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The City proposes to construct a 7-acre equestrian day-use and park facility at a former, privately-owned equestrian site within Aliso Canyon Park. Aliso Canyon Park is an existing, undeveloped City park, covering approximately 60 acres in area. The project includes a parking area for (6) equestrian trailers and (24) passenger vehicles, along with a (220-foot by 110-ft) riding ring, a small (27-foot long by 5-row) bleacher, meadow areas, walking paths, and a bio-swale, as well as picnic areas with both covered and uncovered tables (Figure1). A modular restroom is included, and a potential (1,800 square-foot) community building with necessary utilities. Although a future community building has been proposed, no funding has been allocated, and there are no immediate plans for its construction. The building is discussed here as a potential future development, but is not included in the attached Initial Study as part of this project. Amenities further include horse waterers, hitching posts, split rail fencing, and landscaping with California native plant species. Moreover, the access road will be demolished and re-graded to meet a 10:1 slope. Two potential crossings over Aliso Canyon Creek the creek (one for equestrians and one for pedestrians and cyclists) are being considered. The equestrian bridge would span a distance of about 60 feet, and be located at an existing wet crossing, while the pedestrian bridge would span a distance of about 50 feet, and be located about 600 feet to the south and opposite from the equestrian parking area. Both bridges would provide access to an existing horse/pedestrian trail that follows along the western bank of Aliso Creek. The trail extends into upper Aliso Canyon. Construction is anticipated to begin in June of 2011 and be completed in November of 2011.
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CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
INITIAL STUDY
(Article I - City CEQA Guidelines)

Council District: 12  Date: July 29, 2010

Lead City Agency: Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering

Project Title: Aliso Canyon Park Improvements Project

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Location
The project is to be located in Aliso Canyon, at 18041 Rinaldi Street, between Hesperia and Chimineas Avenues, in the southern Santa Susana Mountains (see Figure 1–Site Aerial Photograph with Project Components). The project site lies within the Granada Hills-Knollwood Community Planning District of the City of Los Angeles General Plan; (see Figure 2 - Regional Map; and Figure 3 - Project Site Location). The plan designated land use for this parcel and adjacent parcels to the east of Hesperia Avenue is Very Low Density Residential (RA), while the parcels to the west of Hesperia Avenue are designated as Public Open Space (OS) (Figure 4 – Zoning Map). The site lies within a City-designated scenic corridor. The project site is on land, recently acquired by the City of Los Angeles for public uses, including park and recreational purposes.

According to a (2003) Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, City records showed that the site was first developed in 1962. The site was occupied by a residence and various outbuildings that served a former ranch and equestrian center and later abandoned. The City acquired the property in 2004.

B. Purpose
The purpose of the project is to provide improvements to neighborhood recreational facilities. Aliso Canyon Park is located within a horse keeping community. The project was initiated at the request of Council District Twelve, and an Aliso Canyon Park committee was formed to give input on potential designs that would accommodate equestrian, hiking and biking current uses while maintaining the natural integrity of the park. Support will be provided by Council District Twelve Sunshine Canyon Amenities Fund that provides for enhancements in the Granada Hills community.
C. Description

The City proposes to construct a 7-acre equestrian day-use and park facility at a former, privately-owned equestrian site within Aliso Canyon Park in the Community of Porter Ranch (Figure 3). Located on Rinaldi Street, between Hesperia and Chimineas Avenues, Aliso Canyon Park is an existing, undeveloped City park, covering approximately 60 acres in area.

The project includes a parking area for (6) equestrian trailers and (24) passenger vehicles, along with a (220-foot by 110-ft) riding ring, a small (27-foot long by 5-row) bleacher, meadow areas, walking paths, and a bio-swale, as well as picnic areas with both covered and uncovered tables (Figure 1). A modular restroom is included in the base project description. Amenities further include bike racks, as well as horse waterers, hitching posts, split rail fencing, and landscaping with California native plant species. Moreover, the access road will be demolished and re-graded to meet a 10:1 slope.

A potential (1,800 square-foot) community building with necessary utilities has been discussed as a possible, future addition to the site. Although a future community building has been proposed, no funding has been allocated, and there are no immediate plans for its construction. Nevertheless, it should also be noted that the Local Volunteer Neighborhood Organizing Committee voted to oppose construction of any future community building at Aliso Canyon Park. The building is discussed here as a potential future development, but is not included in the Initial Study as part of this project.

Aliso Canyon Creek is an ephemeral stream that supports riparian woodland vegetation. Two potential crossings over the creek (one for equestrians and one for pedestrians and cyclists) are being considered. The equestrian bridge would span a distance of about 60 feet, and be located at an existing wet crossing, while the pedestrian bridge would span a distance of about 50 feet, and be located about 600 feet to the south and opposite from the equestrian parking area. Both bridges would provide access to an existing horse/pedestrian trail that follows along the western bank of Aliso Creek. The trail extends into upper Aliso Canyon.

Preliminary Construction Schedule

Construction is anticipated to begin in June of 2011 and be completed in November of 2011.

