COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

"Enriching Lives"

JAMES A. NOYES, Director

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331
Telephone: (626) 458-5100
www.ladpw.org

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:
P.O. BOX 1460
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460

January 8, 2004

IN REPLY PLEASE REFER TO FILE: PD-3

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

LATIGO CANYON ROAD AT CULVERT MARKER 4.87
NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND AUTHORITY TO PROCEED
SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT 3
3 VOTES

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Consider the Negative Declaration for the proposed project to remediate surficial sliding of a hillside in the Santa Monica Mountains in the unincorporated County of Los Angeles territory, concur that the project with the proposed mitigation measures will not have a significant effect on the environment, find that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the County, and approve the Negative Declaration.

2. Adopt the enclosed Reporting Program to endure compliance with the project and conditions adopted to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.

3. Approve the project, and authorize Public Works to carry out the project.

4. Find that the proposed project will have no adverse effect on wildlife resources, and authorize Public Works to complete and file a Certificate of Fee Exemption with the County Clerk.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

The purpose of the project is to stabilize the downhill slope and to restore the integrity of the damaged roadway adjacent to the project site thus providing increased safety for vehicular traffic on Latigo Canyon Road.

The project site is along Latigo Canyon Road in the vicinity of Culvert Marker 4.87. The hillside material will be excavated and recompacted to 90 percent compaction. The project also involves constructing subdrainage systems beneath the graded hillside area to carry subsurface flow toward the adjacent culvert and removal and reconstruction of an approximate 110-foot-long section of the upper Latigo Canyon Road. Upon project completion, the impacted area will be revegetated with native vegetation. The project area is approximately 59,000 square feet.

An environmental impact analysis/documentation is a California Environmental Quality Act requirement that is to be used in evaluating the environmental impacts of this project and should be considered in the approval of this project. As the project administrator, we are also the lead agency in terms of meeting the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

The Initial Study of Environmental Factors indicated that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment. In accordance with the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines adopted by your Board on November 17, 1987, a Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for public review.

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

This action is consistent with the County's Strategic Plan Goal of Service Excellence as it will allow us to restore the integrity of the damaged roadway, thereby, improving the quality of life in the County.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

The estimated construction cost of the project is $623,000. Funding for this project is included in the proposed Fiscal Year 2003-04 Road Fund Budget.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

Under the California Environmental Quality Act, any leasing agency preparing a Negative Declaration must provide a public notice within a reasonable period of time prior to certification of the Negative Declaration. To comply with this requirement, a Public Notice pursuant to Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code was published in the *Malibu Times* on June 29, 2000. Copies of the Negative Declaration were provided to the Malibu Library for public review. Notices regarding the availability of the Negative Declaration were also mailed to residents within the vicinity of the project.

The public review period for the Negative Declaration ended on July 26, 2000. Comments were received during the public review process from the California Department of Fish and Game and the California Department of Transportation. Responses to comments are included in Attachment B of the Negative Declaration.

Based upon the Initial Study of Environmental Factors, it was determined that the project with the proposed mitigation measure will not have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, approval of the Negative Declaration is requested at this time.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

The California Environmental Quality Act requires public agency decision makers to document and consider the environmental implication of their action.

Mitigation measures have been included as part of the project. We have prepared the enclosed Reporting and Monitoring Program that includes maintaining records to ensure compliance with environmental mitigation measures adopted as part of this project. Your Board is being asked to approve and authorize Public Works to carry out this project.

A fee must be paid to the State Department of Fish and Game when certain notices required by the California Environmental Quality Act are filed with the County Clerk. The County is exempt from paying this fee when the Board finds that a project will have no impacts on wildlife resources. The Initial Study of Environmental Factors concluded that there will be no adverse effects on wildlife resources.

Upon approval of the Negative Declaration by your Board, Public Works will file a Certificate of Fee Exemption with the County Clerk. A $25 handling fee will be paid to the County Clerk for processing. We will also file Notice of Determination in accordance with requirements of Section 21152(a) of the California Public Resources Code.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

The project will not have an impact on current road services or projects.

