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

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO FILE: PD-3

January 22, 2004

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:

STUNT ROAD AT CULVERT MARKER 1.21
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 construct an 18-foot-high gabion wall along the slope at Culvert Marker 1.21 in the Topanga Park area of 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 ensure 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 proposed project is to restore the roadway shoulder and minimize surficial sliding adjacent to the roadway, thus providing increased safety for traffic on Stunt Road. The proposed project is located in the Topanga Park area of unincorporated County of Los Angeles territory and consists of constructing an 18-foot-high gabion wall along the slope at the north side of a sharp bend of the road at Culvert Marker 1.21 in the vicinity of Cold Creek, approximately 20 feet from the edge of the roadway shoulder. The gabion wall consists of six 3-foot-deep by 3-foot-high wire mesh boxes varying in length from 7.5 feet to 13.5 feet filled with rocks. The project also includes reconstructing the roadway shoulder at the project location.

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. By implementing the proposed improvements, residents of the County who travel on these roadways will benefit from the enhanced mobility, traffic safety, and air quality.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

Funding for construction of the project is proposed to be included in the Fiscal Year 2004-05 Road Fund budget. The estimated cost of the project is $450,000. A construction contract will be advertised for bids at a later date, contingent on your approval of this action.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

Under California Environmental Quality Act, any lead 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, notices were mailed to residents in the vicinity of the project. A copy of the Negative Declaration was sent to the Calabasas Public Library for public review.

Comments were received during the public review period from the California Departments of Transportation and Fish and Game. The responses to those comments are included in Attachment B of the Negative Declaration.

Based upon the Initial Study of Environmental Factors, the Negative Declaration determined that the project with necessary mitigation measures 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 implications of their action.

A fee must be paid to the Department of Fish and Game when certain notices required by 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 there will be no adverse effects on wildlife resources. Upon approval of the Negative Declaration by your Board, we 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 a Notice of Determination in accordance with the requirements of Section 21152(a) of the California Public Resources Code.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

The project will not have a significant impact on current services or projects currently planned.

CONCLUSION

Please return one approved copy of this letter to us.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES A. NOYES
Director of Public Works

SDS:ph
C040969
P:\pdpub\Temp\EP&A\Enviromental Unit\Projects\Stunt Road @CM1.21\brd ltr.doc

Enc.

cc: Chief Administrative Office
County Counsel

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FOR

STUNT ROAD AT CULVERT MARKER 1.21

I. Location and Brief Description

The proposed project is located in the Topanga Park area of unincorporated Los Angeles County territory, approximately three miles north of the City of Malibu. The proposed project involves constructing an 18-foot high gabion wall along the slope at the north side of a sharp bend in the road at Culvert Marker 1.21 in the vicinity of Cold Creek, approximately 20 feet away from the edge of the roadway shoulder. The gabion wall consists of six 3-foot-long by 3-foot-high wire mesh boxes filled with rocks, varying in width from 6 feet to 12 feet. The project also includes reconstructing the roadway shoulder at the project location. Right-of-way acquisition will be required to construct the proposed project.

The purpose of the project is to restore the roadway shoulder that was damaged during the 1998 storms and to minimize surficial sliding adjacent to the roadway, thus providing increased safety for traffic on Stunt 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.

POA:ro
P-2/596

Attach.

INITIAL STUDY OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

1. **Project title**: Stunt Road at Culvert Marker 1.21

2. **Lead agency name and address**: Los Angeles County Department of Public works, 900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803

3. **Contact person and phone number**: Mr. Paul Akamonu, (626) 458-4319

4. **Project location**: Topanga Park area of unincorporated Los Angeles County territory

5. **Project sponsor's name and address**: Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, 900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803

6. **General plan designation**: Open Space

7. **Zoning**: Open Space

8. **Description of project**: The proposed project is located in the Topanga Park area of unincorporated Los Angeles County territory, approximately three miles north of the City of Malibu. The proposed project involves constructing an 18-foot high gabion wall along the slope at the north side of a sharp bend in the road at Culvert Marker 1.21 in vicinity of Cold Creek, approximately 20 feet away from the edge of the roadway shoulder. The gabion wall consists of six 3-foot-long by 3-foot-high wire mesh boxes filled with rocks, varying in width from 6 feet to 12 feet. The project also includes reconstructing the roadway shoulder at the project location. Right-of-way acquisition will be required to construct the proposed project.