Activities and Approvals

Consultation with regulatory agencies and acquisition of permits is required before the project components can be constructed. The following summarizes regulatory permits and approvals relevant to the Aliso Canyon Park Improvements Project:

1. Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program permit.
2. California Fish & Game Code Section 3500: Migratory Bird Protection.
3. California Fish & Game Code Section 1600: Streambed Alteration Agreement.
4. South Coast Air Quality Management District, South Coast Air Quality Management District’s (SCAQMD) Rule 403.
5. City of Los Angeles: Grading Permit, Construction (B) Permit, Zoning Variance.

The analysis in this document assumes that, unless otherwise stated, the project would be designed, constructed and operated following all applicable laws, regulations, ordinances and formally adopted City standards (e.g., Los Angeles Municipal Code and Bureau of Engineering Standard Plans). Construction would follow the uniform practices established by the Southern California Chapter of the American Public Works Association (e.g., Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction and the Work Area Traffic Control Handbook) as specifically adopted by the City of Los Angeles (e.g., The City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Additions and Amendments to the Standard Specifications For Public Works Construction [AKA "The Brown Book," formerly Standard Plan S-610]).

As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and, upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities.

III. EXISTING ENVIRONMENT
Aliso Canyon is a north-south trending, cismontane feature in the southern Santa Susana Mountains. The Canyon lies within the community of Northridge. Land use is a mixture of residential, single-family homes, and interstitial open space, being undeveloped land. The project is planned for an area of open space, owned by the City of Los Angeles, and to be managed by the City Department of Recreation and Parks. Single family residential lots surround the property along Hesperia Avenue and Chimineas Avenue.

The property is near two other park facilities: Zelzah Park (0.13 miles / 0.22 km to the east) and Eddelston Park (adjoining Aliso Canyon Park to the northwest). Both are operated by the City Department of Recreation and Parks.

A gated, unpaved road provides access from Rinaldi Street. The road runs parallel to Aliso Canyon Creek.

MTA transit lines 239 and 243 both utilize Rinaldi Street. However, neither line directly serves Aliso Canyon Park. Line 239 makes the closest approach, approximately 0.9 miles (1.48 km) to the east, where buses turn south from Rinaldi Street onto Louise Avenue. No LADOT transit lines utilize Rinaldi Street, the nearest transit line (Number 419) runs along Devonshire Boulevard to the South.

Geology and Hydrology
The City has completed a geotechnical study of the project site (Attachment A). The
project site lies within a shallow ravine, incising the lower, south-facing slopes of the Santa Susana Mountains. Oat Mountain is the range’s highest peak at 3,747 feet (1,142 m) above mean sea level (msl). The range is a part of the east/west-trending, Transverse Ranges Geomorphic Province. Site Elevations range from 1,152 to 1,183 feet (351.3 to 360.7 meters) msl. From north to south, the average slope is approximately 2.4% along the relatively flat canyon bottom, while side slopes range from approximately 40% (west) to 60% (east). Low ridges rise above the site, reaching a height of approximately 70 to 150 feet (21.3 to 45.7 meters) from east to west. Based upon factors of steepness and the presence of weekly-cemented sedimentary material, the adjacent slopes of Aliso Canyon have been designated as a potential landslide hazard.

According to the California Division of Mines and Geology, Geologic Map of California, Los Angeles Sheet (dated 1969); the project site is underlain by alluvial sediments and material from construction of the Simi Valley Freeway (SR 118), Side slopes are primarily comprised of sedimentary beds of the Saugus Formation, being poorly consolidated and folded conglomerates, sands, silts and clays. The formation dates from the Pleistocene period. Based upon boring data, at depths from 3.7 to 6.1 meters (12 to 20 feet), underlying Bedrock of the Saugus Formation consists of a hard, weathered sandstone/siltstone or conglomerate material (Geotechnical Engineering Group, 2010).

The project lies approximately 0.2 miles (0.3 km) to the north of the east-west trending, Mission Hills Fault Zone. This fault zone follows the southern margin of the Santa Susana Mountains and normally acts as a geologic barrier to groundwater movement. According to the Southern California Earthquake Data Center, the fault type is a reverse fault, which is not considered active, but has also not been designated as surface rupture fault under the Alquist-Priolo Act.

With a watershed of about 190 hectares (77 acres), Aliso Canyon is a part of the upper, Los Angeles River watershed. Surface flow, based upon surface drainage and topography, would be generally from north to south along the canyon bottom. Aliso Canyon Creek channel is approximately 3.3 m (10 feet) wide and 1.7 m (5 feet) deep, with the stream cross-section being 2-foot wide and deep within the channel (Miles, 2007). In the reach between Sesnon Boulevard and Rinaldi Street, most of the runoff is contributed by urban sources. Drainage eventually flows into the Los Angeles River and San Pedro Bay. Van Norman Reservoir is the nearest surface water body, approximately 2.6 miles (4.1 km) to the east-northeast of the project.

Site groundwater is expected. According to the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Aliso Canyon Park is at the northwestern margin of the San Fernando Groundwater Basin. Groundwater contour intervals for this area show a groundwater elevation of about 228.7 m (750 feet) msl. Historically, groundwater depth has been recorded at a higher level, about 33 m (100 feet) below the ground surface. From recent soil boring data, groundwater was found at depths from 0.3 to 1 m (1 to 3 feet);
however, this condition was attributed to seasonal infiltration from winter/spring rainfall events (Geotechnical Engineering Group, 2010).

