA No. 3A (Buffer) - Zuma Canyon
- SEA No. 3B (Buffer) - Zuma Canyon
- SEA No. 4 - Upper La Sierra Canyon
- SEA No. 6 - Las Virgenes
- SEA No. 12 - Palo Comado Canyon

Further, habitat linkage corridors have been identified in the northern part of the CSD area,[12] and regional wildlife linkages have been identified throughout the CSD area.[13] There are also several streams and creeks in the CSD area, as well as Malibou Lake.[14] Several "Significant Ridgelines" are also found within the CSD area.[15]

Active nests (i.e. "nursery sites") of many bird species are protected by the federal Migratory Bird treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code sections 3503 and 3512. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), 16 U.S.C. Section 703, et seq., prohibits the taking, killing, possessing, transporting, and importing of migratory birds, parts of migratory birds, and their eggs and nests, except when specifically authorized by the Department of the Interior. Under California Fish and Game Code Section 3503, it is unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird (except non-natives, including English sparrows (Passer domesticus) and European starlings (Sturnus vulgaris). Section 3503.5 specifically protects birds in the orders Falconiformes and Strigiformes (birds-of-prey). Section 3513 essentially overlaps with the MBTA, prohibiting the take or possession of any migratory non-game bird. Disturbance that causes nest abandonment and/or loss of reproductive effort is considered a "take" by the CDFW. No Globally Important Bird Areas are found in the CSD area.

SMMNAP policies require the protection of wildlife corridors and species movement, such as:

"IV-1 Place primary emphasis on the preservation of large, unbroken blocks of natural open space and wildlife habitat areas, and protect the integrity of habitat linkages. As part of this emphasis, support programs for the purchase of open space lands, encourage clustering of development to increase the amount of preserved open space, reduce grading and the need for vegetation clearance, and develop design

[12] GIS-NET3 "Wildlife Linkage Designs" layer accessed 8/10/2015.
[13] Draft Los Angeles County General Plan Figure 9.2: Regional Habitat Linkages Map.
[14] GIS-NET3 "River, Channel, or Stream" layer accessed 8/10/2015.
[15] GIS-NET3 "Significant Ridgelines" layer accessed 8/10/2015.

criteria for the construction of highways and other infrastructure improvements that meets environmentally-sensitive standards similar to those imposed on new development.

IV-2 When determining which portions of a development site should be retained in open space, first priority should be the preservation of viable, sensitive habitat areas and linkages. Preserving open space for its aesthetic qualities is also essential, as discussed in Goal II.

IV-3 Require development designs that protect and preserve significant, viable habitat areas and habitat linkages/wildlife corridors in their natural condition.

a. Require buffers or other measures adequate to protect such areas.
b. Within designated habitat areas of rare, threatened or endangered species, prohibit disturbance of protected biotic resources.
c. Within the following areas, preserve plant communities which contribute to animal reproduction (including plant diversity, faunal resting areas, foraging areas and food sources), or when unavoidable, require the replacement of such plant communities so as not to result in a measurable reduction in the reproductive capacity of sensitive plant and animal communities:
    - riparian areas and wetlands subject to state and federal regulations (such as blue line streams on USGS quadrangles);
    - riparian woodlands, Sycamore-alder riparian woodlands, Southern and Valley oak woodlands and California walnut woodlands; and
    - animal habitat linkages/wildlife corridors.
d. Where plants listed as 'special' or 'of concern' by the California Natural Diversity Database (California Department of Fish and Game) are present, require that new development not result in a net reduction in the number of these plants. Maintenance of the number of plants may be accomplished by replacement in another part of the site or off-site in the appropriate habitat, with a monitoring program approved through the Conditional Use Permit process--which includes a requirement for at least one season of successful reproduction (i.e., producing seed that germinates the following year, assuming the weather cooperates) before any disturbance of the existing habitat is permitted--to ensure the survival of the species in the replacement habitat."

"IV-5 Prohibit the use of motorized off-road vehicles within sensitive habitat areas, habitat linkages/wildlife corridors and riding and hiking trails, and limit off-trail activities to those that are consistent with protection of environmental resources."

"IV-8 Required preservation of natural biological habitats and habitat linkages should be ensured by land dedications in fee title wherever appropriate to a public agency which has the authority to manage, preserve or enhance park and open space lands. Secondary alternatives are conservation easements, granting of development rights or other similar protection measures. Financing for the long term maintenance of such areas should be assured through endowments or other public funding mechanisms."

The proposed CSD amendment would add vineyard development standards that may prevent or reduce impacts to wildlife corridors, such as such as by requiring vineyards provide buffers from streams/drainage course and prohibiting vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant.

The proposed CSD amendment would not provide entitlement for any projects, including those projects that could affect habitat linkages and corridors or wildlife nursery sites. The amendment would not include any changes to habitat linkages, wildlife corridors, or wildlife nursery sites, nor would it revise, replace, or

attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with the County Code and SMMNAP, or other State and federal policies and regulations regarding habitat corridors and wildlife nursery sites. Future projects subject to CEQA would still be required to analyze site specific impacts to wildlife corridors and nursery sites through surveys and/or other documentation, and to mitigate these impacts through appropriate measures. Therefore, the CSD amendment would have less than a significant impact on the movement of native resident or migratory species or native wildlife nursery sites.

e.) There are five identified Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD:

- SEA No. 3A (Buffer) - Zuma Canyon
- SEA No. 3B (Buffer) - Zuma Canyon
- SEA No. 4 - Upper La Sierra Canyon
- SEA No. 6 - Las Virgenes
- SEA No. 12 - Palo Comado Canyon

In addition, the proposed Santa Monica Mountains SEA, which will be adopted as part of the County General Plan update, covers most of the CSD area.[16] Plant communities within this proposed SEA include: chaparral, redshank chaparral, coastal sage scrub, native grassland, coast live oak woodland, valley oak woodland, walnut woodland, southern willow scrub, cottonwood-willow riparian forest, sycamore-alder riparian woodland, oak riparian forest, freshwater marsh, and salt marsh.[17]

In addition, the SMMNAP contains policies that protect oak trees and other native trees, such as:

"IV-4 Maximize the preservation of oak and sycamore trees and communities within proposed development sites. "

"IV-35 Preserve and, where feasible, restore tree communities--especially oak and sycamore woodlands--and savannas as important elements of the area's scenic character."

The proposed CSD amendment would add vineyard development standards that may prevent or reduce impacts to oak woodlands and other native trees, by requiring vineyards to provide buffers from streams/drainage courses and prohibiting vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent.

The proposed CSD amendment would not provide entitlement for any projects, including those projects that could affect oak woodlands or native trees. The amendment would not include any changes to SEA areas or SEA conformance criteria, nor would it revise, replace, or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with the County Code and SMMNAP policies regarding oak woodlands or native trees.

Future projects that are subject to CEQA and are located in an SEA would require review by one of the Department of Regional Planning's technical advisory bodies, unless specifically exempted by Title 22 or State CEQA exemptions. Projects located in an SEA would be reviewed by the Significant Ecological Area Technical Advisory Committee (SEATAC). In addition, development activities that may impact trees suspected of being oaks require the preparation of an oak tree report; the specific location of any oaks or oak woodlands in the area would be identified in this report. Future projects would still be required to analyze site specific impacts to oak woodlands and native trees through oak tree reports, tree surveys,

[16] GIS-NET3 "SEA Proposed" layer accessed 8/10/2015.
[17] 2000 SEA Update Study. http://planning.lacounty.gov/sea/, accessed 8/10/2015.

and/or other documentation, and to mitigate these impacts through appropriate measures. Therefore, the CSD amendment would have a less than significant impact on oak woodlands or native trees.

f.) The CSD area does not include any wildflower reserve areas, is not located in proximity to the State-designated Antelope Valley Poppy Reserve, and is not located in proximity to other County-designated wildflower areas.

There are five identified Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD:

- SEA No. 3A (Buffer) - Zuma Canyon
- SEA No. 3B (Buffer) - Zuma Canyon
- SEA No. 4 - Upper La Sierra Canyon
- SEA No. 6 - Las Virgenes
- SEA No. 12 - Palo Comado Canyon

Also, as noted, most of the CSD area is located within the proposed Santa Monica Mountains SEA[18] and oak woodlands have been identified within the area.[19] The Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance sets requirements for how proposed developments are to interact with oak trees on or near the project site and how to deal with their removal or encroachment by the proposed project, when necessary. In these circumstances, the applicant must apply for an Oak Tree Permit.

In addition, the SMMNAP contains policies that protect oak trees, such as:

"IV-4 Maximize the preservation of oak and sycamore trees and communities within proposed development sites."

"IV-35 Preserve and, where feasible, restore tree communities--especially oak and sycamore woodlands--and savannas as important elements of the area's scenic character."

The proposed CSD amendment would add vineyard development standards that may prevent or reduce impacts to wildflower areas and oak trees, by requiring vineyards to provide buffers from streams/drainage courses and prohibiting vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent.

The proposed CSD amendment would not provide entitlement for any projects, including those projects that could affect oak trees or wildflower areas. The amendment would not include any changes to oak tree development standards or permit requirements, nor would it revise, replace, or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with the County Code and SMMNAP policies regarding oak trees or wildflower preserve areas. The proposed CSD amendment does not alter or have any other effect on the implementation of applicable natural habitat management plans. Future projects will continue to be required to comply with the SEA Ordinance, habitat management plans, and other County Code requirements and SMMNAP policies.

Future projects that are subject to CEQA and are located in an SEA would require review by one of the Department of Regional Planning's technical advisory bodies, unless specifically exempted by Title 22 or State CEQA exemptions. Projects located in an SEA would be reviewed by the Significant Ecological Area Technical Advisory Committee (SEATAC).

