

Environmental Checklist Form (Initial Study)

County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning



Project title: Rocky Oaks Guest Ranch—Project No. R2014-02690-(3): Conditional Use Permit No. 201400127; Environmental Assessment No. 201400127

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

Contact Person and phone number: Tyler Montgomery, (213) 974-0051

Project sponsor's name and address: Gigi Goyette, P.O. Box 544, Pacific Palisades CA 90272

Project location: 340 Kanan Road, Malibu, Santa Monica Mountains North Area, unincorporated Los Angeles County

APN: 2058-017-025 USGS Quad: Point Dume

Gross Acreage: 38 acres

General plan designation: N/A

Community/Area wide Plan designation: N20 (Non-Urban—One dwelling unit/20 acres max.)

Zoning: A-1-20 (Light Agricultural—20 Acres Max. Required Lot Area,) within the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District (CSD)

Description of project: The applicant proposes the conversion of an existing 4,042-square-foot single-family residence into a guest ranch. The conversion would consist of adding approximately 420 square feet—an ADA-accessible restroom—to the existing residence. Three parking areas of permeable pavement—5,634 square feet, 10,924 square feet, and 9,280 square feet, respectively—would be placed at three previously graded locations along the existing 1,900-foot-long driveway. These parking areas would hold a total of 67 off-street parking spaces. The facility would host a maximum of eight overnight guests and six employees. A total of one exterior special event with a capacity of up to 200 people would be allowed at the facility per month, along with 12 interior special events of less than 100 people and 12 interior special events with 100 to 200 people. An unlimited number of smaller meetings, limited to 45 persons or less, would be permitted from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. year-round. A total of 350 cubic yards of grading is proposed (200 cubic yards cut, 150 cubic yards fill) is proposed. The project requires a significant ecological area conditional use permit (“SEA-CUP”) as the project is proposed within a mapped significant ecological area (“SEA”). Existing vineyards on the site would be reauthorized using current best management practices. Walking trails are also located on the site.

Surrounding land uses and setting: The project site is located on a 38-acre steeply sloping lot with grades of more than 50%. The summit of the site is developed with a 4,042-square-foot single-family residence, swimming pool, patio, terrace, and landscaping, all access by a winding paved driveway of approximately 1,900 feet in length. This driveway accesses Kanan Road, a 100-foot-wide public parkway to the southwest. The site contains 6.51 acres of existing grapevines and 1.08 acres of existing orchards (avocado, citrus, and olive

trees). The remainder of the project site consists of rocky outcrops, shrubs, and grasses, some of which have been affected by fuel modification for the existing residence. There are also three graded pads along the length of the driveway, where the new parking areas are proposed. The subject property is surrounded by open space to the east and west, single-family residences and vacant land to the north, and single-family and equestrian uses to the south. The project site is located within a designated SEA.

Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

The Gabrieleno-Tongva Tribe (Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians) has received consultation on this project per the requirements of AB 52. Any plan for determining the impacts to tribal cultural resources shall be based on the response to this consultation.

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

<i>Public Agency</i>	<i>Approval Required</i>
<u>Dept. of Public Works</u>	<u>Building & grading permits</u>
<u>California Dept. of Alcoholic Beverage Control</u>	<u>Liquor license</u>

Major projects in the area:

<i>Project/Case No.</i>	<i>Description and Status</i>
<u>R2004-00178 / RPP 200600006</u>	<u>Approved 01/04/06 for the existing single-family residence.</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Reviewing Agencies:

Responsible Agencies

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

Trustee Agencies

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

Special Reviewing Agencies

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

County Reviewing Agencies

- DPW:
 - Land Development Division (Grading & Drainage)
 - Geotechnical & Materials Engineering Division
 - Watershed Management Division (NPDES)

Regional Significance

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

- Fire Department
 - Forestry, Environmental Division
 - Planning Division
 - Land Development Unit
- Sanitation District
- Public Health/Environmental Health Division: Land Use Program (OWTS)
- Sheriff Department
- Parks and Recreation
- Subdivision Committee
- Other

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture/Forest | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils | | |

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

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature (Prepared by) 2/16/2023
Date

Signature (Approved by) 2/16/2023
Date

1. AESTHETICS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

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

The main structure is located on a designated significant ridgeline; however, all new construction will be either interior improvements or paving of parking areas located more than 50 feet (vertical and horizontal) from the ridgeline. Therefore, the impact of the project would be less than significant.