   The purpose of the project is to restore the roadway shoulder that was damaged during the 1998 storms and to minimize surficial sliding adjacent to the roadway, thus providing increased safety for traffic on Stunt Road.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting**:

   A. Project Site - The project site is a steep terrain. Vegetation consists mainly of shrubs and grass. Animal life consists of lizards, birds, insects, and wildlife. Cold Creek is located approximately 25 feet below the project site.

   B. Surrounding Properties - The area surrounding the project site is rural. There is no residence within the immediate vicinity of the project site. The vegetation in surrounding area consists of shrubs and grass, and animal life consists of lizards, birds, insects and wildlife.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)**

    - California Coastal Commission - Coastal Development Permit

STUNT ROAD AT CULVERT MARKER 1.21

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" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

___ Aesthetics ___ Agriculture Resources ___ Air Quality

___ Biological Resources ___ Cultural Resources ___ Geology/Soils

___ 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 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 would 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.

Paul Akamnonu 6/14/00

Signature Date

PAUL AKAMNONU

Printed Name ~~For~~

POA:ro/P-2/597

STUNT ROAD AT CULVERT MARKER 1.21
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

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 as 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, and EIR is required.

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

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XIX 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.

STUNT ROAD AT CULVERT MARKER 1.21

	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 non-agricultural use?	____	____	____	X

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

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 non-attainment 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 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?	____	____	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 Service?	____	____	____	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 or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	____	____	____	X

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. 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 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
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 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 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?	___	___	___	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 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?	___	___	___	X
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge 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 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)?	____	____	____	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 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?	____	____	____	X
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 plan 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 or 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 (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	____	____	____	X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	____	____	____	X
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, 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?	____	____	____	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 require 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 county congestion management agency for designated roads or highway?	____	____	____	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 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 range of a rare or endangered plan or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	___	___	X	___

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 -

No significant effects have been identified. However, the following standard mitigation measures have been included:

Earth

- Proper disposal of all excess excavated material.

Air Quality

- Control dust by appropriate means such as watering and/or sweeping.
- Compliance with applicable air pollution control regulations.

Noise

- Compliance with all applicable noise and ordinances during construction.
- Construction activities would be restricted from 7:15 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Monday through Friday.

Cultural Resources

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

XIX. EARLIER ANALYSES

No earlier analysis was made for the proposed project.

POA:ro
P-2/599

ATTACHMENT A

DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

STUNT ROAD AT CULVERT MARKER 1.21

I. AESTHETICS - Would the proposal:

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

No impact. The proposed project would not affect a scenic vista. Therefore, the project will have no impact on scenic vista.

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 will not affect a scenic highway. Therefore, the project will have no impact on scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

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

Less than significant impact. The wall will be compatible with the aesthetics of the area. The project will not significantly alter the viewscope of the area. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact on the visual character of the site.

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

No impact. The proposed project will not introduce any additional lighting systems. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on day or nighttime views in the area.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - Would the proposal:

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?

No impact. The proposed project location is not used for agricultural purposes or as a farmland. Therefore, the project will not convert any farmland to non-agricultural use. 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 proposed 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 non-agricultural use?***

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

III. AIR QUALITY - Would the proposal:

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

No impact. The proposed project will not conflict with or obstruct 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 take approximately two months running from 7:30 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 pollution 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 not considered significant.

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)?***

Less than significant. Project specifications will require the contractor to comply with all federal and the South Coast Air Quality Management 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. Sensitive receptors near the project site may be subjected to dust and construction equipment emission during project construction. Since the impact is temporary and short-lived, it is not considered significant.