---

[18] GIS-NET3 "SEA Proposed" layer accessed 8/10/2015.
[19] 2000 SEA Update Study. http://planning.lacounty.gov/sea/, accessed 8/10/2015.

In addition, development activities that may impact trees suspected of being oaks require the preparation of an oak tree report; the specific location of any oaks or oak woodlands in the area would be identified in this report. Future projects would still be required to analyze site specific impacts to oak trees and wildflower reserve areas through oak tree reports, surveys, and/or other documentation, and to mitigate these impacts through appropriate measures. Therefore, the CSD amendment would have a less than significant impact on local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

g.) The CSD area is not located within a CDFW Natural Community Conservation Plan, nor is it located within a federal Endangered Species Act Habitat Conservation Plan. There are, however, five identified Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD:

- SEA No. 3A (Buffer) - Zuma Canyon
- SEA No. 3B (Buffer) - Zuma Canyon
- SEA No. 4 - Upper La Sierra Canyon
- SEA No. 6 - Las Virgenes
- SEA No. 12 - Palo Comado Canyon

Also, as noted, most of the CSD area is located within the proposed Santa Monica Mountains SEA.[20]

The proposed CSD amendment would add vineyard development standards that may prevent or reduce impacts to SEAs, by requiring vineyards to provide buffers from streams/drainage courses, prohibiting vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent, prohibiting pesticide use and requiring integrated pest management practices, and requiring site development measures that prevent runoff. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant.

Further, the proposed development standards for water wells may help to prevent or reduce impacts to SEAs, because applicants would have demonstrate that the proposed wells would not have significant adverse individual or cumulative impacts on groundwater, streams, or natural resources, in order to get the wells approved.

The proposed CSD amendment would not provide entitlement for any projects, including those projects that could affect SEAs. The amendment would not include any changes to SEA conformance criteria or permit requirements, nor would it revise, replace, or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with the County Code, SMMNAP, or General Plan policies regarding SEAs.

Future projects that are subject to CEQA and are located in an SEA would require review by one of the Department of Regional Planning's technical advisory bodies, unless specifically exempted by Title 22 or State CEQA exemptions. Projects located in an SEA would be reviewed by the Significant Ecological Area Technical Advisory Committee (SEATAC). Future projects would still be required to analyze site specific impacts to SEAs through surveys, and/or other documentation, and to mitigate these impacts through appropriate measures. Therefore, the CSD amendment would have a less than significant impact on adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plans.

[20] GIS-NET3 "SEA Proposed" layer accessed 8/10/2015.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in CEQA Public Resources Code § 21074?	☐	☐	☒	☐

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

a., b., c., d., and e.) The proposed amendment to the Santa Monica Mountains CSD would define vineyards as a use, establish development standards for vineyards, add development standards for water wells, and require a CUP for all new water wells, including all water wells proposed as an accessory use. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review. New development in the project area related to a vineyard or water well could be located on property that contains a cultural resource (historical resource, archaeological resource, unique paleontological resource on site or unique geologic feature or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources, human remains, or tribal cultural resource), however all existing federal, state, and local regulations that mandate protection of such cultural resources shall still apply. Therefore, any impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. A list of applicable federal and state local regulations are below.

Federal

- United States Code, Title 16, Sections 470 et seq.: National Historic Preservation Act
- United States Code, Title 16, Sections 470aa et seq.: Archaeological Resources Protection Act
- United States Code, Title 25, Sections 3001 et seq.: Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act State

State

- California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5: Disturbance of Human Remains
- California Public Resources Code Sections 5020 – 5029.5: Authorized State Historical Resources Commission
- California Public Resources Code Sections 5079 – 5079.65: Authorized Office of Historic Preservation.
- California Public Resources Code Sections 5097.9 – 5097.99: Protections for Native American historical and cultural resources and sacred sites; authorized Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC); prescribes responsibilities respecting discoveries of Native American human remains.
- California Government Code Sections 65352.3 et seq. (Senate Bill 18): Native American Consultation
- California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 8: 2010 California Historic Building Code
- California Government Code Sections 50280 et seq.: Mills Act

d) In addition, maps show that there are no known formal cemeteries in the project area. In the event of unintended discovery of human remains, project development would be subject to all existing regulations regarding human remains, including notifying the County coroner and law enforcement. Therefore, any impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

e) In addition, the Department mailed formal notification of the proposed amendment to the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians on August 4, 2015. To date, no comments have been received.

6. ENERGY

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Conflict with Los Angeles County Green Building Standards Code (L.A. County Code Title 31)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Involve the inefficient use of energy resources (see Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

a.) The proposed amendment to the Santa Monica Mountains CSD would define vineyards as a use, establish development standards for vineyards, require a CUP for water wells as a primary or accessory use, and establish development standards for new water wells. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review.

The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which, in the existing code, are permitted through either a plot plan or discretionary review. The proposed amendment does not modify existing energy efficiency regulations. New development related to vineyards and water wells in the project area shall comply with existing regulations, including the Los Angeles County Green Building Standards Code (L.A. County Code Title 31). Therefore, the proposed amendment will not conflict with the Los Angeles County Green Building Standards Code (L.A. County Code Title 31). No impact is anticipated.

b.) The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which, in the existing code, are permitted through either a plot plan or discretionary review. The proposed amendment would not grant entitlements for any project. New development related to vineyards and water wells in the project area shall comply with all existing energy efficiency regulations. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not involve the inefficient use of energy resources. No impact is anticipated. The existing code does not regulate vineyard cultivation practices. The proposed amendment will mandate efficient irrigation and cultivation practices for existing and future vineyards, thereby implying that energy will be used more wisely and efficiently than without the proposed amendment.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known active fault trace? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

a.i. and ii.) The proposed Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD amendment would define vineyards as a use, add development standards for vineyards, require a CUP for water wells as a primary or accessory use, and add development standards for water wells. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review. The amendment would apply to the entire CSD area.

The entirety of Los Angeles County is part of the seismically active region of Southern California. This presents overall risks for damages to new and existing development. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act of 1972 addresses active surface faults and is intended to prohibit the location of developments and structures for human occupancy across the trace of active faults. The Seismic Hazards Zone Mapping Act (California Public Resources Code, Section 2690) deals with other effects of seismic activity, including ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, or other ground failures. The County General Plan also prohibits new developments, as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Act, within fault traces until a comprehensive geological study has been completed.

No Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones have been identified within the Santa Monica Mountains North Area and no major active faults are currently mapped within the CSD area.[21,22] The nearest fault to the area is the Malibu Coast Fault, which is approximately five miles south along the coast.[23] The proposed CSD amendment does not grant entitlements for any projects in an active or potentially active fault zone.

The proposed amendment to the CSD would not rezone any parcels or ease existing development regulation and therefore would not induce new development to occur. Further, the proposed project would not change or prevent future development from being required to comply with all applicable seismic building standards.

Therefore, the potential for the CSD amendment to expose people or structures to rupture of a known earthquake fault or strong seismic ground shaking is a less than significant impact.

[21] Ventura Freeway Corridor Area Wide Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report. Prepared by LSA Associates. March 10, 1999.
[22] GIS-NET3, "Fault Trace" layer accessed 8/5/15.
[23] GIS-NET3, "Fault Trace" layer accessed 8/5/15.

a.iii.) There are pockets of identified liquefaction areas throughout the CSD, such as in and near the Lobo Canyon Area, the Topanga Canyon area, areas adjacent to Malibu Creek and Malibou Lake, and near Cheseboro and Liberty Canyon.[24]

The proposed CSD amendment, however, does not grant entitlements for any projects in liquefaction areas. Further, the proposed amendment would not rezone any parcels or ease existing development regulation and therefore would not induce new development in or near liquefaction areas to occur. The CSD amendment would not change or prevent future development from being required to comply with all applicable seismic building standards related to liquefaction areas. As such, even though portions of the CSD area are subject to seismic related hazards, the proposed CSD amendment would not induce any unanticipated development to occur that would exposing people seismic-related ground failure.

Additionally, the CSD amendment would require that vineyards provide a buffer from streams/drainage courses, where liquefaction areas are often found. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant. The amendment would also require discretionary review for new water wells, which would help ensure that they are built in conformance with all applicable seismic standards related to liquefaction areas. As such, the CSD amendment's potential to expose people or structures to seismic-related ground failure would be a less than significant impact.

a.iv.) Much of the land in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD contains known landslide areas.[25] The proposed CSD amendment, however, does not grant entitlements for any projects in landslide areas. Further, the proposed amendment would not rezone any parcels or ease existing development regulation and therefore would not induce new development in or near landslide areas to occur. The proposed amendment would not change or prevent future development from being required to comply with all applicable seismic building standards related to landslide areas.

Additionally, the CSD amendment would establish vineyard development standards that would prevent or minimize erosion, such as prohibiting vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent, requiring that tillage be avoided to the maximum extent feasible, and requiring site development measures that minimize runoff and transport of sediment such as bioretention facilities and bioswales. Such standards may also reduce the movement or flow of soil, rocks, earth, water, or debris down slopes during landslides. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant.

The amendment would also require discretionary review for new water wells, which would help ensure that they are built in conformance with all applicable seismic standards related to landslide areas. As such, the CSD amendment's potential to expose people or structures to landslides would be a less than significant impact.

b.) The CSD area is not heavily urbanized and contains a considerable number of vacant and undeveloped parcels, and most development in the area would likely result in at least some small amount of erosion. The proposed CSD amendment, however, does not grant entitlements for any projects that would result in substantial erosion or the loss of topsoil. Further, the proposed amendment would not rezone any parcels or ease existing development regulation and therefore would not induce new development that would result in substantial soil erosion of loss of topsoil. The proposed amendment would not preclude any future development project from being required to comply with all applicable construction best management practices related to soil erosion and loss of top soil.