A designated liquefaction zone occurs along the canyon bottom; sediments that are considered to be vulnerable to liquefaction underlie the project site. The Project Site lies within an area, mapped for “historic occurrence of liquefaction, or where local geological, geotechnical, and groundwater conditions which indicate a potential for permanent ground displacements” or where “previous occurrence of landslide movement, or local topographic, geological, geotechnical, and subsurface conditions indicate a potential for permanent ground displacements such that mitigation as defined in Public Resources Code, Section 2693(c), would be required,” according to the Official Map of Seismic Hazards, released by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology on March 25, 1999.

**Biological Resources.**
The City has completed a vegetation assessment (Attachment B) and a wildlife assessment of the project site (Attachment C). In the vicinity of the proposed project, biological resources include native and exotic vegetation in both disturbed and undisturbed conditions. In undisturbed areas, habitat is utilized by a diverse range of fauna, including birds, reptiles and mammals. From the Biological (Vegetation) Assessment Report, site vegetation included a mixture of California native and exotic plant species. Within the areas of potential impact, 35 native species were recorded, but principally as components of chaparral, coastal sage scrub, or riparian woodland vegetation communities. Within the disturbed meadow area, vegetation is fairly well degraded, mostly dominated by exotic ruderal weedy plant species; however, some native riparian vegetation occurs in the area of the dry channel. Riparian woodland vegetation occurs along Aliso Canyon Creek, two bridges are proposed within this community. Coastal sage scrub vegetation occurs in widely dispersed patches on both the eastern and western side slopes, and is more developed on the fill slope adjacent to Rinaldi Street. Vegetation is supported by both surface drainage and shallow subsurface water (Jones, 2010).

From the floristic survey prepared in conjunction with this project, seventy-three plant species were observed at the site; nearly half of the total was native California plant species. The most common and most dominant California native plant species were arroyo willow, coast live oak, mugwort, and mule fat. Other native species included California sagebrush, California bush sunflower, California blackberry, California sycamore, chaparral mallow, Fremont cottonwood, goldenbush, hoary nettle, Mexican elderberry, and water cress (Jones, 2010).

Non-native species are predominantly annual weedy grasses and herbs- two weedy and non-native shrub species were also present. Exotic plant species were common in the meadow area. Of the thirty-eight exotic species recorded, common species included grasses such as rip gut brome, barley, and Bermuda grass. Annual and perennial species included bristly ox-tongue, Russian thistle, Australian saltbush and storksbill.
Seven plant species that have been listed, or are candidates for listing, by the state or federal government as rare, threatened or endangered have been reported to occur within the Oat Mountain 7.5’ U.S.G.S. quad (Attachment B, Table VI). Of the listed plant species, five are common to chaparral or coastal sage scrub communities: Nevin’s barberry, San Fernando Valley Spineflower, Santa Susana tarplant, Slender-horned spineflower and Lyon’s pentachaeta. Two species are common to seasonal wetland (vernal pool) communities: Spreading navarretia and California orcutt grass. Nevin’s barberry is also found in foothill woodland and riparian scrub. Slender-horned spineflower is also found in alluvial scrub. Lyon’s pentachaeta is also found in valley grassland. Although components of chaparral, coastal sage scrub, foothill woodland and riparian woodland communities are present, none of the listed plant species was observed within the study area.

The City’s wildlife survey (Attachment C) noted one reptile, thirty avian and four mammal species within the project area. Mammals included mule deer, pocket gophers tree and ground squirrels. The reptile observed was the western fence lizard. Birds included hummingbirds, woodpeckers, finches, flycatchers, wrens and hawks (see Attachment D, for the complete list of observed species).

A California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) search was completed to detect special-status wildlife species with the potential to occur within 5 miles of the project area. A U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service database search was also conducted. No critical habitat is present within the proposed project area. Based on the CNDDB search, 10 special status wildlife species had occurrences within five miles of the proposed project area: western yellow-billed cuckoo, monarch butterfly, western mastiff bat, hoary bat, San Diego desert woodrat, coast horned lizard, coastal California gnatcatcher, western spadefoot, two-striped garter snake, and least Bell’s vireo. In addition, we assessed habitat potential for California red-legged frog, and arroyo toad.

Based on the results of the wildlife survey and literature search, eight of 10 special status species have the potential to occur in the proposed project area: western mastiff bat, hoary bat, San Diego desert woodrat, least Bell’s vireo, Coast horned lizard, arroyo toad, western spadefoot, and monarch butterfly. See Attachment C for a discussion of factors used to make these determinations. An assessment for both the coastal California gnatcatcher and least Bell’s vireo are provided below (ICF 2010).