CONCLUSION

Please return one approved copy of this letter to us.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald L. Wolfe

JAMES A. NOYES
Director of Public Works

AA:ph
C031855
P:\pdpub\Temp\EP&A\Enviromental Unit\Projects\Latigo Cyn Rd, MM 4.87\Latigo Brdltr..doc

Enc.

cc: Chief Administrative Office
County Counsel

PROGRAM FOR REPORTING AND MONITORING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT MITIGATION MEASURES

LATIGO CANYON ROAD AT CULVERT MARKER 4.87

The following program will be used to monitor and implement the mitigation measures discussed in Section XVIII of the Negative Declaration.

1.0 **Program Management**

1.1 After adoption of environmental mitigation measures by the Board of Supervisors, Public Works shall designate responsibility for monitoring and reporting compliance with each mitigation measure.

1.2 To facilitate implementation and enforcement of this program, Public Works shall ensure that the obligation to monitor and report compliance with environmental mitigation measures is required by all project-related contracts between the County and consultant, prime construction contractor, and nay other person or entity who is designated to monitor and/or report compliance under this program during the preconstruction and construction phases.

1.3 Public Works, as appropriate, shall take all necessary and appropriate measures to ensure that each project-related environmental mitigation measure, which was adopted, is implemented and maintained.

2.0 **Preconstruction**

2.1 Public Works or consultant for project design is responsible for incorporating mitigation measures into project design and confirming in writing that final construction drawings include all design-related mitigation measures.

2.2 Public Works or consultant for design of project-related off-site improvements is responsible for incorporating mitigation measures and confirming in writing that final construction drawings include all design-related mitigation measures.

3.0 **Construction**

3.1 Public Works or prime construction contractor for project and/or for project-related off-site improvements is responsible for construction and/or monitoring the construction of mitigation measures incorporated in final construction documents and reporting instances of noncompliance in writing.

3.2 Public Works or prime construction contractor for project and/or for project-related off-site improvements is responsible for implementation and/or monitoring the implementation of mitigation measures affecting methods and practices of construction (e.g., hours of operation, noise control of machinery) and reporting instances of noncompliance in writing.

3.3 Public Works is responsible for monitoring compliance of prime constriction contractor(s) with responsibility set forth in 3.1 and 3.2 above and reporting noncompliance in writing.

4.0 **Project Operation**

4.1 After completion and final acceptance of the project, Public Works is responsible for monitoring and maintaining compliance with adopted mitigation measures, which affect project operation.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FOR

LATIGO CANYON ROAD AT CULVERT MARKER 4.87

I. Location and Brief Description

The proposed project is located in the Santa Monica Mountains, north of the Malibu Vista area in the unincorporated County of Los Angeles territory. The project involves remediating surficial sliding of the hillside along Latigo Canyon Road in the vicinity of Culvert Marker 4.87. The material will be excavated and recompacted to 90 percent compaction. The project also involves constructing subdrainage systems beneath the graded hillside area to carry subsurface flow toward the adjacent culvert and removal and reconstruction of an approximate 110-foot-long section of the upper Latigo Canyon Road. Upon project completion, the impacted area will be revegetated with native vegetation. The project are is approximately 59,000 square feet.

The purpose of the project is to stabilize and minimize surficial sliding of the downhill slope and the restore the integrity of the damaged roadway adjacent to the project site, thus providing increased safety for vehicular traffic on Latigo Canyon Road.

II. Mitigation Measures Included in the Project to Avoid Potentially Significant Effects

No significant effects are identified. However, mitigation measures are discussed in Section XVIII of the Initial Study.

III. Finding of No Significant Effect

Based on the attached Initial Study, it has been determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

INITIAL STUDY OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

1. **Project Title:** Latigo Canyon Road at Culvert Marker 4.87

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 11th Floor, Programs Development Division, 900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, California 91803-1331

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Mr. Albert Anidi – (626)458-5199

4. **Project Location:** Santa Monica Mountains, north of the Malibu Vista area in the unincorporated Los Angeles County territory (see attached map)

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, California 91803-1331

6. **General Plan Designation:** Non-urban hillside

7. **Zoning:** Non-urban

8. **Description of Project:** The project involves remediating surficial sliding of the hillside along Latigo Canyon Road in the vicinity of Culvert Marker 4.87. The material will be excavated and recompacted to 90 percent compaction. The project compaction. The project also involves constructing sudrainage systems beneath the graded hillside area to carry subsurface flow toward the adjacent culvert and removal and reconstruction of an approximate 110-foot-long section of the upper Latigo Canyon Road. Upon project completion, the impacted area will be revegetated with native vegetation. The project area is approximately 59, 000 square feet.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:**

   A. **Project Site-**The project site is located on a steep terrain at an approximately elevation of 1,600 feet above sea level. The area is moderately vegetated with chaparral and shrubs. The existing roadway is in fair condition with cracks in certain areas of the roadway pavement. Animal life consists of small mammals, lizards, and insects.