[24] GIS-NET3, "Liquefaction Zone" layer accessed 8/5/15.
[25] GIS-NET3, "Landslide Zone" layer accessed 8/5/15.

Additionally, as noted, the CSD amendment would establish vineyard development standards that would prevent or minimize soil erosion, such as prohibiting vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent, requiring that tillage be avoided to the maximum extent feasible, and requiring site development measures that minimize runoff and transport of sediment such as bioretention facilities and bioswales. Such standards may prevent or reduce substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant.

The amendment would also require discretionary review for new water wells, which would help ensure that they are built in conformance with all applicable construction best management practices related to soil erosion and loss of topsoil. As such, the CSD amendment's potential to result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil would be a less than significant impact.

c.) Much of the land in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD contains known landslide areas.[26] The proposed CSD amendment, however, does not grant entitlements for any projects that would be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or would become unstable as a result of the project. All future vineyards and water wells would continue to be required to comply with all applicable construction techniques and building regulations including soil re-compaction, adherence to all relevant building codes, the preparation of any necessary geotechnical reports, and the procurement of any necessary permits to ensure the integrity of future structures.

Additionally, as noted, the CSD amendment would establish vineyard development standards that would prevent or minimize soil erosion, such as prohibiting vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent, requiring that tillage be avoided to the maximum extent feasible, and requiring site development measures that minimize runoff and transport of sediment such as bioretention facilities and bioswales. Such standards may prevent or reduce lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, collapse, or landslide from unstable soil. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant.

The amendment would also require discretionary review for new water wells, which would help ensure that they are built in conformance with all applicable construction techniques and building regulations to ensure the integrity of future structures. As such, this would be a less than significant impact.

d.) Within the CSD area, there are locations that are known to have expansive soils.[27] In addition, all soils possess some capacity for expansive behavior. The proposed CSD amendment, however, does not grant entitlements for any projects located on expansive soils. All future vineyards and water wells would continue to be required to comply with the Los Angeles County Building Code, which includes construction and engineering standards, as well as any additional recommendations developed in tandem with a soils or geology report.

Additionally, as noted, the CSD amendment would establish vineyard development standards that would prevent or minimize soil erosion, such as prohibiting vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent, requiring that tillage be avoided to the maximum extent feasible, and requiring site development measures that minimize runoff and transport of sediment such as bioretention facilities and bioswales. Such standards may help to prevent or reduce substantial risks to life or property from expansive soils. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant.

[26] GIS-NET3, "Landslide Zone" layer accessed 8/5/15.

[27] Ventura Freeway Corridor Area Wide Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report. Prepared by LSA Associates. March 10, 1999.

The amendment would also require discretionary review for new water wells, which would help ensure that they are built in conformance with all applicable construction and engineering standards in the Los Angeles County Building Code, and in conformance with additional recommendations contained in a soils or geology report. As such, this would be a less than significant impact.

e.) There are areas within the CSD that may contain soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems, where sewers are not available for disposal of wastewater. The proposed CSD amendment, however, does not grant entitlements for any projects located in such areas. Further, it does not revise, replace, or attempt to supersede applicable standards and procedures to ensure compliance with the County Code and SMMNAP policies regarding wastewater systems. Therefore, this would be a less than significant impact.

f.) As the Santa Monica Mountains CSD is characterized by mountainous terrain, it would include areas that could be subject to Hillside Management Area (HMA) Ordinance. The proposed CSD amendment, however, does not include any changes to HMA criteria. Proposed vineyards and water wells in the CSD area would still be required to comply with the HMA Ordinance.

Further, the amendment would prohibit planting of vineyards on slopes over 50 percent and would require best management practices that reduce erosion, which would be protective of hillside areas. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant. The amendment would also require discretionary review for new water wells, which would help ensure that those wells subject to the HMA Ordinance would be built in conformance with the Ordinance's requirements. As such, this would be a less than significant impact.

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

a) As the project does not induce growth or increase the number of vineyards, there are no impacts. As stated in the Draft Los Angeles County Community Climate Action Plan, emissions of N2O can result from anthropogenic inputs of nitrogen into soil through fertilizers by way of a direct (directly from the soils to which the nitrogen is added/released) and indirect (following volatilization of ammonia and oxides of nitrogen from managed soils) pathway (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2006). The CCAP estimates GHG emissions generated by agriculture in the unincorporated areas in 2010 were approximately 30, 290 MT CO2e or 0.4% of the 7.9 million MT CO2e from community activities. However, these emissions are primarily generated by dairy operations and livestock activities.

b) The project amendment does not conflict with the State's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 and 2030. On March 24, 2015, the Board of Supervisors closed the public hearing and indicated their intent to approve the Draft Community Climate Action Plan for the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. The CCAP identifies greenhouse gas emissions related to community activities in the unincorporated areas; establishes a reduction target consistent with the State's reduction goals to the year 2020; and provides a roadmap for implementation.

The CCAP estimates GHG emissions generated by agriculture in the unincorporated areas in 2010 were approximately 0.4% or 30, 290 or 0.4% of the 7.9 million MT CO2e from community activities. These emissions are primarily generated by dairy operations and livestock activities. By 2020, future emissions for agricultural activities are expected to decrease slightly, relative to 2010. This trend is a result of reductions in cropping activity. As the project does not induce growth or increase the number of vineyards, and does not conflict with the Draft CCAP. Therefore, there are no impacts.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere	☐	☐	☒	☐

with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, because the project is located:				
i) within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard?	☐	☐	☒	☐
i) Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?	☐	☐	☐	☒

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

a.) The proposed amendment to the Santa Monica Mountains CSD would define vineyards as a use, establish development standards for vineyards, add development standards for water wells, and require a CUP for all new water wells, including all water wells proposed as an accessory use. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review.

The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which, in the existing code, are permitted through either a plot plan or discretionary review. The proposed amendment will not address, change, or replace any existing regulations related to the transport, storage, or production of hazardous materials; and new development related to vineyards and water wells in the project area is not expected to produce nor use hazardous wastes; therefore the proposed amendment will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. No impact is anticipated.

b.) The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which, in the existing code, are permitted through either a plot plan or discretionary review; and new

development related to vineyards and water wells in the project area is not expected to produce nor use hazardous wastes; therefore, a significant hazard to the public or the environment through a reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment is not anticipated.

Further, the proposed CSD amendment would prohibit the use of pesticides, rodenticides, fumigants, and other synthetic substances within vineyards. Additionally, the amendment would require that vineyards utilize Integrated Pest Management (IPM) techniques to prevent and control pests in a manner that avoids harm to other organisms, air, soil, and water quality. The proposed amendment would also require that waste be contained on site, away from streams/drainage courses and underground water sources used for human consumption, and disposed of in a manner that does not negatively impact natural resources. These proposed development standards would prevent or reduce the likelihood of hazard to the public or the environment through the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment. As such, this is a less than significant impact.

c.) The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which, in the existing code, are permitted through either a plot plan or discretionary review; and new development related to vineyards and water wells in the project area is not expected to produce, emit, nor handle hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste; therefore, the emission of hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses is not anticipated. No impact is anticipated.

d.) The California Department of Toxic Substances (DTSC) oversees the cleanup of disposal and industrial sites that have resulted in contamination of soil and groundwater. In close cooperation with the United States Environmental Protection Agency, DTSC administers both state and federal hazardous waste programs including the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act ((CERCLA, 42 U.S.C §9601-9675), the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) and a number of other state and federal bodies of law dealing with hazardous materials and the environment. The Envirostar database lists properties regulated by DTSC where extensive investigation and/or cleanup actions are planned or have been completed at permitted facilities and clean-up sites. Per County requirements, any sites with issues regulated by DTSC must be remediated and remedied before new development is allowed to occur. Therefore, because the proposed project would not preclude any new development from remediating on-site hazards prior to development, the proposed project is not expected to result in a significant hazard to the public and environment, any impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

e.) The project site is not located within an airport land use plan, nor within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impact is anticipated.

f.) The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which, in the existing code, are permitted through either a plot plan or discretionary review. New development related to vineyards and water wells will be required to comply with existing Title 22 development standards, plus any additional standards for vineyards and water wells. Vineyards and water wells will not create interference or create malfunctions to air traffic communication, provided that such uses are reviewed and approved by the County. Therefore, any impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

g.) The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which, in the existing code, are permitted through either a plot plan or discretionary review. New development related to vineyards and water wells will be required to comply with all applicable health and safety requirements, to ensure that these projects do not interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, any impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

h.i.) The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which, in the existing code, are permitted through either a plot plan or discretionary review. It is possible that new development related to vineyards and water wells in the project area will be within Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones. However, in accordance with the requirements of the County Fire Department, all development must meet standards for adequate fire flow and water pressure. Therefore, any impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

h.ii.) The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which, in the existing code, are permitted through either a plot plan or discretionary review. It is possible that new development related to vineyards and water wells in the project area will be within a high fire hazard and may have inadequate access. However, in accordance with the requirements of the County Fire Department, all development must meet standards for adequate fire flow and water pressure, and fire would access would be required upon the development of any specific parcel. Therefore, any impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

h.iii.) The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which, in the existing code, are permitted through either a plot plan or discretionary review. It is possible that new development related to vineyards and water wells in the project area will be within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards. However, in accordance with the requirements of the County Fire Department, all development must meet standards for adequate fire flow and water pressure. Therefore, any impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

h.iv.) The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which, in the existing code, are permitted through either a plot plan or discretionary review. It is possible that new development related to vineyards and water wells in the project area will be within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard. However, in accordance with the requirements of the County Fire Department, all development must meet standards for adequate fire flow and water pressure. Therefore, any impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

i.) The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which, in the existing code, are permitted through either a plot plan or discretionary review. Any new construction would be subject to current Title 22 development standards and would also be subject to County Fire Department standards, therefore new development related to vineyards and water wells is not anticipated to constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard. No impact is anticipated.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Add water features or create conditions in which standing water can accumulate that could increase habitat for mosquitoes and other vectors that transmit diseases such as the West Nile virus and result in increased pesticide use?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional	☐	☐	☒	☐

sources of polluted runoff?

g) Generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
h) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
i) Result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance?	☐	☐	☒	☐
j) Use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
k) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
l) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, or within a floodway or floodplain?	☐	☐	☐	☒
m) Place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

a) The proposed amendment to the Santa Monica Mountains CSD would define vineyards as a use, establish development standards for vineyards, and add development standards for water wells, require a CUP for all new water wells, including all water wells proposed as an accessory use. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review. The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which are currently allowed uses in the CSD. The proposed amendments to the CSD are focused on ensuring that the development of new vineyards in all zones follow best management practices for water run-off, pest control and soil erosion, as well as requiring a Conditional Use Permit for all new water wells to ensure there are no environmental impacts on individual projects. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant. The amendments will not change land use designations of Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan or County General Plan and, therefore would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, impacts would be less than significant.

b) The requirement of a Conditional Use Permit for new water wells as either a primary or accessory use would require the applicant to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the County, that the proposed well will not have significant adverse individual or cumulative impacts on groundwater, streams, or natural resources. For a well location in close proximity of a stream, drainage courses, and similar surface water conveyance, a groundwater assessment must be performed by a qualified professional to ensure surface water will not adversely impact groundwater quality. The applicant shall be required to do a test well and provide data relative to depth of water, geologic structure, production capacities, degree of drawdown. The proposed amendments do not grant entitlements for any projects and will not change residential land use designations in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan or the County General Plan and, therefore would have a less than significant impact on domestic water supply from public or groundwater sources.

c,d) Some portions of the unincorporated Santa Monica Mountains North Area are subject to high erosion and debris disposition from runoff. The proposed amendments do not grant entitlements for any projects and do not lessen development regulations and are not expected to induce increased development of vineyards in the area. Therefore, the proposed amendments would not result in the alteration of existing drainage patterns or the alteration of streams, rivers, or any other waterway. All new development standards related to runoff and soil erosion would follow best management practices and would not alter existing drainage courses or deplete groundwater supplies. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary

basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant. Substantial erosion or siltation, or the substantial increase in the rate of surface runoff that would result in flooding is not expected to increase from the project and, impacts would be less than significant.

e) The proposed amendment to the Santa Monica Mountains CSD would define vineyards as a use, establish development standards for vineyards, add development standards for water wells, and require a CUP for all new water wells, including all water wells proposed as an accessory use. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review. The project would not create features or conditions for increased accumulation of standing water, therefore impacts would be less than significant.

f) The proposed amendments do not lessen development regulations or re-zone properties; therefore an increase in development activities is not expected as a result of these amendments. The proposed project is not expected to increase runoff to an extent that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. Therefore the impacts would be less than significant.

g) Construction and developments throughout the unincorporated Santa Monica Mountains North Area may create impacts related to runoff, however all future development that would occur after implementation of the proposed project would continue to be required to comply with water quality requirements of the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit, often referred to as the "MS4 Permit", under which Los Angeles County is a permittee. These water quality regulations are designed to minimize the impact of point and non-point sources of pollution that emanate from development. Point sources of pollutants are well-defined locations at which pollutants flow into water bodies (discharges from wastewater treatment plants and industrial sources, for example). Nonpoint sources of pollutants are typically derived from project site runoff caused by rain or irrigation and eventually make their way into a water body. The proposed amendments do not grant entitlements for any projects and does not revise, replace, or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with the County Code and Community Plan policies, therefore impacts would be less then significant.

h) The proposed amendments do not grant entitlements for any projects and do not revise, replace or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with the County Code and policies. Therefore the proposed amendments will not conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance and impacts would be less than significant.

i) There are major drainage courses located in the Santa Monica Mountain North Area (per USGS maps), however the proposed amendments add development standards and permit review, they do not grant entitlements for any projects. Areas of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) are designated by the State Water Resources Control Board. In Los Angeles County, ASBSs exist in the ocean waters along the coast of the City of Malibu and around Santa Catalina Island. The Santa Monica Mountain North Area is located approximately five miles inland, runoff that empties into Malibu Creek watershed and Las Virgenes Creek watershed eventually empty into the Pacific Ocean. However, there are no identified

ASBSs near the mouth of Malibu Creek or Las Virgenes Creek, there would be no impact to ASBSs as a result, therefore there would less than a significant impact.

j) Some portions of the Santa Monica Mountains North Area have septic tanks limitations for area with geologic features such as high groundwater or close proximity to surface water. However, the proposed amendment to the Santa Monica Mountains CSD would define vineyards as a use, establish development standards for vineyards, and require a CUP for all new water wells, including all water wells proposed as an accessory use. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review. The proposed amendments do not grant entitlements for projects and would not affect regulations governing septic tanks or private sewage disposal and, therefore there impacts would be less than significant.

k) The proposed amendments to the Santa Monica Mountains CSD would define vineyards as a use, establish development standards for vineyards, add development standards for water wells, and require a CUP for all new water wells, including all water wells proposed as an accessory use. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review. The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which are currently allowed uses in the CSD. The amendments would aide in preserving water quality and further enforce County development policies, therefore the impacts would be less than significant.

l,m) The Santa Monica Mountains North Area does contain 100-year flood hazard areas as mapped by FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency). The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which are currently allowed uses in the CSD. The amendments would not grant entitlement to any projects and all future development would require compliance with County Code requirements to avoid flood hazard impacts. Therefore there would be no impact.

n) The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which are currently allowed uses in the CSD. The amendments would not grant entitlement to any projects and all future development would require compliance with County Code requirements to avoid flood hazard impacts, therefore there would be no impact.

o) The Santa Monica Mountains North Area is not located in an area subject to seiche or tsunami's however, mudflow from storm events could arise. However, the proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which are currently allowed uses in the CSD. The amendments would not grant entitlement to any projects and all future development would require compliance with County Code requirements to mudflow impacts, therefore there would be no impact.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Be inconsistent with the applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Be inconsistent with the County zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject property?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria?	☐	☐	☐	☒

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

a) The proposed amendment to the Santa Monica Mountains CSD would define vineyards as a use, establish development standards for vineyards, require a CUP for water wells as a primary or accessory use, and establish development standards for new water wells. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review. The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which are both permitted through either a plot plan or discretionary review. The amendment, would not grant entitlements for any project, and would not result in the development of any specific project that would physically divide an established community. Therefore, the proposed CSD amendment would not physically divide an established community.

b) The Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan (SMMNAP) is the component of the County's General Plan that governs land use in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area. The SMMNAP determines land use designations for all property in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area. The proposed amendment would apply to the entire Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD, and would therefore affect all land use designations:

Open Space: OS, OS-P, OS-DR, OS-W
Mountain Lands: N20, N10, N5
Rural Residential: N2, N1
Residential: U2, U4, U8
Commercial: C, CR
Public and Semi-Public Facilities: P

Vineyards are an allowed use in all land use designations except for the "P" land use designation (Public and Semi-Public Facilities). The proposed CSD amendment would establish vineyard development standards

intended to reduce the impacts of vineyards, e.g., through requiring stream/drainage course buffers, prohibiting vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent, and requiring practices and measures that regulate water usage, prevent runoff and sediment transport, improve soil condition, and prevent harm to other organisms, air quality, and water quality. These development standards would not conflict with the underlying land use designations.

Water wells are permitted in all land use designations as an accessory use or through a CUP as a primary use. The proposed amendment would require a CUP for all new water wells, including all water wells proposed as an accessory use. This new permit requirement would not conflict with the underlying land use designations.

The proposed CSD amendment would not change any land use designations or result in any land use designations that are inconsistent with the SMMNAP. The proposed CSD amendment is therefore consistent with the SMMNAP.

The proposed CSD amendment would be also be consistent with the policies of the SMMNAP, such as:

"IV-6 Buffer zones shall be established adjacent to areas of important preserved biological resources, including natural streams and drainages. Such buffer zones shall be of an adequate width so as to protect biological resources from grading and construction activities, as well as from the long-term use of adjacent lands, the need for extensive lighting, and increased erosion and runoff, including winter stream flows. Permitted land modification activities within preservation and buffer areas are to be limited to those that are consistent with the maintenance of the reproductive capacity of the identified resource. The land uses and design of development adjacent to a vegetative preservation area, as well as activities within the designated buffer area, shall not disturb natural drainage patterns to the point that preserved vegetative resources receive too much or too little water to permit their ongoing health."

"IV-17 Promote comprehensive provisions for water conservation and reclamation to protect water supply and to reduce runoff and erosion, thereby helping to protect water quality."

"IV-19 All new development shall incorporate BMPs which promote infiltration of stormwater-onsite wherever possible--where it will not exacerbate geologic hazards. Examples of BMPs include:

- Using pervious materials for parking lots, sidewalks, etc.
- Installation of bioswales, french drains, cisterns, etc.
- Directing rooftop and parking lot runoff to landscaped areas
- Constructing subregional infiltration basin, wet ponds or constructed wetlands."

"Vl-3 Preserve areas of diverse topography with large areas unbroken by man-made slopes, and long-range vistas of open ridgelines and mountain slopes which define the extent of urban and suburban development."