- b) **Be visible from or obstruct views from a multi-use (equestrian, hiking, and biking) trail?**

The Rocky Oaks Loop Trail is located approximately 700 feet to the west of the project site. However, all new construction will be either interior structural improvements or the paving of parking areas, neither of which would be substantially visible.

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

The proposed project would not damage or remove any trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings.

- d) **Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features?**

All new construction will be either interior structural improvements or the paving of parking areas, neither of which would be substantially visible from surrounding areas. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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

All new construction will be either interior structural improvements or the paving of parking areas, neither of which is expected to create substantial light, shadows, or glare.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

Official State Scenic Highways are designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). According to Caltrans, “[t]he stated intent (Streets and Highway Code Section 260) of the California Scenic Highway Program is to protect and enhance California’s natural beauty and to protect the social and economic values provided by the State’s scenic resources” (State of California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Program, website: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist3/departments/mtce/scenic.htm>, accessed

July 26, 2018). While there are numerous designated Scenic Highways across the state, the following have been designated in Los Angeles County: Angeles Crest Highway (Route 2) from just north of Interstate 210 to the Los Angeles/San Bernardino County Line, two segments of Mulholland Highway from Pacific Coast Highway to Kanan Dume Road and from west of Cornell road to east of Las Virgenes Road, and Malibu Canyon-Las Virgenes Highway from Pacific Coast Highway to Lost Hills Road.

In addition to scenic highways, unincorporated Los Angeles County identifies ridgelines of significant aesthetic value that are to be preserved in their current state. This preservation is accomplished by limiting the type and amount of development near them. These “Significant Ridgelines” (“Major Ridgelines” on Santa Catalina Island) are designated by the General Plan or applicable Area/Community Plan, Local Coastal Program, or Community Standards District.

Riding and hiking trails have been designated throughout unincorporated Los Angeles County. At present, there are officially adopted trails in the Antelope Valley, the Santa Clarita Valley, and the Santa Monica Mountains designated by the General Plan or applicable Area/Community Plan and Local Coastal Program.

The main structure is located on a designated significant ridgeline and within view of the Rocky Oaks Loop Trail; however, all new construction will be either interior improvements or paving of parking areas located more than 50 feet (vertical and horizontal) from the ridgeline. As a result, the aesthetic impact is less than significant from a CEQA perspective.

2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

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 (FMMP) of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project would not convert farmland to non-agricultural use.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site is not located in a designated agricultural zone or other designated agricultural area. There is no Williamson Act contract for this area.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code § 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code § 51104(g))?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site is not zoned as forest land or timberland.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project would not remove or convert forest land.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The proposed project would not result in changes to the environment that would result in the elimination of agricultural land or forest land.

3. AIR QUALITY

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD)?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The proposed project would conform to the land use requirements of the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan, as the proposed project is a non-urban land use allowed with a CUP within the non-urban land use category. As a result, any potential emissions from the project are accounted for in the South Coast AQMP and are unlikely to have a significant impact.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>b) 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?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

“Non-attainment” describes any region that does not meet (or that contributes to ambient air quality in a nearby area that does not meet) the national primary or secondary ambient air quality standard for a specific pollutant. In Los Angeles County, the levels of ozone, particulate matter, and carbon monoxide continually exceed the Federal and California Ambient Air Quality Standards and the County is considered in “Non-Attainment” for these pollutants.