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

Less than significant impact. No material or chemicals with a potential for creating odor are proposed to be used during the construction phase of the project. The odor from diesel trucks during construction activities will be minimal and temporary. Thus, the impact of creating objectionable odor is considered less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the proposal:

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?***

Less than significant. No known sensitive or special status species exist at the project site. The Department will prepare a revegetation plan and implement the plan to mitigate the impact of removal of minor amount of vegetation during construction. The revegetation will be at the project site, at a ratio acceptable to the California Coastal Commission. Thus, the impact of the proposed project on sensitive or special status species is considered less than significant.

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?***

Less than significant impact. There is no riparian habitat and no known sensitive natural community at the project site. Implementation of the Revegetation Plan will mitigate the impact of removal of minor amount of vegetation during construction.

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 site is not 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. Any wildlife that currently exists in or near the project area would be temporarily displaced due to construction but would be able to relocate to adjacent areas. Upon project completion, wildlife would be able to return to the project site. Also, the project is not proposed in a watercourse or any fish habitat; thus, it will not impact any resident or migratory fish. Therefore, the impact on resident or migratory wildlife or fish species will be 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 such as oak trees exist at the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

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?***

No impact. The project is located in an area with no known adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on any of these plans.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the proposal:

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

No impact. No known paleontological, archaeological, and historical resources exist 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 sites 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 proposal:

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. No known earthquake faults are located in or near the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will not impact any earthquake fault.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less than significant impact. The proposed project requires grading and compaction of earth. The project area has not been the epicenter of any known earthquake. Thus, the activities related to the project will have a less than significant effect on ground shaking.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No impact. The project area is not known to have suffered any liquefaction or identified as a potential liquefaction area. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on liquefaction.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. The proposed project will have no impact on, or induce, landslide in the project area.

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

Less than significant impact. During construction of the project, excavation, backfilling and compaction of the soil would occur. Project specifications would require the contractor to properly compact the earth and properly dispose of any excess excavated materials. Overall, the existing topography would not be significantly altered since the excavated areas would be backfilled to its original condition and excess materials removed. Also, the proposed project has a beneficial impact of minimizing erosion at the project site. 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?***

No impact. The proposed project site is not known to be on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable. Thus, the project will have no impact on unstable soil or geologic unit.

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. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact soil expansion.

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?***

No impact. There are no septic tanks or sewer pipes at the project site. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the proposal:

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 is not anticipated to be involved 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 through 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. The Phase I Site Assessment conducted by the Department for the project site concluded that there is a low potential for contamination in the project area. The project is not expected to cause an explosion, emission, or release of hazardous or acutely hazardous substances in the short or long term. Furthermore, the potential for accidental explosion or

release of hazardous substance from construction equipment is remote. In addition, project specifications would require the contractor to properly maintain all equipment during construction. However, in case of accidental spillage or leaks, the contractor will remediate according to all applicable laws regarding chemical cleanup. Also, there is no school within one-fourth of a mile radius of the project site.

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 is not within an airport land and not within two miles of a public use airport. Thus, 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 is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on 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?***

No Impact. The proposed project is located outside of the roadways. Therefore, the proposed project has no impact on emergency response plan 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 is not located in a wildland. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildlife fire.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the proposal:

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

Less than significant impact. The construction area is adjacent to the roadway shoulder and approximately 25 feet above the low flow water surface of Cold Creek. Non-storm flow are confined to an area approximately 10 feet away from the work site. The contractor will be required to ensure that no construction debris is allowed on the slopes of the creek. Additionally, the contractor will be required to follow the standard specifications of Los Angeles County Department of Public Works pertaining to project site maintenance and construction activities. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on water quality standards or waste discharge requirements is 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 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)?***

Less than significant impact. The paved access road and the debris storage area to be constructed as part of this project would minimally decrease the permeable area. The net reduction in permeable area would be approximately 0.001 acre and therefore, negligible. Thus, the impact of the proposed project on depletion of groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge is considered less than significant.

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?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project would not alter the drainage pattern in the area. The nearby Ballona Creek would continue to convey flows in the area. Thus, the project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation. Therefore, the impact of the project on erosion or siltation on- or off-site will not be considered significant.