   B. **Sorrounding Properties-**The area surrounding the project site is rural. Apart from the residence adjacent to the site, there is no residence in close proximity to the project site. The surrounding topography is generally hilly. The vegetation in the surrounding area consists of mature trees, shrubs and grass, and animal life also consists of small mammals, lizards, birds, and insects.

10. **Other agencies whose approval is required (and permits needed):** Approval will be required from the California Coastal Commission prior to project construction.

P:\pdpub\Temp\EP&A\Enviromental Unit\Projects\Latigo Cyn Rd, MM 4.87\Negativedeclaration.doc

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

___Aesthetics	___Agriculture Resources	___Air Quality
___Biological Resources	___Cultural Resources	___Geology/Solis
___Hazards & Hazardous Materials	___Hydrology/Water Quality	___Land Use/Planning
___Mineral Resources	___Noise	___Population/Housing
___Public Services	___Recreation	___Transportation/Traffic
___Utilities/Service Systems	___Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

_X_ 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 standard, 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 would have significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTALIMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

_____ Signature

_____ Date

Albert E. Anidi
Printed Name

LACDPW
For

Attach.

AA:ph
P:\pdpub\Temp\EP&A\Enviromental Unit\Projects\Latigo Cyn Rd, MM 4.87\FactorsPotentiallyaffected.doc

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 a lead agency 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 a well as on-site, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) "Potential Significant Impact" is appropriate if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more "Potential Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report is required.

4) "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an affect from "Potential 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 XVIII, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program Environmental Impact Report, or other California Environmental Quality Act process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVIII at the end of the checklist.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). See the sample question below. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

LATIGO CANYON ROAD CULVERT MARKER 4.87
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I.	**AESTHETICS – Would the project:**					
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
	b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?				X
	C)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
	d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
II.	**AGRICULTURE RESOURCES** – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:					
	a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non agricultural use?				X
	b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?				X
	c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use?				X
III.	**AIR QULAITY** – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
C)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for zone precursors)?			X	
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	—		X	
IV.	**BIOLOGICAL RESOUCES – Would the project:**				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife?				X
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident, migratory fish, or wildlife species; or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors; or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X	

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan; Natural Community Conservation Plan; or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?				X
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:					
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?				X
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5				X
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
VI. GEOLOGIY AND SOILS – Would the project:					
a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				X
	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 for a know fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
	ii) Strong Seismic ground shaking?				X
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
	iv) Landslides?				X
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
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?			X	

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				X
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
VII.	**HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:**				
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code, Section 65962.5, and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles or a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
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?				X
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
h)	Expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where				X

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	residences are intermixed with wildlands?				
VIII.	**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY– Would the project:**				
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharger requirements?			X	
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 preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
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?			X	
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?			X	
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
g)	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?				X
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i)	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?				X
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
IX.	**LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:**				
a)	Physically divide an established community?				X
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but				X

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	limited to, general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:					
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific land, or other land use plan?				X
XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:					
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
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?				X
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?				X
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:					
a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of				X

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	replacement housing elsewhere?				
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
XIII.	**PUBLIC SERVICES -**				
a)	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
	Fire protection?				X
	Police protection?				X
	Schools?				X
	Parks?				X
	Other public facilities?				X
XIV.	**RECREATION -**				
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?				X
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or required the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
XV.	**TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project**				
a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X	
b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the Count Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?				X
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?				X
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a				

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:					
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b)	Require 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?				X
c)	Require 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?			X	
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g)	Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE -					
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, reduce the number or restrict the ranger of rare or endangered plant or				X

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively Considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				X
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

XVIII. DISCUSSION OF WAYS TO MITIGATE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS –

Section 15041 (a) of the State CEQA guidelines states that a lead agency for a project has authority to require changes in any or all activities involved in the project in order to lessen or avoid significant effects on the environment. No significant effects have been identified. However, the following standard mitigation measures have been included:

Air Quality

- Compliance with applicable air pollution control regulations.