The proposed project would conform to the land use requirements of the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan, as the proposed project is a non-urban use allowed with a CUP within a non-urban land use category. As a result, any potential emissions from the project are accounted for in the South Coast AQMP and are unlikely to have a significant impact. The proposed project is not of a large enough scale to otherwise have a significant effect on existing air quality standards.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The proposed guest ranch would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The project site is adjacent to residential and open space uses. However, the use is not expected to release substantial emissions of any kind.

During construction, a total of 350 cubic yards of earth will be graded, and approximately 26,000 square feet of permeable pavement will be placed on site. Such construction activity is not expected to create a significant impact from dust or other fugitive emissions to those living and working within 1,000 feet.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The construction of a guest ranch would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Any odors created would be from auto exhaust and would be less than significant due their intermittent nature and the distance from surrounding residential and/or recreational uses.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

A Biological Constraints Analysis was prepared for the project site by Rachel Tierney Consulting in July of 2020. An addendum to this BCA was prepared by Matt Ingamells at Padre Associates, Inc. in July of 2022. Both BCAs were reviewed by Department of Regional Planning staff biologists. Two sensitive plant species were confirmed to exist on the project site: Plummer's mariposa lily (*Calochortus plummerae*) and Nevin's brickellbush (*Brickellia nevinii*). Mountain lions (*Puma concolor*) have the potential to occur on the project site, most likely in transit between hunting areas, as the project site is poor hunting territory due to lack of food sources of its primary prey. The project would not result in the removal of any current habitat, and the increases in noise and lighting levels associated with the project would be small and highly localized, and would not affect the behavior, increase mortality or reduce reproductive success of mountain lions. The project, with mitigation measures, would be consistent with nearby biological resources. The mitigation measures would include an on-site biological monitor, habitat restoration, and a native bird survey. These have been added to the attached MMRP.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFW or USFWS?

A Biological Constraints Analysis was prepared for the project site by Rachel Tierney Consulting in July of 2020. An addendum to this BCA was prepared by Matt Ingamells at Padre Associates, Inc. in July of 2022. Both were reviewed by Department of Regional Planning staff biologists. A stand of canyon sunflower scrub was observed west of the existing vineyards, and rocky outcrops are scattered throughout the project site. Each of these are considered to be sensitive natural habitat. However, these habitats would not be within areas of additional development, and no additional fuel modification is proposed. Further, additional noise and light from the proposed change of use for the existing structures is unlikely to have a significant impact, as the guest ranch must comply with the Los Angeles County Noise Ordinance (County Code, Title 12) and the standards of the Rural Outdoor Lighting District (County Code, Chapter 22.80). A noise impact study was prepared by Mike Dickerson of MD Acoustics, LLC on November 14, 2022. This study used data to simulate the effect of 200 people in loud conversation at the outdoor gathering areas. In the BCA addendum of July 2022, it is stated that sound levels of 60 dB can adversely affect bird communication. Simulated sounds levels of 60 dB or greater would occur in an area extending 60 to 225 feet from outdoor gathering areas at their greatest usage. This would not extend into any existing undeveloped habitat. In addition, a mitigation measure is proposed that would require the installation of five-foot-high glass noise barriers around outdoor gathering spaces, which would further reduce surrounding noise levels. Additional outdoor lighting would likely be minimal and intermittent, and a mitigation measure requiring implementation of a rural outdoor lighting plan is proposed. As a result, the impact of the project on these sensitive natural communities is likely to be less than significant.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally or state protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Current U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) maps do indicate any wetlands located on the project site.

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?