Most of the coastal sage scrub habitat within and adjacent to the proposed project area was on the western slope of the canyon, with a small patch immediately adjacent to Rinaldi Street. The Sesnon Fire which occurred in October 2008 impacted much of this habitat (ICF, 2010; Los Angeles County, 2008). Currently, it is in the early stages of recovery and most shrubs typical of coastal sage scrub are approximately 0.25 to 0.5 m (1-2 ft) high and are interspersed with weedy herbaceous plants. This is not typical California gnatcatcher habitat and is not likely to support the California gnatcatcher. The small (approximately 0.18 ha/0.4 ac) patch along Rinaldi Street was not burned and is in good condition. They are known to breed successfully in patches...
as small as 0.2 ha (Atwood and Bontrager, 2001), but mean territory size for inland pairs is 3.4 ha (Braden et al. 1997). However, this patch of coastal sage scrub appears too small and too isolated to support breeding by the California gnatcatcher. Other factors decreasing the likelihood of California gnatcatcher occurrence on this small patch of coastal sage scrub are the steepness of the slope, and the adjacent major road and highway (ICF 2010).

The riparian woodland along the creek bed provides suitable habitat for the least Bell's vireo. Within the project area, there is a band of willow-mulefat riparian habitat, approximately 66 to 164 feet (20 to 50 m) in width that extends approximately 1,640 feet (500 m) north of Rinaldi Street. Within the over story, willows dominate, growing to approximately 25 to 40 feet (8 to 12 m) in height, along with occasional western sycamore and cottonwood trees. There is a relatively thick understory of both willow and mulefat. The riparian woodland extends upstream and integrates into an oak woodland riparian habitat that is also potentially suitable habitat for the vireo (ICF 2010).

The coastal sage scrub vegetation community covers a large portion of Southern California, but has become fragmented and diminished in areal extent due to urbanization and development pressures. Not directly protected as habitat, the community harbors many rare, threatened or endangered plant and animal species (O'Leary 1989). However, the community is indirectly protected under the state’s, Natural Community Conservation Planning Act, a southern California coastal sage scrub Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) was established by the California of Fish and Game to conserve endangered and threatened plant and animal species that inhabit coastal sage scrub communities; however, the Santa Susana Mountains are not included within this planning area.

Because of the existence and the potential for disturbance of riparian woodland habitat onsite, the least Bell’s vireo may be impacted, especially during its breeding/nesting season. The breeding season occurs from mid-March through September, with nest building commencing in March. As a consequence, a nesting survey will be performed prior to construction to determine whether precautions will be necessary to accommodate the species’ breeding activities (See Initial Study Section on Biological Resources).

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS
This section documents the screening process used to identify and focus upon environmental impacts that could result from this project. The following Initial Study Checklist form follows the recommendations of the governor's Office of Planning and Research and was used in conjunction with the City's CEQA Thresholds Guide and other sources to screen and focus upon potential environmental impacts resulting from this project. Sources of information that adequately support findings of no impact are referenced by a number in parentheses following each question. All
sources so referenced are available for review at the offices of the Bureau of Engineering, 1149 South Broadway, Suite 600, Los Angeles. Answers to other questions (as well as answers of "no impact" that need further explanation) are discussed within the comment section of each issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:
   a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
      Comment: The project does not contain any scenic vistas. No ridgelines or cliffs will be affected. However, the street-level view of the valley bottom will be transformed from a relatively undeveloped, state. However, views of the recreational facility will be buffered by the mature trees that are to remain in place, and by native vegetation that will be part of the project’s landscaping.
      ![ ] ![ ] ![ ] ![ ]

   b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
      Reference: (19) Sections A1 & A2
      Comment: City designated heritage trees are present within the project site; however, no existing trees will be removed as part of this project. No historic structures or rock outcrops are present. The site is outside of any scenic corridor.
      ![ ] ![ ] ![ ] ![ ]

   c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
      Reference: (19) Sections A1 and A3
      Comment: The site is located within a city-designated scenic corridor. The site’s visual character will be impacted temporarily from grubbing and construction activity. To minimize impacts from construction, the site will be replanted with native California plant species representative of the existing flora. Exotic, non-native plant species will be eradicated.
      ![ ] ![ ] ![ ] ![ ]

   d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?
      Reference: (19) Section A4
      Comment: 
      ![ ] ![ ] ![ ] ![ ]

2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES – 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?
      Reference: (5)
      Comment: The project site is not currently used as farmland.
      ![ ] ![ ] ![ ] ![ ]

   b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
      Reference: (5)
      Comment: The project site is not zoned for agricultural use.
      ![ ] ![ ] ![ ] ![ ]
Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: The project site is not currently used as farmland.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. AIR QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
   Reference: (24).
   Comment:

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
   Reference: (19) Sections B1, B2, and B3; (13).

Comment: Construction activity, such as grading, trenching, digging, or other minor construction, may generate dust subject to SCAQMD Rule 403. The project may involve a small, yet undetermined, number of diesel-powered construction vehicles and equipment. Usage may generate PM-10 and PM-2.5, CO, Ozone, NOx, or other emissions. Nevertheless, contractors will be required to follow all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations to minimize any impacts to air quality during construction. Operators will apply additional precautions to water dusty areas and minimize the tracking of soil from unpaved dirt areas to paved roads. Construction impacts will be temporary and dust control measures will be implemented as part of the standard specifications.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
   Reference: (24).
   Comment: .