Noise

- Compliance with all applicable noise ordinances during construction.
- Construction activities would be restricted to the County appointed construction times.

Transportation

- Advance notification of all street and/or lane closures and detours to all emergency service agencies and affected residents.
- Compliance with all applicable laws and ordinances regarding the transportation routes for the haul of material.

Earth

- Proper disposal of all excess excavated material.
- Excavated areas will be backfilled and roadway will be resurfaced.

Cultural Resources

- Immediate cessation of construction upon discovery of any cultural resource.

P:\pdpub\Temp\EP&A\Enviromental Unit\Projects\Latigo Cyn Rd, MM 4.87\LATIGO AVENUEChicklist.doc

ATTACHMENT A

DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

LATIGO CANYON ROAD AT CULVERT MARKER 4.87

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

a) ***Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project involves the removal and replacement of earthen material and revegetation of a hillside. It will not obstruct the existing viewscope of the area. The aesthetics impact will be less than significant since the impacted area will be revegetated.

b) ***Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?***

No impact. The proposed project area has been subjected to surficial sliding, which has disturbed existing vegetation. Construction activities may impact existing scenic resources within the project site; however, as discussed earlier, the impacted area will be revegetated.

c) ***Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?***

Less than significant impact. The vegetation removed will be replaced with native vegetation so that the viewscope of the area will not be altered. Thus, the impacts to aesthetics or quality of the site are considered less than significant.

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

No impact. Construction activities will be limited between 7 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. There, night time construction, which would introduce additional lighting systems, is not anticipated.

II. <u>AGRICULTURE RESOURCE</u> – ***In determining whether impacts to agricultural resource are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.*** <u>Would the project:</u>

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 nonagricultural use?***

No impact. The proposed project is located in a non-urban hillside, which is topographically unsuitable for agricultural or farmland purposes. Thus, the project will have no impact on farmland.

b) ***Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?***

No impact. The proposed project will not conflict with any zoning for agricultural use. Thus, the project will not impact any existing zoning for agricultural use.

c) ***Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use?***

No impact. The proposed project does not involve changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use.

III. <u>AIR QUALITY</u> – ***Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.*** <u>Would the project</u>:

a) ***Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?***

No impact. Public Works currently complies with dust control measures enforced by the South Coast Air Management District (SCAQMD). The proposed project will not conflict with the current implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

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

Less than significant impact. Construction-related emissions and dust would be emitted during project construction. However, the effect would be temporary and would not significantly alter the ambient air quality of the area. Construction activities are anticipated to occur from 7 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. The project specifications would require the contractor to control dust by appropriate means such as sweeping and/or watering and comply with applicable air polluting regulations. When transporting excess excavated material, the contractor would be required to cover material with a tarp to reduce dust emissions and prevent falling debris. Thus, the impacts would be temporary and considered less than significant.

c) ***Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?***

Less than significant impact. Project specifications will require the contractor to comply with all Federal and Air Quality Districts emission control regulations. Therefore, the impact from increase of any criteria potential under applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard is considered less than significant.

d) ***Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?***

Less than significant impact. Only one residence is in close proximity to the project. Sensitive receptors in the area may be subjected to dust and construction equipment emissions during project construction. The impact is considered to be less than significant since the exposure would be temporary and precautions will be taken to mitigate exposure to pollutants. Project specifications would require the contractor to control dust by appropriate means such as sweeping and/or watering and comply with all applicable air pollution control regulations.

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

Less than significant impact. Objectionable odors may be generated from diesel trucks during construction of the project and from newly placed asphalt. These types of odors will be short-term and temporary. Therefore, the impact of creating objectionable odor is considered less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) ***Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

No impact. Per a biological survey conducted at the site, no sensitive or special status species, or any species identified as a candidate in local or regional plans, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are known to exist at the project site. The vegetation to be removed during construction consists of chaparral cover. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on sensitive or special status species or their respective habitat.

b) ***Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

No Impact. The is no riparian habitat or no known sensitive community in the project area.

c) ***Have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?***

No impact. The proposed project does not involve a wetland habitat. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact wetland habitat.