The National Park Service, CDFW, and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy have expressed concerns about the adverse effects of urbanization on wildlife, particularly the fragmentation of habitat areas, which prevents the freedom of movement that species need. Preservation of linkages between large blocks of core habitat is of the utmost importance in the Santa Monica Mountains and preservation through linkages is a major concern. In general, a linkage is a feature that connects at least two blocks of habitat. The assumed function of a linkage is to facilitate dispersal of individuals between blocks of habitat, allowing for long-term genetic interchange and for re-colonization of blocks of habitat from which populations have been locally extirpated. Mountain lions (*Puma concolor*) have the potential to occur on the project site, most likely in transit between hunting areas. No additional fencing or raised structures are proposed for development as part of the project, and no existing habitat is proposed for development. As a result, the project is unlikely to affect wildlife movement.

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

While there are oaks of at least 5-in. diameter on the project site, the project does not propose additional development of fuel modification within the protected zone of any oak or other unique native tree.

f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.174), the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 102), Specific Plans (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.46), Community Standards Districts (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.300 et seq.), and/or Coastal Resource Areas (L.A. County General Plan, Figure 9.3)?

The subject parcel is not a designated wildflower reserve area. The project does not propose additional development or encroachment into the protected zone of any protected oak tree. The parcel is not in a designated Sensitive Environmental Resource Area, as it is not in the Santa Monica Mountains Coastal Zone. The project site is within a designated Significant Ecological Area (SEA). As a result, the project was reviewed by the Significant Ecological Area Technical Advisory Committee (SEATAC) at its September 14, 2020 and January 9, 2023 meetings. SEATAC concluded that the project, with mitigation measures, would be consistent with nearby biological resources. The mitigation measures would include an on-site biological monitor, habitat restoration, and a native bird survey, as well as the installation of five-foot-tall glass noise barriers around outdoor gathering spaces. These have been added to the attached MMRP.

g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan?

The project site is not part of an adopted habitat conservation plan.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site does not contain historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 and there is no record of national or state-designated historical resources on the project.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project site does not contain known archaeological resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5, and no excavation or increase of the current development footprint would occur.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project site does not contain known paleontological resources, and will not excavate near unique geologic features or rock formations. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project site does not contain known human remains.

If archeological resources or human remains are discovered as a result of site disturbance, a condition of approval will be incorporated to ensure that the permittee shall suspend construction in the vicinity of cultural resource or human remains encountered during ground-disturbing activities at the site, and leave the resource or human remains in place until a qualified archaeologist can examine and determine appropriate measures.

6. ENERGY

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project would be required to comply with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development (“LID”) standards (Title 31) and CALGreen standards. Construction itself would be minimal in nature, and the facility’s operation would not consume large amounts of resources.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project would not eliminate any opportunities for the construction of renewable energy production, and the project itself would be required to comply with LID and CALGreen standards.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

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 active fault trace? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

There is no fault trace within the project site. Therefore, people or structures on the project site will not be exposed to potential substantial adverse effects (Source: California Geological Survey, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones Map).

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

The project site is located five miles to the northwest of the nearest recorded fault trace. There is no fault trace within the project site. Therefore, people or structures on the project site will not be exposed to potential substantial adverse effects (Source: California Geological Survey, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones Map).

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading?

The project site is not located within a designated soil liquefaction area (Source: California Geological Survey).

iv) Landslides?

Most of the project site are located within a designated landslide area (Source: California Geological Survey). Thus, the Department of Public Works will require the submittal and clearance of a geotechnical report and require specified construction techniques for development to occur on the site. No construction shall occur on the site without the review and clearance of said department. Therefore, the resulting impact would be less than significant.

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

The proposed project would result in 350 cubic yards of grading. This grading would be required to comply with DPW's best practices manual for erosion control and drainage. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

Any development resulting from the project would be subject to the County's Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance, which requires for the management of storm runoff to lessen the potential amounts of erosion activities resulting from storm water. In addition, the Regional Water Quality Control Board would require new development to obtain a Municipal Storm Water National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") Permit, which requires the incorporation of storm water mitigation measures. As such, the permit would reduce the quantity and improve the quality of rainfall runoff that leaves the site

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?