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
   Reference: (19) Sections B1, B2 and B3.
   Comment: Sensitive receptors (residences, parkland, or sensitive species) are present within 200 feet of the project. The project will meet all appropriate emissions standards established by SCAQMD. Because of the limited amount of grading, use of equipment and term of construction. The project will not significantly expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?
   Reference: (19) Section B2.
Issues

Comment: The project does not contain land uses typically associated with emitting objectionable odors, such as wastewater treatment facilities, or solid waste-disposal facilities. Some odor causing-emissions (diesel exhaust or volatile organic compounds) will be emitted during project construction; however this a temporary impact During operation, the equestrian staging area and restrooms could create potentially objectionable odors; however, the equestrian staging area will accommodate only a limited number of horses. The onsite restrooms will have vents, and will be regularly maintained. Generation of odors will be less than significant

4. 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?  

      Reference: (19) Section C; (11).

      Comment: The proposed project will lie within parkland, owned by the City of Los Angeles. Construction plans will contain restrictions, which will minimize the disturbance of native vegetation, lessen erosion and maintain slope stability. The Bureau of Engineering’s Environmental Management Section will be present or available to monitor impacts to vegetation and to provide guidance to construction crews, during the construction period.

      Construction activities will be limited to the disturbed meadow area and in the immediate vicinity of the two bridge crossings. Native trees and shrubs will be flagged as necessary within the construction zone; patches of native vegetation will be avoided. The existing, unimproved right-of-way along Hesperia Avenue will be utilized for construction access. Nevertheless, the adjacent riparian woodland will be fenced-off, along the western edge of Hesperia Avenue, to delineate and protect the riparian woodland habitat from intrusion during construction. Approximately 7-acres of existing, non-native vegetation will be cleared from the meadow area.

      As provided by the CADFG, a search of the Natural Diversity Data Base (NDDDB) revealed occurrences of seven plant species within the Oat Mountain 7.5’ U.S.G.S. quad) that have been listed, or are candidates for listing, by the state or federal government as rare, threatened or endangered (Attachments C and D); although components of chaparral, coastal sage scrub, foothill woodland and riparian woodland communities are present, none of the listed plant species was observed, or previously recorded within the study area.

      Meanwhile, the CNDDB search yielded occurrences of ten special status wildlife species within five miles of the proposed project area; Based on the results of the wildlife survey and literature search, eight of 10 special status species have the potential to occur in the proposed project area: western mastiff bat, hoary bat, San Diego desert woodrat,
least Bell’s vireo, Coast horned lizard, arroyo toad, western spadefoot, and monarch butterfly.

Because of the existence of riparian woodland habitat onsite, there is a high potential for the presence of the least Bell’s vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*). If present, the federally listed species may be impacted, especially during its breeding/nesting season. The breeding season occurs from February through July, with nest building commencing in March. There will be a two month unavoidable overlap with the vireo breeding season.

In addition, there will be a two-month overlap with other species including raptors, which generally extends to the end of August. Since protected or migratory avian species have been identified as potentially present in the project area, consequently, a biological monitor will be necessary. The biological monitor will be retained to conduct weekly surveys and to monitor for the presence of nests during periods when construction crews are present. Any occupied nests found during this survey shall be mapped on construction plans. Construction activities within the vicinity (300 feet) of any mapped nests shall be restrained until a qualified biologist determines that the nest is no longer active.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?  
Reference: (19) Section C; (25).
Comment: Two bridge crossings of Aliso Canyon Creek are planned. Bridge abutments will be approximately 50 feet apart and will be placed outside the jurisdictional wetland boundaries. Consequently, a wetland delineation will be required to identify jurisdictional boundaries. Mature trees will be avoided. Tree branch/root trimming may be necessary during construction, including excavations for the bridge abutments, but must be performed under the supervision of a certified arborist.

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?  
Reference: (19) Section C; (26).
Comment: See 4(b).

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?
Reference: (19) Section C.
Comment: The riparian woodland along Aliso Canyon Creek is a possible wildlife corridor. However, to minimize disturbance to wildlife movements, construction will be limited to daytime hours, and with the short term of construction, impacts to wildlife should be deemed less than significant.
Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (19) Section C; (15); (11), (16).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: No mature native trees are to be removed. Also see comment 4(c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

Reference: (19) Section C; (18) Conservation Element; (10); (11); (12); (24).
Comment: The project site lies outside of any designated habitat conservation area.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:
   a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5?
   Reference: (4); (19) Section D; (20), (41).
   Comment: See 5(b).
   POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT | MITIGATION | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT | NO IMPACT |
   ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ |

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5?
   Reference: (4), (41).
   Comment: In a review of available City records, the site lies within one mile of two previous archaeological sites, and lies adjacent to an area designated as likely to yield archaeological resources. Based upon a South Central Coastal Information Center recommendation, a Phase I Archaeological Survey (Attachment D) for pre-historic and historic cultural resources was performed by LSA Associates. The survey found no cultural or paleontological resources have been previously documented within the project boundaries, and no resources were identified during the field survey. However, due to underlying sensitive geological (Saugus) Formation and the proximity of local paleontological fauna discovered within the Saugus Formation, a qualified Paleontologist must be present during any earth moving activities. Additionally, if previously undocumented cultural or paleontological resources are identified during earthmoving activities, a qualified archaeologist/paleontologist shall be retained to assess the nature and significance of the find, diverting construction excavation if necessary.

   c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
   Reference: (1) Section 6-3.2; (35); (28), (41).
   Comment: See 5(b).
   POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT | MITIGATION | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT | NO IMPACT |
   ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ |

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?
   Reference: 
   Comment
   POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT | MITIGATION | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT | NO IMPACT |
   ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ |

6. 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:
**Issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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?