"Vl-21 Encourage siting of developments to include setbacks that protect public lands, streams, scenic features, views, and other natural features and that maximize open space areas; project density and structure placement shall be consistent with the need to minimize vegetation clearance for fire protection."

"Vlll-2 Minimize consumption of new water supplies through active water conservation programs and the use of reclaimed water--on site, wherever possible."

The proposed CSD amendment would prohibit planting of vineyards on slopes over 50 percent, thereby

helping to preserve areas of diverse topography. It would also require that vineyards provide a buffer from streams/drainage courses, as required by SMMNAP policies. The CSD amendment would also require vineyard development standards that help conserve water and require water reclamation when feasible, which would protect water supply. Further, the amendment is consistent with the above SMMNAP policies as it would require measures that reduce runoff and erosion and protect water quality. The CSD amendment would also require applicants for water well CUPs to demonstrate that proposed wells will not adversely impact groundwater, streams, or natural resources. This requirement would help the County better regulate water supply, usage, and quality in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD, in line with SMMNAP policies.

The proposed amendment would also be consistent with the policies of the General Plan's Land Use Element, such as:

"Policy 7: Assure that new development is compatible with the natural and manmade environment by implementing appropriate locational controls and high quality design standards."

"Policy 13: Prevent inappropriate development in areas that are environmentally sensitive or subject to severe natural hazards, and in areas where essential services and facilities do not exist and are not planned."

"Policy 15: Require that new development in non-urban areas have adequate accessibility to paved roads and water lines of sufficient capacity."

"Policy 20: Establish land use controls that afford effective protection for significant ecological and habitat resources, and lands of major scenic value."

The proposed CSD amendment would require buffers from streams/drainage courses and prohibit vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent. These requirements would ensure that development is compatible with the natural environment, prevent inappropriate development in environmentally sensitive areas, and establish land use controls that protect ecological and scenic resources. The amendment would also require proof of legal access for any new vineyard development that is not accessed directly from a public road. This requirement would prevent development where essential facilities do not exist and ensures that non-urban development have adequate access to paved roads.

c) The Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD, Section 22.44.133 of the Los Angeles County Zoning Ordinance (Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code), was established to implement the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan in a manner that protects the health, safety, and welfare of the community, especially the surrounding natural environment. The CSD contains development standards that address area-specific concerns.

The CSD amendment would apply to all zones within the Santa Monica Mountains CSD:

Single-Family Residence Zone: R-1
Residential Planned Development Zone: RPD
Light Agricultural Zone: A-1
Heavy Agricultural Zone: A-2
Neighborhood Business Zone: C-2
Unlimited Commercial Zone: C-3
Commercial Planned Development Zone: CPD
Commercial Manufacturing Zone: C-M
Commercial Recreation Zone: C-R

Light Manufacturing Zone: M-1
Heavy Manufacturing Zone: M-2
Manufacturing – Industrial Planned Zone: MPD
Open Space Zone: O-S
Resort and Recreation Zone: R-R
Institutional Zone: I-T

Currently, vineyards are permitted in all zones, except for the I-T Zone (Institutional Zone). Vineyards are permitted under the use "Crops—field, tree, bush, berry and row, including nursery stock." Under the current requirements, vineyards require a CUP in the R-1 and RPD Zones. In all other zones (except I-T), vineyards require a site plan review. The proposed CSD amendment would define vineyards as a use separate from other crop uses, and would establish development standards that would govern its use. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review. If the permit requirements for vineyards remain the same as those required for "Crops", then a CUP would be required for R-1 and RPD zones whereas a site plan review is required for all other zones, except for the I-T zone. The new vineyard development standards would not conflict with the existing standards and requirements of each zone.

Individual water wells are currently permitted in all zones through a CUP. Water wells as an accessory use are permitted through ministerial permits, such as plot plan reviews. The proposed CSD amendment would require a CUP for all new water wells, including all water wells proposed as an accessory use (e.g., to a house or to an agricultural use). This would allow all water wells to be subject to a discretionary review, which would require individual projects to analyze impacts to water supply and usage.

The proposed amendment to the CSD would not contain any standards or permit requirements that would conflict with the existing communitywide, zone-specific, or area-specific development standards of the CSD, nor would it change the zoning designations of any property. Therefore, the proposed CSD amendment would be consistent with the CSD and the County Zoning Ordinance.

d) As the Santa Monica Mountains CSD is characterized by mountainous terrain, it would include areas that could be subject to Hillside Management Area (HMA) criteria. Further, there are five identified Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD. The proposed CSD amendment does not include any changes to HMA criteria or SEA conformance criteria.

The amendment would prohibit planting of vineyards on slopes over 50 percent and would require best management practices that reduce erosion, which would be protective of hillside areas. The amendment would also add vineyard development standards that would be protective of significant ecological areas, such as requiring stream/drainage course buffers, integrated pest management practices, and site development measures that reduce runoff.

The requirement for a CUP for all new water wells, including all water wells proposed as an accessory use, would not conflict with HMA or SEA criteria.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) was adopted to encourage the production and conservation of mineral resources, prevent or minimize adverse effects to the environment, and protect public health and safety. In addition, Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code (Part 9 of Chapter 22.56) requires that applicants of surface mining projects submit a Reclamation Plan prior to receiving a permit to mine, which must describe how the excavated site will ultimately be remediated and transformed into another use.

The County depends on the State of California's Geological Survey (State Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology) to identify deposits of regionally- significant aggregate resources. These clusters or belts of mineral deposits are designated as Mineral Resources Zones (MRZ-2s), and there are four major MRZ-2s are designated in the County: the Little Rock Creek Fan, Soledad Production Area, Sun Valley Production Area, and Irwindale Production Area. The California Department of Conservation protects mineral resources to ensure adequate supplies for future production.

The proposed project would amend the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District CSD by adding a definition of vineyards and new development standards for the development and operation of vineyards in all zones within the CSD, adding development standards for all new water wells, and requiring a Conditional Use Permit for all new water wells as either a primary or accessory use within the CSD. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review.

The proposed Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD amendment would apply to all zones in the CSD area. Currently, all zones in the CSD area, except for the I-T Zone, allow vineyards. Water wells are currently permitted in all zones in the CSD area through either a site plan review or discretionary review.

The proposed project is located within the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD, as identified on the map following Section 22.44.133 of Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code, and does not include property designated as Mineral Resources Zones (MRZ-2s), or is located within the four major MRZ-2s designated within the County, and therefore would result in no impact 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 California Geological Survey (CGS) has not identified aggregate resources within the proposed project area as to be part of California's current availability of permitted aggregate resources, and therefore will result in no impact to the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. In addition, the proposed project would not preclude the future extraction of known resources.

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 General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The proposed project will conform to Los Angeles County Code Title 12, Chapter 12.08 (Noise Control Ordinance). Section 12.08.390 of the County Code provides a maximum exterior noise level of 45 decibels (dB) between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. (nighttime) and 50 dB from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. (daytime) in Noise Zone II (residential areas).

The proposed project would amend the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District (CSD) by adding a definition of vineyards and new development standards for the development and operation of vineyards in all zones within the CSD, adding development standards for all new water wells, and requiring a Conditional Use Permit for all new water wells as either a primary or accessory use within the CSD. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review.

The proposed CSD amendment would apply to all zones in the CSD area. Currently, all zones in the CSD area, except for the I-T Zone, allow vineyards, which are permitted as "crops" per Title 22 standards of the Los Angeles County Code. Crop uses are currently permitted through either a site plan review or a discretionary review, depending on the underlying zone. Water wells are permitted in all zones in the CSD area through either a site plan review or discretionary review. The proposed amendment would define vineyards as a use separate from other crop uses, and would establish development standards specific to vineyards. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant.

The proposed project does not propose development or seek entitlements for a specific project. Furthermore, it does not revise, replace, or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with the County Code and General Plan policies. Therefore, it will not expose persons to noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies, and result in a less than significance impact.

Projects, including those causing excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels, will be required to meet current noise standards and comply with the County Noise Ordinance. Furthermore, projects including those causing ambient, temporary, or permanent noise increase, will be required to meet current noise standards and comply with the County Noise Ordinance, and thus result in a less than significance impact.

The amendments only address development standards and does not re-zone properties or lessen development regulations such that would induce the growth of vineyards or other uses. Therefore, the CSD amendments would not expose sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels. Further, the proposed project amendments do not propose changes to parking standards or requirements which could increase the amount of ambient noise. Thus, there would not be a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Additionally, the proposed project does not address the use of amplified sound systems, thus the proposed project would have not result in 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, and result in a less than significant impact.

The proposed project amendments do not rezone any parcels and as a result the project is not expected to induce any new development. The amendments would regulate vineyards and water wells. However, the

amendments do not preclude all future developments from complying with all applicable provisions of Title 12 of the Los Angeles County Code or the General Plan Noise Element. Therefore impacts are expected to be less than significant.

There is no adopted airport land use plan in the CSD area or known private airstrip. Thus, because the proposed CSD amendments would not rezone any parcels or induce development that is not already anticipated to occur and because none of the noise contours extend into the CSD area, they are not expected to expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from airports and impacts are less than significant. Projects, including those causing ambient, temporary or permanent noise increases, will be required to meet current noise standards.