The project site is not located near a fault trace or a liquefaction zone. Most of the project site are located within a designated landslide area (Source: California Geological Survey). Thus, the Department of Public Works will require the submittal and clearance of a geotechnical report and require specified construction techniques for development to occur on the site. No construction shall occur on the site without the review and clearance of said department. Therefore, the resulting impact 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 direct or indirect risks to life or property?

The project site is not located on soil identified as expansive. The proposed structures would be required to comply with the Los Angeles County building codes, which include construction and engineering standards, as well as any recommendations developed in tandem with a soils or geology report.

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

A new onsite wastewater treatment system (OWTS) is proposed for the project site. A preliminarily approved OWTS plot plan percolation test have been reviewed and cleared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health—Environmental Health Division.

f) Conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.104)?

The project would not conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance, as no new construction would occur on those portions of the project site with grades of more than 25%.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) **Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project would be consistent with the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan, and there would not be a project-specific significant effect that is peculiar to the project or its site, as the project is a proposal for a commercial/light industrial use within an appropriate land use category and surrounded by similar uses. The project would also be required to meet the requirements of the County LID standards and CalGreen standards. Therefore, it is not expected that the project will generate GhGs that may have a significant impact on the environment.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project would be consistent with the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan, and there would not be a project-specific significant effect that is peculiar to the project or its site, as the project is a proposal for a commercial/light industrial use within an appropriate land use category and surrounded by similar uses. The project would also be required to meet the requirements of the County LID standards and CalGreen standards. Therefore, it is not expected that the project will conflict with any plan, policy, or regulation for reducing GhG emissions.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

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

The project does not include the routine transportation, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or the use of pressurized tanks. During the construction phase of the project, the project may include minimal use of hazardous materials, such as solvents, paints, lubricants, and oils. Current local, state, and Federal laws relating to the use, storage, and disposal of these materials make it unlikely that the project would have a significant effect on the environment.

- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment?

The project does not include the routine transportation, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or the use of pressurized tanks. During the construction phase of the project, the project may include minimal use of hazardous materials, such as solvents, paints, lubricants, and oils. Current local, state, and Federal laws relating to the use, storage, and disposal of these materials make it unlikely that the project would have a significant effect on the environment.

- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses?

The use of the project site will not generate a significant amount of hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste. During the construction phase of the project, the project may have included minimal use of hazardous materials, such as solvents, paints, lubricants, and oils. Current local, state, and Federal laws relating to the use, storage, and disposal of these materials make it unlikely that the project would have a significant effect on the residences located within ¼ mile 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 § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

The project site is not included on the CalEPA Hazardous Waste and Substance Sites List (Cortese List) or on the California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database of clean-up sites and hazardous waste permitted facilities Sources: (http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese_List.cfm); (<http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>).

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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

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

The construction of a guest ranch on an agriculturally-zoned property will not impair implementation of, or physically interfere, with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

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

i) within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?

The Los Angeles County Fire Department has reviewed the project for compliance with access, fire flow, fuel modification, and construction standards for Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones and cleared it for public hearing

ii) within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?

The Los Angeles County Fire Department has reviewed the project for compliance with access, fire flow, fuel modification, and construction standards for Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones and cleared it for public hearing

iii) within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard?

The Los Angeles County Fire Department has reviewed the project for compliance with access, fire flow, fuel modification, and construction standards for Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones and cleared it for public hearing. Surrounding land uses consist of residential/equestrian uses and vacant land.

h) Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?