**References:** (7); (8); (36).

**Comment:** The site is located within an Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone. See comment 6(c)(a)(iii).

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

**Reference:** (19) Section E1; (7), (36).

**Comment:** There is a high probability of ground shaking caused by either local and regional faulting. The nearest active fault that may produce significant ground shaking is the Northridge (East Oak Ridge) fault, 3.2 miles (2 km) to the south. A significant impact may occur if the proposed project design did not comply with building code requirements intended to protect people from hazards associated with strong seismic ground shaking.

As per standard practice, a geotechnical evaluation was be prepared which prescribed methods, techniques, and specifications for: site preparation, treatment of undocumented fill and/or alluvial soils, fill placement on sloping ground, fill characteristics, fill placement and compactions, temporary excavations and shoring, permanent slopes, treatment of expansive soils, and treatment of corrosive soils. Design and construction of the proposed project would conform to recommendations in the geotechnical evaluation.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

**Reference:** (19) Section E1; (7); (8); (9).

**Comment:** The site is shown on the State of California Seismic Hazard Zones Map. The project is located on fill next to an ephemeral stream, where groundwater is found at a shallow elevation during normal wet seasons. Nevertheless, groundwater has been historically been found well below 100 feet. In the Geotechnical Study, shallow groundwater was determined to have been derived from surface infiltration and retained by dense soils of low cohesiveness and low permeability. Liquefaction affects areas with fine-grained loose sands; the underlying fill material and native soils are not considered as vulnerable. As a result, the probability for liquefaction to occur onsite is low, and the potential impact is less than significant.

iv) Landslides?

**Reference:** (19) Section E1; (8); (9); (28), (36).

**Comment:** See Comment 6(c)

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

**Reference:** (19) Section E2.
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment: Construction activities, such as grubbing and trenching, may lead to erosion problems. In construction of the bridge foundations, tree removal will be avoided, and vegetation will be trimmed, not removed to retain root mass and lessen erosion. Moreover, standard City specifications and best management practices will be observed to provide adequate safeguards for control of erosion on the construction site. The project’s impact will be less than significant. The topsoil consists of mostly fill material; however Best Management Practices will be also implemented to minimize soil erosion.

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?

Reference: (19) Section E2, (14), (36).

Comment: See 6(b) and 6(c). The project site is relatively flat and adjacent to a steep slope along the eastern margin. The slope’s geological unit is the Saugus Formation, where portions are comprised of unconsolidated, weakly-cemented sediments. Since seismically-induced landslides are common after earthquakes, the probability of such an on-site failure is considered moderate. Liquefaction is discussed in section 6(a)(iii). The potential for lateral spreading is considered low due to the parent material type and historical groundwater levels. Meanwhile, subsidence would occur on poorly compacted fill, or in areas of oil production or groundwater pumping.

Prior to construction and as a standard practice, a geotechnical evaluation has been prepared which prescribed methods, techniques, and specifications for: site preparation, treatment of undocumented fill and/or alluvial soils, fill placement on sloping ground, fill characteristics, fill placement and compactions, temporary excavations and shoring, permanent slopes, treatment of expansive soils, and treatment of corrosive soils. Design and construction of the proposed project would conform to recommendations in the geotechnical evaluation. Geotechnical Engineering Group (2010) recommended that minor groundwater dewatering would be necessary to construct building foundations. Plans and specifications, as well as site earthwork and foundation construction will be reviewed by the Geotechnical Engineering Group for this project.

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?

Reference: (3).

Comment: No expansive soils are present onsite.

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

Reference: (9); (1).

Comment: A self-contained portable restroom facility planned. The facility will be serviced by a truck. No septic tanks are planned.

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

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

Reference: (34).
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (31); (33); (34).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **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 |
| Reference: (19) Section F1. | | | | |
| Comment: The project does not involve the use of hazardous materials. | | | | |

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | | | | X |
| Reference: (19) Section F1. | | | | |
| Comment: The project does not involve the use of hazardous materials. | | | | |

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 |
| Reference: (19) Section F1; (25). | | | | |
| Comment: There is no school within ¼ mile of the project site. The project will not emit or handle hazardous materials, substances or waste. | | | | |

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 |
| Reference: (29); (30). | | | | |
| Comment: A 2003 preliminary Phase I site assessment showed no evidence of hazardous material contamination. In addition, an electronic database search of listings maintained by federal, state, and local agencies of sites with known or suspected hazardous material contamination, use of hazardous or toxic materials and regulated wastes, discharge or spillage incidents, discharge permits, landfills, and storage tanks was performed. The site is not included on any of the listings. | | | | |