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?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project would not alter the course of flows in the nearby Ballona Creek. However, there would be minimal increase in surface runoff due to the addition of the paved access road and the debris storage area. Ballona Creek would continue to convey runoff in the area. Therefore, the impact to surface runoff is considered less than significant.

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 minimal increase in runoff would be conveyed in the nearby Ballona Creek. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on the existing or planned stormwater drainage system will be considered less than significant.

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

Less than significant impact. The contractor shall follow the County's standard specifications regarding site maintenance and will adhere by the Best Management Practice to minimize any degradation to water quality.

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 which would impede or redirect flood flows within the 100-year flood hazard area.

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?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project is not located near or around a dam. Also, runoff are contained within Ballona Creek and no flooding is anticipated as a result of the project. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project to risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding from failure of a levee or dam is considered less than significant.

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

No impact. The proposed project will not cause any inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the proposal:

a) Physically divide an established community?

No impact. The proposed project will not physically divide any established community. Therefore, the project will have no impact on physically dividing an 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 does not conflict with the land use plan of the County of Los Angeles. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on land use plan.

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

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

X. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the proposal:

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 construction of the proposed project will not deplete any known mineral resources. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

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 location is not in any known locally-important mineral resource recovery site. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

XI. NOISE - Would the proposal 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 is short-lived. Since the construction period will last for a short period, the project would not expose people to severe noise levels, thus the impact to severe noise levels is considered less than significant.

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

Less than significant impact. Excavation and compaction during construction could cause minimal, temporary ground vibration. The impact is short-lived, only at time of excavation or compaction. Thus, the impact on groundborne vibration or noise level is considered less than significant.

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

Less than significant 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 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. No construction work is anticipated to be done on weekends, nights, or holidays. Thus, the proposed project will not significantly increase the existing noise levels and is considered less than significant.

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 excessive noise levels or 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?***

Less than significant impact. Though noise levels within the proposed project site would increase during construction, the impact is short-lived. Since the construction period will last for a short period, the project would not expose people to severe noise levels; thus, the impact to severe noise levels is considered less than significant.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the proposal:

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)?

No impact. The proposed project will not induce population growth in the area.

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 and will not displace any people. The proposed project would have a beneficial impact to existing houses and residents by stabilizing the roadway and providing increased safety to traffic in the area.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICE - Would the proposal:

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?

I-iii) **No impact.** The proposed project will not affect public service and will not result in a need for new or altered governmental services in fire protection, police protection, school, parks, or other public facilities.

XIV. RECREATION - Would the proposal:

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 would not require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities..

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the proposal:

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. The minor increase in traffic in the project area due to construction vehicles could minimally increase the existing traffic. This impact is only during construction and, therefore, is temporary and short-lived. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on increase in traffic 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 minor increase in traffic in the project area due to construction vehicles will not 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., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?***

No impact. The proposed project does not involve any design features that are known to constitute safety hazard. Therefore, the project would have no impact on hazards due to design features.

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

Less than significant. No road closures or detours are anticipated during construction of the proposed project. The contractor will be required to notify all emergency facilities and emergency service providers of the project. Since the project will be completed in less than eight weeks, impacts resulting from any slight increase in traffic due to construction vehicles is temporary and short-lived. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on emergency access is considered less than significant.

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

No impact. During construction, the crew will park their vehicles at the project site which is off the roadways, and at other approved location in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on parking capacity of the area.

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 SYSTEMS - Would the proposal:

a) ***Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?***

No impact. No increase in the number of wastewater discharge facilities will occur as a result of the proposed project. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

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?***

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 storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

No impact. The proposed project will not result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities.

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 number of wastewater discharge facilities will occur as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on wastewater treatment.

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

No impact. The proposed project will not result in a facility that would generate solid waste. Therefore, the project will have no impact on landfill.

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

Less than significant impact. Construction of the proposed project will result in excess excavated materials and construction debris. Project specifications will require the contractor to dispose of these 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.

h) Result in substantial alteration to power, natural gas or communication systems?