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?***

Less than significant impact. The impact to wildlife is not expected to be significantly affected but the proposed project. The proposed project would impact approximately 1.3 acre, which is relatively small compared to the available wildlife area in the project vicinity. Wildlife that currently exists in or near the area would be temporarily displaced due to construction activities and would be able to relocate to adjacent undeveloped area. Upon project completion, wildlife would be able to return to the project site. There are no known rare, unique, or endangered

species within the project are. The impact to wildlife would, be temporary and considered less than significant.

e) ***Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?***

No impact. No known locally protected biological resources exist at the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resource.

f) ***Conflict with provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plan?***

No impact. No known adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan exists within the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on any of these plans.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a-d) ***Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5; directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature; or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries?***

No Impact. A quick check was done by the Cotsen Institute of Archaeology at UCLA and no known paleontological, archaeological, and historical resources were found in the project area. However, if any cultural resources, including human remains, are discovered during construction, the contractor shall cease excavation and contact a specialist to examine the project site as required by project specifications. Thus, the effects of the proposed project on these resources is not considered significant.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

a) ***Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:***

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

No Impact. There are no know active faults underlying the project site, and we do not anticipate a fault rupture occurring at the project site.

ii) ***Strong seismic ground shaking?***

No impact. The proposed project will result in a beneficial impact. The project is a known landslide area. During a strong seismic ground shaking, the project may be subject to movement. However, our proposed project will minimize any potential landslide that may occur at the project site.

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

No impact. See response VI(a)ii. The area is not known to have suffered any liquefaction nor has it been identified as a potential liquefaction area. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on liquefaction.

iv) ***Landslides?***

No impact. The project site currently experiences erosion and subsequent surficial sliding onto the roadway. The proposed project would have a beneficial impact by stabilizing the hillside area. Thus, the impact is considered less than significant.

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

Less than significant impact. See response III(a)iv. The project would require excavation, compaction, and backfilling with compacted soils. However, changes in topography from excavation grading would be minimal. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project to the loss of top soil or soil erosion would be considered less than significant.

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?***

Less than significant impact Currently, the project site is unstable. However, the project would have a beneficial impact by stabilizing and minimizing surficial sliding. Therefore, the impact from the project on lateral spreading, on-or off-site landslide, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse would be less than significant.

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?***

No impact. The soil at the project location is not considered expansive. Soil expansion is not expected at the proposed project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact soil expansion.

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

No impact. There are no septic tanks or wastewater disposal pipes within the project scope. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

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

No impact. The proposed project does not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

b-c) ***Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment though reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment or emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances or wastes within one quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?***

Less than significant impact. Combustible engine fluids from the construction equipment are potentially hazardous substances. Necessary precautions will be taken to prevent the spillage of any hazardous substances that may affect the public or the environment at the project sit. It Is unlikely that an explosion, emission, or release of hazardous or acutely hazardous substances will occur as a result of the proposed project. Project specifications would require the contractor to properly maintain all equipment during construction. In the event of any spills of fluids, the contractor Is required to remediate according to all applicable laws regarding chemical cleanup. Thus, the proposed project impact on the public or environment is considered less than significant.

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

No impact. The project site is not known to be a hazardous materials site. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on hazardous materials.

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?***

No impact. The proposed project area is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public use airport. The proposed project will have no impact on 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?***

No impact. The proposed project area is not within two miles of a public airport. The proposed project construction would not 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?***

Less than significant impact. The project construction may require a road closure, which may cause short-term vehicle delays. However, the proper authorities will be notified regarding the schedule of construction periods in which lane closures may occur. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact on the emergency response or emergency evacuation plan.

h) ***Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?***

No impact. The proposed project will not increase fire hazard in the are. The vegetation planted will be supplied with temporary irrigation during the germination phase and will sustain itself in the future like the surrounding native vegetation. Thus, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a risk involving wildland fires.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

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

Less than significant impact. The proposed project involves constructing subdrainage systems, which would divert subsurface runoff into an adjacent culvert to minimize the landslide potential. Proper measures will be taken to ensure that the project does not discharge debris into the culvert area during construction. The contractor is required to implement Best Management Practices as required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued to the County by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to minimize construction impacts on water quality. Therefore, the project impacts on hydrology and water quality are considered less than significant.