The proposed use is guest ranch and would not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard, as it would comply with all requirements for habitable structures within a VHFHSZ.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

In unincorporated Los Angeles County, the proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements of the Low-Impact Development Ordinance, as well as the requirements of the County’s MS4 Permit (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System), in order to control and minimize potentially polluted runoff. Because all projects are required to comply with these requirements in order to obtain construction permits and certificates of occupancy, the proposed project would not impact any nonpoint source requirements. The location and percolation of the proposed onsite wastewater treatment system (OWTS) has also been cleared by the Department of Public Health—Environmental Health Division.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project site would be served by a public water system and would not make use of local groundwater. Its addition of impervious surfaces would be unlikely to affect aquifer recharge, as the project would be required to comply with the requirements of the Low-Impact Development Ordinance, which requires the retention of much resulting runoff on-site.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of a Federal 100-year flood hazard area of County Capital Flood floodplain; the alteration of the course of the stream or river; or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

i.) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Project development would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site in a manner which would result in flooding, erosion, or siltation on-site or off-site. The will be required to submit an approved drainage plan and comply with all NPDES and MS4 requirements, and the impact of impervious surfaces would be lessened by the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance, which requires the retention of stormwater on-site.

ii.) Substantially increase the rate, amount, or depth of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?

Project development would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site in a manner which would result in flooding, erosion, or siltation on-site or off-site. The will be required to submit

an approved drainage plan and comply with all NPDES and MS4 requirements, and the impact of impervious surfaces would be lessened by the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance, which requires the retention of stormwater on-site.

iii.) 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?

Project development would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site in a manner which would result in flooding, erosion, or siltation on-site or off-site. The will be required to submit an approved drainage plan and comply with all NPDES and MS4 requirements, and the impact of impervious surfaces would be lessened by the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance, which requires the retention of stormwater on-site.

iv.) Impede or redirect flood flows which would expose existing housing or other insurable structures in a Federal 100-year flood hazard area or County Capital Flood floodplain to a significant risk or loss or damage involving flooding?

No development is proposed within a mapped Federal or County floodplain.

d) Otherwise place structures in Federal 100-year flood hazard or County Capital Flood floodplain areas which would require additional flood proofing and flood insurance requirements?

No development is proposed within a mapped Federal (FEMA) or County floodplain.

e) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 12,84)?

The project is required to the County's Low Impact Development ("LID") Ordinance.

f) Use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course)?

The proposed location and percolation of the project's onsite wastewater treatment system (OWTS) has been reviewed and cleared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health—Environmental Health Division.

g) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, or risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

The project site is not located within any mapped flood hazard, tsunami, seiche, or potential inundation areas.

h) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

The project site would be served by a public water system and would not make use of local groundwater. Its addition of impervious surfaces would be unlikely to affect aquifer recharge, as the project would be required to comply with the requirements of the Low-Impact Development Ordinance, which requires the retention of much resulting runoff on-site.

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

The of a guest ranch on an agriculturally-zoned property would not result in a physical division of an established community. The project does not require the construction of new freeways or rail lines or flood control channels, and the project will conform to the existing street pattern.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any County land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

The property has a land use category of N20 (Non-Urban—One dwelling unit/20 acres maximum) within the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan. The land use designation indicates the project site is suitable for the development of a guest ranch with a CUP.

c) Conflict with the goals and policies of the General Plan related to Hillside Management Areas or Significant Ecological Areas?

The proposed project would not conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance, no development is proposed on slopes with grades of more than 25%. The project is located within a Significant Ecological Area, and the applicant has applied for an SEA-CUP, which requires review of the project’s compatibility with biological resources by the Significant Ecological Area Technical Advisory Committee (SEATAC).

12. MINERAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource, as the project site is not identified as a mineral resource area on the Los Angeles County Natural Resource Areas map.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site, as the project site is not identified as a mineral resource area on the Los Angeles County Natural Resource Areas map.