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 |
| Reference: (19); (25). | | | | |
| Comment: | | | | |

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 |
| Reference: (25). | | | | |
| Comment: | | | | |

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | | | | X |
| Reference: (19) Section F1. | | | | |
| Comment: | | | | |
**Issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (19) Section K2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: The project site lies within a designated fire-hazard area. Nevertheless, a major highway is adjacent, which provides a rapid evacuation route and response time by the Los Angeles Fire Department. Also, structures will have an adequate setback from vegetated areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (19) Section G2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: Ground disturbance activities would only take place temporarily during construction. Throughout construction, the proposed project would comply with applicable stormwater management requirements for pollution prevention. To prevent potential substantial degradation of water quality, construction practices would include erosion control, spill prevention and control, solid and hazardous waste management, and dust control to reduce the discharge of pollutants from construction areas to the stormwater system. All project landscaping will include native vegetation (drought-tolerant xeriscaping, if possible) requiring minimal irrigation and safe care (e.g., no harmful chemicals), designed to assist in filtering any runoff. Bio-swales will be constructed to capture and filter runoff from the parking areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (19) Section G3; (23).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: Project will not draw groundwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (19) Section G1; (25).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. As discussed in comment 9 (a), the project would result in temporary soil disturbance activities during construction during which time a stormwater pollution prevention plan for the control of soil erosion and sediment runoff would be implemented. The project would be constructed in accordance with applicable requirements of the municipal code, including grading requirements. A stormwater pollution prevention plan for the control of soil erosion and sediment runoff would be implemented and a set of mitigation measures would be implemented to ensure a less than significant impact during operation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 that would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (19) Section G1; (25); (27).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See comments for 9 (a) and 9 (c) above. In addition, there will be a minor increase in impermeable pavement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (19) Section G2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See comment for 9 (a) above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (19) Section G2; (25).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See comment for 9 (a) above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (19) Section G1; (27).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: This project does not involve construction of housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (19) Section G1; (27).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: The site lies within a 100-year flood hazard area, Zone C. Flooding would not be impeded or redirected due to setback of isolated structures from the creek.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (19) Section G1; (27).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: The area would be closed to public access during major storm events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or <strong>mudflow</strong>?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (19) Section E1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 10. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (19) Section H2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (19) Section H1; (18).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment: The proposed project is located within the Granada Hills-Knollwood Community Plan area which is part of the City of Los Angeles’ General Plan. The current zoning designation is OS and RA. The General Plan land use designation is Very Low Density Residential.

The site is zoned for both open space and low density residential uses. Since the equestrian area is planned for an area zoned for low density residential housing, a change in land use, or a zoning variance will be necessary as a condition of approval. The project meets environmental goals and the number of planned non-residential structures will be less than the criteria for low density residential. Environmental impacts and utility/public service demands will be less than if the parcels were developed for their zoned uses. Development of the proposed project site would be consistent with the General Plan or zoning designations of the site and surrounding area and would not conflict with any adopted plans, policies, or regulations. The project is consistent with the community plan’s policy of providing adequate recreation facilities to correspond with population and service demands. The Granada Hills-Knollwood Community Plan recognizes the need for the expansion and improvement of needed local parks. The plan states that these parks are to be improved as funds become available. In this situation, improving Aliso Canyon Park with an equestrian facility would further satisfy the goal and intent of the plan.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?
Reference: (18); (19) Section C; (11).
Comment: The proposed project site is not within designated habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans. Therefore, no conflict with any plans would occur as a result of the proposed project. No mitigation measures are necessary.

11. 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?
Reference: (19) Section E4.
Comment:

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?
Reference: 
Comment:

12. NOISE – Would the project result in:
   a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
Reference: (19) Sections I1, I2, I3, and I4; (14); (18).
**Issues**

Comment: Construction of facilities and structures requires the use of equipment, which may generate high noise levels. Stationary and mobile vehicular noise sources associated with the operation of a project may also increase existing noise levels. A significant impact would occur if the project resulted in or exposed people to noise levels in excess of standards established in the general plan and/or noise ordinance of the municipal code.

The proposed project would likely result in temporary higher-than-average noise levels in the local community during construction. However, the Bureau of Engineering Standard Project Specifications for public works construction are designed to comply with the City’s General Plan Noise Element and related Municipal Code Noise Ordinance and, given that the proposed project would be implemented in accordance with these, significant adverse impacts to noise levels are not expected. There are no permanent sensitive receptors within the vicinity of the proposed project site, since the land within the project site and the area across Osborne Street both remain undeveloped. However, park visitors, including trail users, and wildlife, may be temporarily exposed to noise during construction. Nevertheless, adequate setbacks, the project’s small scale, and short construction period would reduce the noise impacts on those receptors (and local wildlife) to less than significant levels.

Nighttime construction or operation is not proposed for this project due to the concern of nearby residents, and proximity to potentially sensitive wildlife habitat, worker safety and the attendant increased costs of construction. As a result, all of the above-mentioned codes will be included in the project plans and specifications along with the corresponding bid package. In addition, construction personnel shall comply with Cal OSHA requirements for hearing protection.