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 preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?***

No impact. The proposed project would not involve the use of any water that would result in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. The project would repair the damaged roadway, but will not affect or extend the permeable area around the project site.

c-d) ***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 offsite or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?***

Less than significant impact. The project involves constructing subdrainage systems, which would redirect the subsurface runoff to an adjacent culvert. As a result, the project may cause slight changes to the drainage patterns of the project site, but overall drainage in the area will remain the same. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact on erosion, siltation, or on the rate of surface runoff.

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

Less than significant impact. The construction of the project will not result in significant additional surface water runoff. Construction is scheduled during dry periods. However, proper precautions by the contractor will be taken to ensure that hazardous chemicals are kept away from the vicinity of the culvert or any surface runoff. Thus, the impact of the project is considered less than significant.

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

No impact. The project primarily involves removing active landslide material and replacing it with compacted fill material. The contractor will adhere to applicable Best Management Practices to minimize any degradation to water quality during construction. Therefore, the project is not expected to generate contaminated surface water runoff.

g) ***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?***

No impact. The proposed project will not place any housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.

h) ***Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?***

No impact. The proposed project will not place any structures within a 100-year flood hazard area, which may impede or redirect flood flows.

i) ***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?***

No impact. The proposed project will not impact any drainage facility. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or property to water-related hazards.

j) ***Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?***

No impact. The proposed project is not located in a coastal area that would be subject to inundation by seiche or a tsunami or mudflow.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

a) ***Physically divide an established community?***

No impact. The project would not introduce a barrier which would divide the physical arrangement of the established community.

b) ***Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?***

No impact. The proposed project will be consistent with the General Plan of the County of Los Angeles, which designated the project area as non-urban. Right of way would be acquired from the property owner of House No. 2375 Latigo Canyon Road to complete the proposed project construction. The right-of- way acquisition will not change existing use of the land. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on general plan designation or zoning.

c) ***Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?***

No impact. The proposed project will not comflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan adopted by any agency or community.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) ***Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?***

No impact. The proposed project would not deplete any mineral resource and would, therefore, have no impact on mineral resources.

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?***

No impact. The project site is not identified as a mineral resource recovery site in the local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:

a) ***Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?***

Less than significant impact. Noise levels within the proposed project site would increase during construction. However, the impact in temporary and will be subject to existing noise ordinances and standards set by U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration. The contractor will be required to comply with the construction hours specified in the County noise control ordinances. Noise levels due to vehicular operation along the roadway, when completed, will be no higher than current levels. The construction period will last for a short period and the project would not expose people to severe noise levels. Thus, the proposed project impact to severe noise levels is considered less than significant.

b) ***Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?***

Less than significant impact. Excavation during construction could cause limited temporary ground vibration. However, the project specifications would require the contractor to comply with all noise laws and ordinances. The project ground borne vibration and noise produced by the construction work would be temporary and would not expose people to severe noise levels and is therefore considered less than significant.

c-d) ***A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

No impact. During the construction phase of the project, a nominal increase in existing noise levels will occur due to construction activities and transportation of material to and from the project site. Due to the short-term nature of the project, the impact will be less than significant. Also, construction activities would be restricted to 7 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. No construction work is anticipated to be done on weekends, nights, or holidays. The proposed project will have no permanent increase in the existing noise levels of the area.

e-f) ***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 ecessive noise levels or for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people resident or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?***

No impact. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of an airport land use plan or air strip. Thus, the proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the are to excessive noise levels.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

a) ***Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?***

No impact. The proposed project would stabilize existing surficial sliding of the hillside and reconstruct the damaged roadway. However, the road improvement is not expected to alter the growth of the human population in the are.

b-c) ***Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, or displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

No impact. The proposed project will not displace existing houses nor displace people, which would create a demand for housing. The proposed project would have a beneficial impact of providing safety for the area by minimizing surficial sliding of the hillside and improving the roadway.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICE

a) ***Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, other public facilities?***

No impact. The proposed project will not affect public service and will not result in a need for new or altered government services in fire protection, police protection, school, parks, or other public facilities. However, the County will coordinate with the police and fire departments regarding construction scheduling to prevent response time delays. Thus, the project will have no impact on these services.