13. NOISE

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would not result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the County Noise Ordinance or the Santa Monica Mountains Local Coastal Program Noise Element. As part of its operation, one exterior special event per calendar month is proposed to occur from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. The project itself would be located approximately 850 feet from the nearest residential uses to the west. The project will conform to the Title 12 Chapter 12.08 (“Noise Control Ordinance”) of the Los Angeles County Code, which provides a maximum exterior noise level of 45 decibels (dB) between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. (nighttime) and 50 dB from 7:00 a.m. to 10 p.m. (daytime) in Noise Zone II (residential areas). A noise impact study was prepared by Mike Dickerson of MD Acoustics, LLC on November 14, 2022. This study used data to simulate the effect of 200 people in loud conversation at the outdoor gathering areas. It concluded that the resulting noise would not exceed 45 dB at property boundaries. The project site will not create noise in excess of these limits, nor will residents of the project be exposed to noise in excess of these limits. The Noise Control Ordinance regulates construction noise and the hours of operation of mobile construction equipment. Due to conditions of approval that require noise monitoring and a good neighbor system for sound disturbance, the environmental effect would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, and it would not expose sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels. There are no schools, hospitals, or senior citizen facilities within several miles of the project site. The project will conform to the Title 12 Chapter 12.08 (“Noise Control Ordinance”) of the Los Angeles County Code, which provides a maximum exterior noise level of 45 decibels (dB) between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. (nighttime) and 50 dB from 7:00 a.m. to 10 p.m. (daytime) in Noise Zone II (residential areas).

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a private airstrip, public airport, or public use airport.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

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)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project would not induce substantial population growth in the area, as only one guest ranch is proposed, and no infrastructure will be extended beyond its current limits.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, including affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The project would displace only the use of the single-family residence currently onsite.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

a) **Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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?

The Fire Department has not indicated any significant effects on fire response time, service level, or facilities. The responsible Los Angeles County Fire Station (#65) is about four miles to the northeast of the project site. No additional fire facilities are required for this project.

Sheriff protection?

The project would not create capacity or service level problems or result in substantial adverse physical impacts. The project site is approximately five miles to the southwest of the Malibu/Lost Hills Sheriff's Station. The proposed project will add some additional customers and employees to the vicinity but not enough to substantially reduce service ratios.

Schools?

The project site is located within the Las Virgenes Unified School District. No population would be added to the school district.

Parks?

No population would be added by the project, so it would not result in a need for additional parkland or the overutilization of existing parkland.

Libraries?

No population would be added by the project, so it would not diminish the capacity of the Los Angeles County Public Library to serve the project site and the surrounding community.

Other public facilities?

The project is not perceived to create capacity or service level problems or result in substantial adverse physical impacts for any other public facility.

16. RECREATION

- | | <i>Potentially
Significant
Impact</i> | <i>Less Than
Significant
Impact with
Mitigation
Incorporated</i> | <i>Less Than
Significant
Impact</i> | <i>No
Impact</i> |
|---|---|--|---|--------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Review of the project by the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation (“Parks and Recreation”) has not indicated that the project would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Does the project include neighborhood and regional parks, multi-use trails or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

No new trails or parks are proposed as part of the project.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The conversion of a single-family residence to a guest ranch on an agriculturally-zoned property would not interfere with regional open space connectivity in any significant way. The project site is already developed with a residence, driveway, and some agricultural uses.

17. TRANSPORTATION

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system. The addition of a small guest ranch on an agriculturally-zoned property would not have a significant impact on any transportation plan, ordinance, or policy.

b) Conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project entails the conversion of a single-family residence to a small guest ranch. The traffic impacts of the project have been reviewed and cleared by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (“DPW”) and is not anticipated to significantly local vehicles miles travelled (“VMT”). No traffic impact analysis was required by DPW.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project does not entail creating sharp curves or dangerous intersections or incompatible uses. The Department of Public Works has reviewed the project’s access and line-of-site studies and cleared the project for public hearing. Further, it is a condition of approval that the project provide a southbound left-turn lane for Kanan Road. Therefore, there will be no increased hazards due to design features, and the overall impact would be less than significant.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project of constructing a guest ranch would not block or provide inadequate emergency access for the project itself or make existing emergency access to off-site properties inadequate. Emergency access has been reviewed and cleared by the Los Angeles County Fire Department.