Less than significant impact. No known utility lines exist at the project site. However, during construction, coordination between the Department and utility service providers will ensure that the residents of the project area will not suffer any loss in service. Thus, the impact of the proposed project on power, natural gas, or communication systems is considered less than significant.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE - Would the proposal:

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 range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Less than significant impact. Based on findings in this environmental review, the proposed project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish and 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. The Department will prepare a revegetation plan and implement the plan to mitigate any vegetation loss at the project site. The revegetation will be at the project site, at a ratio acceptable to the California Coastal Commission. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on plant community is considered less than significant.

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 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 environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

COMMENT LETTER 1

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—BUSINESS, TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING AGENCY

GRAY DAVIS, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF ADVANCE PLANNING
DISTRICT 7, IGR OFFICE 1-10C
120 SO. SPRING ST.
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
TEL: (213) 897-6696 ATSS: 8- 647-6696
FAX: (213) 897-6317

July 6, 2000

IGR/CEQA cs/000664
NEG DEC
County of Los Angeles
Stunt Rd. at Culvert Marker 1.21
Topanga Park
Construction of an 18-foot high gabion wall
Reconstruction of roadway shoulder
Vic. LA-27-4.19
SCH # 2000061105

Mr. Paul Akamonu
County of Los Angeles
Department of Public Works
900 S. Fremont Ave.
Alhambra, CA 91803-1331

Clear
7/24/00
C

Dear Mr. Akamonu:

Thank you for including Caltrans in the environmental review process for the above-mentioned project. Based on the information received, we have the following comments:

1-1 We recommend that construction related truck trips on State highways be limited to off-peak commute periods. Transport of oversize or over-weight construction vehicles on State highways will need a Caltrans Transportation Permit.

If you have any questions regarding our response, refer to Caltrans IGR/CEQA Record # cs/000664, and please do not hesitate to contact me at (213) 897-4429.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By

STEPHEN BUSWELL
IGR/CEQA Program Manager

cc: Mr. Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse

RECEIVED
JUL 12 2000
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA-THE RESOURCES AGENCY GRAY DAVIS, *Governor*
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
South Coast Region
4949 Viewridge Avenue
San Diego, California 92123
(858) 467-4201
FAX (858) 467-4239

July 20, 2000

Mr. Paul Akamnonu
Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
900 South Freemont Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 91803

Dear Mr. Akamnonu:

Negative Declaration for Stunt Road at Culvert Marker 1.21
SCH # 2000061105, Los Angeles County

The Department of Fish and Game (Department), has reviewed the Proposed Negative Declaration and Initial Study (IS) for impacts to biological resources. The proposed project includes the construction of an 18 foot high gabion wall along the slope of a sharp bend of Stunt Road within Topanga State Park and approximately 25 feet from Cold Creek. According to the IS the project will not encroach into Cold Creek or associated riparian zones.

The following statements and comments have been prepared pursuant to the Department's authority as Trustee Agency with jurisdiction over natural resources affected by the project (CEQA Section 15386) and pursuant to our authority as a Responsible Agency under CEQA Section 15381 over those aspects of the proposed project that come under the purview of the California Endangered Species Act (Fish and Game Code Section 2050 et seq) and Fish and Game Code Section 1600 et seq.:

Impacts to Biological Resources

1. Page 1, No. 9 of the IS states that "Vegetation consists mainly of shrubs and grass. Animal life consists of lizards, birds, insects, and wildlife" . Section IV a. of the Biological Resources section of the IS states that the project will have "less than significant" impacts and that "No known sensitive or special status species exists a the project site".

2-1 a. The Department cannot concur with the less than significant impact to biological resources conclusion made in the IS. The IS failed to reference how this conclusion was made. The Department recommends the following references ,**in conjunction**, which would substantiate the IS conclusions regarding impacts to biological resources:

1. records of occurrences of special status species on and near the proposed project site taken from the Department's Natural Diversity Data Base;

2. conclusions of a recent site visit by a qualified biologist to determine the presence or absence of special status wildlife and/or botanical species;

3. and, conclusion of a consultation with the Resource Ecologist for the Topanga State Park concerning possible occurrence of special status species on or adjacent to the proposed disturbance site.