XIV. RECREATION

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?***

No impact. The proposed project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks.

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

No impact. The proposed project does not include recreational facilities and will not require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:

a) ***Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?***

Less than significant impact. Latigo Canyon Road has a very little traffic because it only serves the few residences along the road. Impacts to traffic would be temporary and limited to the construction period. Project specifications would require the contractor to notify residents in advance of any road closure. Necessary safety precautionary measure such as posting or use of flagperson to direct construction traffic in and out of the construction area would be provided as needed. Thus, the impact to transportation/circulation is considered less than significant.

b) ***Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?***

No impact. The proposed project will not directly or indirectly cause traffic to exceed a level of standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways in the project area.

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?***

No impact. The proposed project will have no impact on air traffic patterns.

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

No impact. The proposed project would not effect traffic flows or patterns. Therefore, the proposed project will not increase hazards due to a design feature.

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

Less than significant impact. Traffic will temporarily be impacted during project construction since project construction may require a road closure or reduce the traffic lanes to one lane of traffic at the project site. Also, the presence of construction equipment on the street may slow down traffic. However, an alternate emergency acce3ss will be maintained at all times. The Los Angeles County fire, police, and paramedic serves will be notifies of the schedule and duration of construction activities. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on emergency access is considered less than significant.

f) ***Result in inadequate parking capacity?***

Less than significant impact. Currently, parking I not allowed on either side of the street. Thus, the project will not result in inadequate parking capacity.

g) ***Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?***

No impact. The proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEM – Would the project:

a) ***Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB?***

No impact. The project will not result in contamination or increase discharge or wastewater that might affect wastewater treatment. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on the wastewater treatment requirements of RWQCB.

b) ***Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?***

No impact. The proposed project will not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

c) ***Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?***

No impact. The proposed project will require the construction of subdrainage systems beneath the graded hillside area to direct subsurface flow towards the adjacent culvert. However, the project will not have a significant impact on storm water drainage.

d) ***Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?***

No impact. The proposed project will not result in a need for additional water supplies. Therefore, the project will have no impact on existing water supply entitlements and resources.

e) ***Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?***

No impact. No increase in the amount of wastewater discharge will occur as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on wastewater treatment.

f-g) ***Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?***

No impact. Construction of the proposed project will result in excess excavated materials and construction debris. Project specifications will require the contractor to dispose of the se materials in accordance to all applicable Federal, State, or local regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on Federal, State, or local solid waste statutes or regulations is considered less than significant.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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 o eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rear or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?***

No impact. Based on findings in this environmental review, the proposed project does not 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, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project will have no impact on the quality of the environment.

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

No impact. The proposed project is designed to increase safety for traffic flows over a long tem. The project would not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulative considerable.

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

No impact. The proposed project would not have direct or indirect detrimental environmental impact on human beings.

P:\pdpub\Temp\EP&A\Enviromental Unit\Projects\Hicks Ave Et Al\ATTACHMENT A.doc

ATTACHMENT B

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

RECEIVED ON THE INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Presented below is a response to written comments received during circulation for the Initial Study/Negative Declaration regarding the proposed Latigo Canyon Road at Culvert Marker 4.87 project. A response to comments that raise environmental issues is required by State of California Environmental Quality Act guidelines. A copy of the letter received is included on the following pages.

Response to letter of comment received from California Department of Transportation

1-1 The contractor will be required by the project specifications to obtain all necessary permits from Caltrans. When possible, the use of oversized loads on State highway will be limited to off-speak hours.

Response to letter of comments received from California Department of Fish and Game

2-1 According to the California Natural Diversity Database of the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning, special status species are not likely to appear on or near our proposed project site. A biological survey conducted for the proposed project by Keane Biological Consulting determined that there are no special status wildlife and/or botanical species at the project site.

2-2 A preconstruction bird survey will be conducted if construction of our proposed project begins during breeding bird season. Avoidance and mitigation measures to avoid disturbance of active nest will be provided, if found.