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

	<i>Less Than Significant</i>		
<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code §21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code § 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site is not listed or eligible for listing in any known register of historical resources. The site does not contain any objects or structures or known historical, cultural or archeological value.

ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project site is not known to contain any resource considered significant by a California Native American tribe. A consultation was sent at least 30 days prior to the Gabrieleno-Tongva Tribe (Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians) for commentary on this issue. No response has been received.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impa ct</i>
--	---	--	---	---------------------------

Would the project:

a) **Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project site is already served by water, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications facilities. The conversion of the existing single-family residence into a guest ranch is not likely to require new or expanded infrastructure facilities.

b) **Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project will have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources. The project site is currently served by the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District has received a conditional statement letter from the district agreeing to serve the project site in its new capacity.

c) **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 conditions?**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project will utilize an onsite wastewater treatment system (OWTS) and will not connect to a wastewater treatment provider. The project would install a commercial-grade OWTS per the requirements of the Department of Public Health—Environmental Health Division.

f) **Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Development at the proposed density at this location is planned for under the existing Los Angeles County Regional Waste Management Plan. Due to the small scale of the proposed project, the proposal to construct one small guest ranch should not significantly impact solid waste disposal capacity.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project would be required to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 requires the County of Los Angeles to attain specific waste diversion goals. In addition, the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991 mandates that expanded or new development projects to incorporate storage areas for recycling bins into the existing design. The project will include sustainable elements to ensure compliance with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. It is anticipated that these project elements will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations to reduce the amount of solid waste. The project will not displace an existing or proposed waste disposal, recycling, or diversion site.

20. WILDFIRE

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The project would not impair any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The conversion of a single-family residence to a small guest ranch would not block or reroute any critical infrastructure, and the traffic generated by such a use is not sufficient for the Department of Public Works to have required a traffic impact analysis. A condition of approval requires the adoption of an emergency evacuation plan for the guest ranch and accessory special events to be approved by Los Angeles County.

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

Although located near the top of steeply sloping terrain, the project site is immediately adjacent to two mapped County highways (Kanan Road and Mulholland Highway), and it has been reviewed by the Los Angeles County Fire Department for adequate emergency access. Therefore, evacuation of the project site during a wildfire event would not create a significant risk to occupants.

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

No new infrastructure that would exacerbate fire risk is proposed for the project site. The existing single-family residence is already connected to utilities and roads.

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

The proposed project is located close to the highest point in the immediate vicinity. Thus, occupants are unlikely to be exposed to downslope or downstream flooding due to post-fire slope instability. The Low Impact Development requirements require most runoff to be retained onsite, and no drainages originate on the site. Thus the potential for onsite post-fire erosion due to runoff is low.

e) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

Although located near the top of steeply sloping terrain, the project site is immediately adjacent to two mapped County highways (Kanan Road and Mulholland Highway), and it has been reviewed by the Los Angeles County Fire Department for adequate emergency access. A condition of approval requires the adoption of an emergency evacuation plan for the guest ranch and accessory special events to be approved by Los Angeles County. Therefore, evacuation of the project site during a wildfire event would not create a significant risk to occupants.

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

The 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. As analyzed in the Initial Study sections above, the proposed project, with mitigation measures regarding an on-site biological monitor, nesting bird survey, habitat restoration, a rural outdoor lighting plan, and installation of noise barriers, the project will have no impact or less than significant impact in all listed areas.

b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project does not achieve short-term goals to the disadvantage of long-term goals.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project does not have cumulative impacts. The proposed project will not be an inducement to future growths, as the project does not require additional infrastructure beyond that necessary to serve the project. There are no impacts that are cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project would not threaten the health, safety or welfare of human beings. As analyzed in the Initial Study sections above, the proposed project will have no impact or less than significant impact in all areas direct or indirect impact to human beings.