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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	☐	☐	☐	☒

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

a) The proposed CSD amendment would require a CUP for all new water wells, which will be subject to a discretionary review, and which would require individual projects to analyze the impacts to water supply and usage. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review. The project will not directly or indirectly induce growth. Therefore, there are no impacts.

b and c) The project is related to vineyards and water wells in the Santa Monica Mountains North area. The Los Angeles County Housing Element of the General Plan does not identify existing affordable housing or sites for potential affordable housing in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area to meet the County's regional housing needs. Although the proposed amendments apply to areas that permit residential uses, and where there are existing residential uses, the housing stock is generally low density, single family uses. Should future projects redevelop and displace existing housing, especially affordable housing, temporary or permanent displacement may occur. However, in certain cases, state and federal rules and regulations would apply, including but not limited to the California Mobilehome Relocation Act and the Federal Uniform Relocation Act. In addition, affordable housing subsidized by certain funding sources are subject to relocation and displacement requirements. There are no known subsidized projects in the area that are subject to relocation and displacement requirements. The project amendments to the CSD will not result in

the substantial displacement of existing housing and affordable housing, or the substantial displacement of people, and necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, there are no impacts.

d) The project is not anticipated to increase population. The project applies to the Santa Monica Mountains North Area, which is located in the Las Virgenes-Malibu-Conejo subregion of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Historically, SCAG's RTP growth forecast for this area, particularly in the unincorporated areas, have reflected minimal increases in population compared to the rest of the SCAG region, given the low density character and the presence of natural resources. The project will not cumulatively exceed official or local population projections, and therefore, there are no impacts.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Sheriff protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Libraries?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which, in the existing code, are permitted through either a plot plan or discretionary review. The proposed amendment is unlikely to place any additional demand on existing fire resources or increase response times from the Fire Department because new development related to vineyards and water wells in the project area shall comply with all existing County Fire Department regulations. Therefore, any impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which, in the existing code, are permitted through either a plot plan or discretionary review. The proposed amendment is unlikely to place any additional demand on existing Sheriff resources or increase response times from the Sheriff's Department because new development related to vineyards and water wells in the project area shall comply with all existing County Sheriff's Department regulations. Therefore, any impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which, in the existing code, are permitted through either a plot plan or discretionary review. The proposed amendment should not change the number of school-age persons in any school district because the proposed amendment will not create new housing because. No impact is anticipated.

The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which, in the existing code, are permitted through either a plot plan or discretionary review. The proposed amendment should not change the number of park patrons in any park service area because the proposed amendment will not create new housing. No impact is anticipated.

The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which, in the existing code, are permitted through either a plot plan or discretionary review. The proposed amendment should not change the number of library patrons in any library service area because the proposed amendment will not create new housing. No impact is anticipated.

The proposed amendment would place new requirements and standards on vineyards and water wells, which, in the existing code, are permitted through either a plot plan or discretionary review. The proposed amendment should not change the number of persons in any area because the proposed amendment will not create new housing. No impact is anticipated.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Does the project include neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity?	☐	☐	☐	☒

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

a) The proposed amendment to the Santa Monica Mountains CSD would define vineyards as a use, establish development standards for vineyards, require a CUP for water wells as a primary or accessory use, and establish development standards for new water wells. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review.

The Los Angeles County General Plan standard for the provision of parkland is four acres of local parkland per 1,000 residents of the population in the County's unincorporated areas, and six acres of regional parkland per 1,000 residents of the County's total population. Further, Policy IV-48c. of the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan (SMMNAP) requires the expansion of the "trails system for hiking, mountain bike riding, and equestrian uses to accommodate projected demands, following an evaluation that has considered such impacts as environmental quality and the safety and enjoyment of all users."

Within the CSD area, recreational facilities include public parkland, such as Peter Strauss Ranch, Malibu Creek State Park, and Summit Valley Edmund D. Edelman Park, and trails such as Rocky Oaks Loop Trail, Coyote Canyon Trail, Morrison Ranch Trail, and Talepop Trail.

The proposed CSD amendment would require a CUP for all new water wells, which would be subject to a discretionary review, and which would require individual projects to analyze the impacts to water supply and usage. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review. The amendment would not grant entitlements for any project and would not change residential land use designations of the General Plan or the SMMNAP. Future projects would continue to be required to

mitigate impacts on recreational facilities through the implementation of existing County Code and SMMNAP policies.

The proposed amendment would apply to the Santa Monica Mountains North Area, which is located in the Las Virgenes-Malibu-Conejo subregion of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Historically, SCAG's RTP growth forecast for this area, particularly in the unincorporated areas, have reflected minimal increases in population compared to the rest of the SCAG region, given the low density character and the presence of natural resources. The project would not cumulatively exceed official or local population projections, would not directly or indirectly induce growth, and would not generate any additional human activity beyond existing conditions. Therefore, the amendment would not cause an increase in the use of or need for expanding recreational facilities, and would therefore have no impact.

b) Within the CSD area, recreational facilities include public parkland, such as Peter Strauss Ranch, Malibu Creek State Park, and Summit Valley Edmund D. Edelman Park, and trails such as Rocky Oaks Loop Trail, Coyote Canyon Trail, Morrison Ranch Trail, and Talepop Trail. The SMMNAP contains policies that require recreational facilities be developed in a manner that protects natural resources:

"IV-47 Locate recreational facilities of all types in a manner consistent with the environmental values of the land, taking special care to avoid impacts on riparian areas. Regulate the intensity, timing, types, and location of recreational facilities to protect resources and established neighborhoods and rural communities.

IV-48 Encourage opportunities for dispersed recreation when consistent with environmental values and protection of natural resources.

> a. Provide passive recreational experiences within undeveloped natural areas consistent with the tolerance capabilities and character of such areas. Natural areas with limited road access and the presence of sensitive environmental resources are to be limited to activities that are keyed to solitude and appreciation of the values of the natural environment.
>
> b. Within natural areas intended for the protection of vegetative, habitat and scenic resources, regulate use to preserve resource values.
>
> c. Expand trails systems for hiking, mountain bike riding, and equestrian uses to accommodate projected demands, following an evaluation that has considered such impacts as environmental quality and the safety and enjoyment of all users. Multiuse trails should be constructed wherever feasible. The trails system should provide linkages between major regional trails and area recreational facilities (see Map 4 - 'Ventura Freeway Corridor Hiking Trails' at the end of this chapter which identifies major hiking trails throughout the region).
>
> d. Ensure that the routing and improvement of trails facilities is compatible with the resource values of adjacent lands.
>
> e. Relocate or redesign any trails that may exist within environmentally sensitive areas to enhance their use and protect natural resources.
>
> f. Prohibit motorized off-road vehicle use on the area trails system; restrict mountain bike use to those trails specifically designed and identified for such use and where conflict with equestrian and hiking uses would not occur…"

"IV-49 Ensure that an appropriate portion of preserved open space areas is devoted to recreational facilities, consistent with the mountains area environment…

…d. Locate and design parking for recreation areas in a manner compatible with the need for preservation of natural resources, including scenic values, wildlife habitats and corridors, and water and groundwater quality."

"IV-52 Allow the development of new, and the retention of existing, private recreational facilities, including equestrian rental and boarding facilities, low intensity campgrounds and conference facilities in rural and mountain areas where the character of such facilities dictates the need for such a setting and can be developed and operated in a manner consistent with the environmental protection policies of the North Area Plan, and where such uses would be compatible with surrounding land uses."

The amendment to the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD would add additional development standards for vineyards, and may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review. Further, the proposed amendment would require a CUP for all new water wells, which would require individual projects to analyze the impacts to water supply and usage. The proposed amendment would not grant entitlements for any project or propose the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities. However, future recreational projects that propose new water wells or vineyards would be subject to the amendment's requirements.

The CSD amendment contains standards that would prevent or reduce the environmental impacts of vineyards and water wells, including those vineyards and water wells proposed at recreational facilities. Such standards include requiring vineyards provide buffers from streams/drainage courses, prohibiting vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent, prohibiting vineyard pesticide use and requiring integrated pest management practices, requiring vineyard site development measures that reduce runoff, and requiring applicants for new water wells to demonstrate that proposed wells would not have significant adverse impacts on groundwater, streams, or natural resources. Further, future projects would continue to be required to mitigate impacts of recreational facilities on the environment through the implementation of existing County Code and SMMNAP policies.

The proposed amendment would apply to the Santa Monica Mountains North Area, which is located in the Las Virgenes-Malibu-Conejo subregion of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Historically, SCAG's RTP growth forecast for this area, particularly in the unincorporated areas, have reflected minimal increases in population compared to the rest of the SCAG region, given the low density character and the presence of natural resources. The project would not cumulatively exceed official or local population projections, would not directly or indirectly induce growth, and would not generate any additional human activity beyond existing conditions. Therefore, the amendment would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, and would have a less than significant impact.

c) There are numerous designated Open Space areas throughout the CSD area, including the Upper Las Virgenes Open Space Preserve, Ladyface Open Space area, and the Rocky Oaks Open Space area. The SMMNAP contains policies that require regional open space connectivity, such as:

"IV-1 Place primary emphasis on the preservation of large, unbroken blocks of natural open space and wildlife habitat areas, and protect the integrity of habitat linkages. As part of this emphasis, support programs for the purchase of open space lands, encourage clustering of development to increase the amount of preserved open space, reduce grading and the need for vegetation clearance, and develop design criteria for the construction of highways and other infrastructure improvements that meets environmentally-sensitive standards similar to those imposed on new development.

IV-2 When determining which portions of a development site should be retained in open space, first priority should be the preservation of viable, sensitive habitat areas and linkages. Preserving open space for its aesthetic qualities is also essential, as discussed in Goal II."

"IV- 41 Preserve open space corridors which physically link open space and habitat areas to populated areas as well as to complementary recreational uses."

"Vl-6 Preserve open space corridors that link major open space areas, natural habitats and public park lands to activity centers, other open space, and scenic routes to help define suburban form and beautify the region."

"Vl-24 Coordinate the provision of greenbelts and open space within individual developments and community areas so as to foster and enhance local identity and sense of place and to connect trails and open space/wildlife corridors wherever possible."