2-2 2. The ND should discuss appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures to reduce adverse impacts, below a level of significance under CEQA , to any special status species found to occur on the site or adjacent areas which may be impacted by project activities.

Impacts to Riparian Resources

2-3 1. Although the IS states that the proposed project will not impact Cold Creek, the project, being conducted on a steep slope above and only 25 feet away from Cold Creek appears to have the potential to cause construction materials and other debris to enter the creek and/or adjacent riparian habitats. Anticipation of this type of disturbance would necessitate a Streambed Alteration Agreement between the Operator and the Department. Unless it can be assured that disturbance to riparian resources during project construction are avoided the Department recommends that the Operator apply for a Streambed Alteration Agreement. Please contact Ms. Natasha Lohmus at (805) 684-6281.

2-4 2. Section VIII of the IS, Hydrology and Water Quality, makes several references to the proposed project not having an adverse impact on "Bollona Creek". These statements in the IS appear to be a mistake since Bollona Creek is not within the project area. The IS should clarify these references.

Impacts to Breeding Birds

1. Proposed project activities such as grading, vegetation removal, filling, etc. has the potential to directly impact a number of native bird species if conducted during the breeding bird season.

   a. Migratory nongame native bird species are protected by international treaty under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act(MBTA) of 1918(50 C.F.R. Section 10.13). Sections 3503, 3503.5 and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code prohibit take of all birds and their active nests including raptors and other migratory nongame birds (as listed under the Federal MBTA).

2-5 b. Proposed project activities (including disturbances to native and non-native vegetation) should take place outside of the breeding bird season (March 1-August 31,) to avoid take (including disturbances which would cause abandonment of active nests containing eggs and/or young).

The Department recommends that the above concerns are addressed before Lead Agency Approval of any CEQA document for this propose project.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comment. Questions regarding this letter and further coordination on these issues should be directed to Mr. Scott Harris, Associate Wildlife Biologist at (818) 360-8140.

Sincerely,

Scott Harris for

Ms. Morgan Wehtje
Environmental Scientist IV

cc: Mr. Scott Harris
Ms. Morgan Wehtje
Ms. Mary Mier
Ms. Natasha Lohmus
Department of Fish and Game

Mr. Jack Ainsworth
California Coastal Commission

State Clearinghouse
Sacramento, California

ATTACHMENT B

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

RECEIVED ON THE INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Presented below are the responses to written comments received during circulation for the Initial Study/Negative Declaration regarding the proposed Stunt Road at Culvert Marker 1.21 project. Response to comments that raise environmental issues, as required by State of California Environmental Quality Act guidelines. A copy of the letters received is included on the following page.

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 the necessary permits from Caltrans. When possible, the use of State highways will be limited to off-peak hours.

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

2-1 A Biological Resources Report was completed by Keane Biological Consulting. The vegetation in the project area is predominately southern mixed chaparral, consisting of coast live oak, toyon, a few sycamores, laurel sumac, and patches of poison oak and California sagebrush. It was also documented that no sensitive, endangered or threatened species are expected to occur in the area affected by the proposed project.

2-2 The Biological Resources Report indicated that the proposed project is not expected to affect sensitive species. However, it may result in impacts on oak trees. An Oak Tree Survey was performed by URS Corporation and they determined that oak trees are not within the project footprint.

2-3 The contractor will be required to place netting to keep construction materials and other debris from entering into the creek and there will be no disturbances to riparian resources during the project construction.

2-4 All references to Ballona Creek should be made to Cold Creek instead.

2-5 The proposed project construction is anticipated to take place outside of the breeding bird season. However, if this can not be avoided a qualified biologist will be retained to avoid any impacts disturbances.

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

STUNT ROAD AT CULVERT MARKER 1.21

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, the Department of 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 any 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 the 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 the prime construction contractor for project and/or for project-related off-site improvements is responsible for constructing 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 construction 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.

SDS
bdltr1.wpd