The amendment to the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD would add development standards for vineyards, and may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review. Further, the proposed amendment would require a CUP for all new water wells, which would require individual projects to analyze the impacts to water supply and usage. The proposed amendment would not grant entitlements for any project, including those projects that would interfere within regional open space connectivity. Future projects would continue to be required to preserve or enhance open space connectivity through the implementation of existing County Code and SMMNAP policies. Further, the proposed amendment contains standards that may help to enhance open space connectivity, such as requiring that vineyards provide buffers from streams/drainage courses, and prohibiting vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent. Therefore, the proposed amendment would have no impact on regional open space connectivity.

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 measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program (CMP), including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the CMP for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

a) The proposed amendment to the Santa Monica Mountains CSD would define vineyards as a use, establish development standards for vineyards, require a CUP for water wells as a primary or accessory use, and establish development standards for new water wells. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review.

Traffic conditions are determined by using a system that measures the volume of traffic going through an intersection at a specific point in time relative to the intersection's maximum possible automobile through-put. This volume-to-capacity ratio is referred to as Level of Service (LOS) and ranges from the best-case scenario LOS A (free-flowing conditions) to the worst-case scenario LOS F (gridlock).

The 2012–2035 Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) provides various strategies to reduce emissions from transportation sources to comply with SB 375, improve public health, and meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards as set forth by the Clean Air Act. The RTP/SCS also suggests improvements to regional transportation systems, including new/expanded bus and rail service, commuter rail extensions, high-speed rail construction, and active transportation and transportation demand strategies. The SCS chapter discusses how the majority of new housing and job growth could be concentrated in high-quality transit areas and other opportunity areas, to improve jobs-housing balance and provide more opportunity for transit-oriented development.[28]

The Transportation Element of the adopted Los Angeles County General Plan contains policies requiring the effectiveness of the circulation system, such as:

"3. Plan and develop bicycle routes and pedestrian walkways."

"5. Coordinate land use and transportation policies.

6. Support the development of a mass transportation system that will provide a viable alternative to the automobile.

7. Support continued improvement and expansion of the present bus system as a public service."

"11. Support development of rail transit or exclusive bus lanes in high demand corridors when sufficient patronage, cost-effectiveness and support of land use policies are assured."

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) administers the County's Congestion Management Program (CMP). The CMP is a tool used to link land use decisions with their impact to the regional transportation system. For purposes of the CMP, 160 intersections in the County have been identified for monitoring along with 81 key freeway segments. Furthermore, 133 bus routes and Metro Rail and Metrolink corridors are also monitored by the CMP. The CMP meets the requirements of Section 65089 of the California Government Code and the federal requirements for a Congestion Management System (CMS).[29]

The Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan (SMMNAP) also contains policies for effectiveness of the performance of the circulation system, such as:

---

[28] SCAG Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy 2012-2035. http://media.scagrtp.net/media/ff582cb8-d388-4405-aee7-5b9543697458 Accessed 8/11/2015.

[29] Metro 2010 Congestion Management Program. http://media.metro.net/docs/cmp_final_2010.pdf Accessed 8/11/2015.

“Vll-1 Emphasize non-motorized transportation, where feasible, before pursuing construction or widening of roadways through hillside areas. Expand the carrying capacity of the area roadway system only where existing environmental resources (habitats/linkages, viewsheds, SEAs, etc.), residential neighborhoods, and rural communities are adequately protected, and it is economically feasible and prudent to do so in light of the environmental threshold carrying capacities and environmental protection, environmental hazard mitigation, and community character policies contained in the North Area Plan.”

“Vll-6 In reviewing projects that generate substantial amounts of "off-peak" traffic, analyze the intrusiveness of project traffic as a land use compatibility issue in addition to the traditional roadway capacity analysis.”

“Vll-8 Work with Caltrans to maximize the capacity of the Ventura Freeway within its existing right-of- way and to expand the carrying capacity of bridges over the freeway; consideration should be given to the establishment of a high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane and the provision of other carpooling incentives.”

“VI 1-10 Limit the intensity and traffic generation of new residential, commercial, office, and business park development projects to that which is consistent with achieving and maintaining roadway performance objectives and protecting the integrity of existing rural communities and urban/suburban residential neighborhoods.

Vll-11 Require commercial development, including commercial recreational uses, to provide incentives for carpooling, such as van-pools.”

“Vll-13 Encourage the routing of through traffic onto the freeway and designated arterial streets, while discouraging through traffic in residential neighborhoods.

Vll-14 Modify the Highway Plan, as appropriate; complete the highway network, (Map 5 – Highway Plan Policy, as amended) and improve roadways, as needed, to accommodate planned development and increases in recreational activities (Figure 3). All highway construction activity should be accomplished in a manner sensitive to adjacent habitat areas, streams and other sensitive areas that may be impacted by such activity.”

“Vll-20 Support the responsible expansion of public transit serving the North Area Plan's communities, including connections between major destinations within the communities and the Los Angeles metropolitan area.”

“Vll-22 Develop, and as part of new non-residential development, require the provision of priority park-and-ride lots and parking facilities for public transit vehicles, bicycles, and motorcycles to encourage these modes of transportation.

Vll-23 Encourage public transit service and staging areas--including park-and ride lots, both within the region and from metropolitan Los Angeles to the area's major employment centers and parks.

Vll-24 Promote bicycle use by requiring establishment of secure and adequate areas for the parking and storage of bicycles, showers, lockers, and other facilities at major employment and recreation destinations.

Vll-25 Develop and maintain a comprehensive system of bicycle routes within the planning area, as depicted on Map 7 - 'Ventura Freeway Corridor Bikeway Plan' (located at the end of this chapter), and provide appropriate support facilities for bicycle riders; incorporate bike lanes and/or bike use signage into local road designs wherever feasible.”

"Vll-27 Promote the establishment of Transportation Demand Management programs in major employment-generating developments."

No part of the proposed amendment would conflict with or alter transportation-related policies, plans, and/or ordinances. The proposed amendment would not grant entitlements to any projects. All future projects would be required to comply with all applicable transportation policies, including those contained in the County Code and the SMMNAP. All future development projects that would occur after adoption of the amendment would continue to be required to comply with all current policies and regulations as maintained by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works relating to traffic and all modes of transportation, including policies that establish measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Therefore, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

b) The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) administers the County's CMP. The CMP is a tool used to link land use decisions with their impact to the regional transportation system. For purposes of the CMP, 160 intersections in the County have been identified for monitoring along with 81 key freeway segments. Furthermore, 133 bus routes and Metro Rail and Metrolink corridors are also monitored by the CMP.

The proposed amendment would not rezone any parcels, is not expected to induce development in the area, would not entitle any projects, and thus would not require the construction of any new transportation infrastructure or generate new traffic trips. Accordingly, the proposed amendment would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the CMP, for designated roads or highways. Additionally, all future development will continue to be required to comply with the County CMP and therefore impacts are expected to be less than significant related to exceeding the CMP Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds.

c) The project site is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport, public use airport, or military airport. The proposed amendment does not grant entitlements for any projects and would not result in any development that either increases demand for air travel services or results in the development of structures sufficiently tall that flight paths need to be altered or necessitates a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. The proposed amendment would have no impact on airport operations or traffic.

d) The proposed CSD amendment would not directly result in any new development of road construction in the CSD area. Further, the proposed amendment would not result in any development features occurring that could result in potentially hazardous conditions. The proposed project would not preclude future development from being required to comply with all applicable Department of Public Works safe design and access requirements. In addition, the proposed amendment would proof of legal access for any new vineyard development that is not accessed directly from a public roadway. This may help prevent or reduce vineyard development where safe and legal access cannot be provided. Therefore the proposed amendment would have a less than significant impact related to a substantial increase in hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.

e) The SMMNAP contains policies requiring adequate emergency access:

"VII-18 Cooperate with adjacent jurisdictions and Caltrans in establishing an alternate emergency through route parallel to the Ventura Freeway which can be used for local travel and emergency access, and which do not impede wildlife corridors in adjacent canyons. From west to east, this route would consist of Agoura Road, Las Virgenes Road, Mureau Road, and Calabasas Road. To complete this route, the following

improvements shall be required: the opening of Agoura Road between Liberty Canyon and Malibu Hills roads, constructing a new, four lane bridge carrying Mureau Road over the Ventura Freeway west of the present bridge, and widening of Calabasas Road to four lanes west of Parkway Calabasas. (See Map 6 - 'Ventura Freeway Proposed Emergency Alternate Route Plan' at the end of this chapter.)

Vll-19 Work with the Sheriff's Department, California Highway Patrol, and Caltrans to establish emergency detours and traffic routing to handle emergencies on the Ventura Freeway."

The proposed CSD amendment would not grant entitlements or directly result in any new construction that would block or provide inadequate emergency access. Further, the proposed amendment would not result in any development features that could result in inadequate emergency access. The proposed project would not preclude future development from being required to comply with all applicable emergency access requirements, including County Code regulations and SMMNAP policies, nor would it alter any existing standards or requirements for maintaining adequate emergency vehicle and resident/employee access. Therefore, the impacts related to the provision of adequate emergency access would be less than significant.

f) Applicable policies regarding public transit are contained in the soon-to-be-adopted Los Angeles County General Plan Update. Related to bicycle plans and infrastructure, the Los Angeles County Bicycle Master Plan seeks to increase the number of people cycling in the County and to improve safety and convenience for cyclists by planning for an additional 800 miles of new bikeways. In addition to bikeways, the Plan also calls for more supportive facilities like bicycle parking facilities and end-of-trip amenities like changing rooms and showers. The Bicycle Master Plan does propose several new Class III bike lanes within the CSD area.

Related to pedestrian facilities, one of the goals of the County's Healthy Design Ordinance is to promote better physical health by making it easier and more pleasant to walk along the unincorporated County's sidewalks. This ordinance calls for an increase in the minimum sidewalk width and the planting of streets trees and landscaping where possible.

Further, the SMMNAP contains policies that support the use of public transit and the development of bicycle and pedestrian facilities:

"Vll-20 Support the responsible expansion of public transit serving the North Area Plan's communities, including connections between major destinations within the communities and the Los Angeles metropolitan area.

Vll-21 Require the provision of bus turnouts in new development and on existing roadways as acquisition and improvement activities occur when requested to do so by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority; cooperate with adjacent jurisdictions to develop/implement this and other public transit-friendly design features into new subdivisions and other discretionary project applications.

Vll-22 Develop, and as part of new non-residential development, require the provision of priority park-and-ride lots and parking facilities for public transit vehicles, bicycles, and motorcycles to encourage these modes of transportation.

Vll-23 Encourage public transit service and staging areas--including park-and ride lots, both within the region and from metropolitan Los Angeles to the area's major employment centers and parks.

Vll-24 Promote bicycle use by requiring establishment of secure and adequate areas for the parking and storage of bicycles, showers, lockers, and other facilities at major employment and recreation destinations.

Vll-25 Develop and maintain a comprehensive system of bicycle routes within the planning area, as depicted on Map 7 - 'Ventura Freeway Corridor Bikeway Plan' (located at the end of this chapter), and provide appropriate support facilities for bicycle riders; incorporate bike lanes and/or bike use signage into local road designs wherever feasible."

The proposed CSD amendment would not grant entitlements and would not include any policies or provisions that would conflict with the Bicycle Master Plan, Healthy Design Ordinance, General Plan Mobility Element, SMMNAP circulation-related policies, or other adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. All future developments would continue to be required to comply with all applicable policies and regulations contained in transportation plans. Further, the proposed amendment is not expected to induce new development and thus will not generate any new traffic or demand for transportation services in the CSD area. Therefore, the proposed amendment is expected to have less than a significant impact related to alternative transportation policies or decreasing the performance or safety of 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 either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

a.) The proposed Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD amendment would define vineyards as a use, establish development standards for vineyards, require a CUP for water wells as a primary or accessory use, and establish development standards for new water wells. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review.

The proposed development standards and permit requirements for vineyards and water wells would not lessen existing regulations related to utility or other public service systems. Further, the CSD amendment would not grant entitlements to any project and would not be expected to induce population growth or new development in the CSD area. In addition, because the amendment would not rezone any parcels, it would not result in any development that is not already anticipated to occur and planned for in existing plans and regulations.

The Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD is under the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. All future development that would occur after the implementation of the amendment would continue to be required to comply with the water quality requirements in the Basin Plan for the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB). Future projects that would connect to a municipal wastewater system (which is the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District in the CSD area) would be required to comply with the standards imposed by the municipal water systems' National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the LARWQCB. Future projects utilizing on-site septic systems would have to comply with Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) of the State of California issued by the LARWQCB.

Therefore the potential for the proposed amendment to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the LARWQCB is a less than significant impact.

b.) The proposed CSD amendment would not grant entitlements to any project and would not be expected to induce population growth or new development in the CSD area. In addition, because the amendment would not rezone any parcels, it would not result in any development that is not already anticipated to occur and planned for in existing plans and regulations.

The proposed amendment would not alter existing standards and procedures to ensure adequate sewage treatment capacity is available to serve proposed development. Further, the proposed CSD amendment would require a CUP for all new water wells, including all water wells proposed as an accessory use (e.g., to a house or to an agricultural use). This would allow all water wells to be subject to a discretionary review, which would require individual projects to analyze impacts to water supply and usage.

The proposed amendments to the CSD are not expected to increase any demand for water or sewer services in the area. Therefore, the potential for the proposed amendment to create water or wastewater system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities is a less than significant impact.

c.) The proposed CSD amendment would not rezone any parcels, and therefore would not result in an increase in impermeable surfaces beyond what is anticipated or result in an increase in stormwater runoff in a way that would significantly impact the stormwater drainage system. The amendment would not grant

entitlements for any project and therefore would have no impact on drainage system capacity or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

The CSD amendment would establish vineyard development standards that may prevent or minimize runoff, such as prohibiting vineyard planting on slopes over 50 percent and requiring site development measures such as bioretention facilities and bioswales that can attenuate or filter flow before it reaches a stream or drainage course. In addition, future projects would be required to comply with the County's Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance in managing runoff. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant. Therefore, the potential for the CSD amendment to impact stormwater drainage facilities would be a less than significant impact.

d.) The CSD amendment would not grant entitlements to any project and would not consume any water. In addition, because the amendment would not rezone any parcels, it would not result in any development that is not already anticipated to occur and planned for in existing plans and regulations. The proposed amendment would not alter existing standards and procedures to ensure water supply is available to serve future development.

For those projects that would require private water wells, as a primary or accessory use, the proposed CSD amendment would require applicants to obtain a CUP, as well as to comply with the applicable development standards for new water wells. This would require individual projects to analyze the impacts to water supply and usage from establishing new water wells. As such, the proposed CSD amendment's impact on water supply would be less than significant.

e.) The CSD amendment would not grant entitlements to any project and would not result in additional energy consumption or create increased demand for public utility services. In addition, because the amendment would not rezone any parcels, it would not result in any development that is not already anticipated to occur and planned for in existing plans and regulations. All future developments would continue to be required to provide all necessary energy infrastructure and implement all energy efficiency requirements and comply with applicable policies and regulations pertaining to all utilities and service systems. Therefore, impacts to energy services are expected to be less than significant.

f.) The CSD amendment would not grant entitlements to any project and would not result in additional demand for solid waste disposal capacity at County landfills. In addition, because the amendment would not rezone any parcels, it would not result in any development that is not already anticipated to occur and planned for in existing plans and regulations. All future developments would continue to be required to implement all solid waste diversion requirements. Therefore, impacts to solid waste services are expected to be less than significant.

g.) The proposed CSD amendment would not preclude future projects from complying with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, including the County's Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) and the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939). Therefore, there the proposed amendment with have no impact on complying with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) 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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) The proposed project would amend the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District CSD by adding a definition of vineyards and new development standards for the development and operation of vineyards in all zones within the CSD, adding development standards for all new water wells, and requiring a Conditional Use Permit for all new water wells as either a primary or accessory use within the CSD. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review. Biological resources such as sensitive habitat and plant species do exist on the CSD area. Sensitive plant species have been identified in the CSD area and are inventoried with the CNDDB. These biological resources are identified and protected through various federal, state, regional, and local laws and ordinances. The County's primary mechanism to conserve biological diversity is through SEAs, which are ecologically important land and water systems that are valuable as plant and/or animal communities, often integral to the

preservation of threatened or endangered species, and conservation of biological diversity in the County. These areas also include nearly all of the wildlife corridors in the County, as well as oak woodlands and other unique and/or native trees. The Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD contains known sensitive or endangered species as identified by the State's Fish and Wildlife Department as well as the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

The proposed amendment would add vineyard development standards that may prevent or reduce impacts to sensitive species such as requiring vineyards to provide buffers from streams/drainage course, prohibiting pesticides and requiring integrated pest management practices, and requiring site development measures such as bioswales to reduce runoff. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant.

The proposed CSD amendment would not provide entitlement for any projects, including those projects that could affect SEAs. The amendment would not include any changes to SEA conformance criteria or permit requirements, nor would it revise, replace, or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with the County Code, SMMNAP, or General Plan policies regarding SEAs.

Future projects that are subject to CEQA and are located in an SEA would require review by one of the Department of Regional Planning's technical advisory bodies, unless specifically exempted by Title 22 or State CEQA exemptions. Projects located in an SEA would be reviewed by the Significant Ecological Area Technical Advisory Committee (SEATAC). Future projects would still be required to analyze site specific impacts to SEAs through surveys, and/or other documentation, and to mitigate these impacts through appropriate measures. Therefore, the CSD amendment would have a less than significant impact on these resources.

b) The proposed amendment would add vineyard development standards that may prevent or reduce impacts to sensitive species, vegetation habitat and water such as requiring vineyards to provide buffers from streams/drainage course, prohibiting pesticides and requiring integrated pest management practices, requiring site development measures such as bioswales to reduce runoff, and prohibiting planting on slopes of fifty percent or greater. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant. Both short term and long term environmental protection goals can be met with the addition of these development standards; therefore impacts would be less than significant.

c) The proposed project would amend the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District CSD by adding a definition of vineyards and new development standards for the development and operation of vineyards in all zones within the CSD, adding development standards for all new water wells, and requiring a Conditional Use Permit for all new water wells as either a primary or accessory use within the CSD. The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant. The proposed development standards for vineyards and water wells do not lessen any existing regulations and therefore are not expected to induce population growth or new development in the CSD area. The proposed amendment is not expected to increase any demand for public services or have cumulative impacts on the environment, and therefore impacts are expected to be less than significant.

d) The proposed project would amend the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District CSD by adding a definition of vineyards and new development standards for the development and operation of vineyards in all zones within the CSD, adding development standards for all new water wells, and requiring a Conditional Use The proposed CSD amendment may also require that all vineyards be subject to a discretionary review. Permit for all new water wells as either a primary or accessory use within the CSD. Whether vineyards are allowed by right, subject to development standards, or whether they are permitted on a discretionary basis and subject to those same development standards, the effects would be less than significant. The proposed CSD amendment would not provide entitlement for any projects, nor would it revise, replace, or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with the County Code and SMMNAP, or other State and federal policies and regulations. Future projects subject to CEQA would still be required to analyze site specific impacts and mitigate these impacts through appropriate measures. Therefore, the proposed amendment would have a less than significant impact on human beings.