Mitigation can include several parts: construction of a temporary sound wall or baffling. Restriction of construction activities and facility operation to daylight hours from 7 a.m. to dusk (since there will be no nighttime construction). These measures should reduce the noise impact to less than significance. See Section VI for Mitigation Measures.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?
Reference: (19) Sections I1, I2, I3, and I4, (14).
Comment: Grading activities associated with the project could generate ground borne vibration from equipment. These effects would be temporary and short-term in nature and would comply with applicable noise standards.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
Reference: (19) Sections I1, I2, I3, and I4.
Comment: Refer to 12 (a) above.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference: Refer to 12 (a) and 12 (b) above.

- **e)** For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?
  - Reference: (19) Section I4.
  - Comment: No public airport is located within the vicinity of the project area. Refer to 8(e) above.

- **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?
  - Reference: (19).
  - Comment: No private airstrips are located within the immediate vicinity of the project area.

13. **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)?
  - Reference: (19) Section J2.
  - Comment:

- **b)** Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
  - Reference: (19) Section J2.
  - Comment:

- **c)** Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
  - Reference: (19) Section J2.
  - Comment:

14. **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:
  - **i)** Fire protection?
    - Reference: (19) Section K2.
    - Comment:
  - **ii)** Police protection?
    - Reference: (19) Section K1.
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: According to conversations with local residents, facilities may potentially attract criminal activity. Nevertheless, the project would incorporate into the plans the design guidelines relative to security in the Design out Crime Guidelines: Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design published by the Los Angeles Police Department’s Crime Prevention Section. In addition, the Department of Recreation and Parks will develop and implement a park patrol program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii) Schools?
- Reference: (19) Section K3.
  - Comment: The proposed project would not promote population growth, either directly or indirectly, because it would serve as a recreational amenity to accommodate the planned regional growth forecasts and would not include new residential or educational development.

iv) Parks?
- Reference: (19) Section K4.
  - Comment: The proposed project is itself a recreational amenity designed to accommodate existing and future regional growth.

v) Other public facilities?
- Reference: (19) Section K5.
  - Comment: The proposed project would not promote population growth, either directly or indirectly, because it would serve as a recreational amenity to accommodate the planned regional growth forecasts and would not include new residential or educational development.

15. 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?
- Reference: (19) Section K4.
  - Comment: The proposed project would not adversely affect existing recreational opportunities or increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities, because it is a recreational amenity designed to respond to a presently existing demand for public-equestrian facilities.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?
- Reference:
  - Comment: Refer to comment 15 (a) above.

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Cause an increase in traffic that 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)?
   Reference: (19) Sections L1, L2, L3, L4, and L8.
   Comment:

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
   Reference: (19) Section L1, L2, L3 & L4.
   Comment: Rinaldi is classified as a major highway in the City of Los Angeles with a level of service, adequate to handle the expected minimal increase in visitation.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location those results in substantial safety risks?
   Reference:  
   Comment:

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
   Reference: (19) Section L5; (18).
   Comment:

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?
   Reference: (19) Sections L5, L8, and K2.
   Comment:

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?
   Reference: (19) Sections L5 and L7.
   Comment: A significant impact would occur if the project resulted in insufficient parking capacity onsite or offsite by spillover of project parking demands to nearby streets or parking facilities or neighborhoods. The project includes construction of off-street public parking areas.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?
   Reference:  
   Comment: Bicycle racks will be included in the design.

### 17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
   Reference: (19) Section K2.
   Comment:

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?
   Reference: (19) Sections M1 and M2.
Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment: There is no existing sewer service to the area of the proposed equestrian facility. The nearest sewer line runs to the west of Aliso Canyon Creek; another runs under Rinaldi Street to the south. The project includes construction of a portable restroom structure, which will not be connected to any sewer, but will require periodic servicing by a septage removal contractor. However, should a community center be constructed, a sewer line will be needed, connecting with the Rinaldi Street sewer line. Connection to existing sewer line, to the west of Aliso Creek, is not planned.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (19) Section M2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (19) Section M1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project has projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (19) Section M2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (19) Section M3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: (19) Section M3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. 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 plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Reference: |

Comment: The project may have potential significant impacts to aesthetics, air quality, biological, and cultural resources. Site, geology, and noise may also be significantly affected. However, with the implementation of mitigation measures as summarized under Section (V), the impacts would be less than significant.
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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)?

Reference:

Comment: The proposed project is located in a highly developed area. The proposed project would have minor localized impacts that could all be mitigated through the proposed mitigation measures. The project’s small contribution to cumulative impacts would not be considered cumulatively considerable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

Reference:

Comment: The proposed project would not have significant impacts that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The proposed project is intended as a public benefit project that would improve the public enjoyment and stewardship of a unique regional recreational facility. During the initial study, no existing hazards were uncovered that would threaten the viability of safe implementation of the proposed project; however, should contamination or other hazards be uncovered during construction, standard practices for removal and/or other remediation would be employed in conformance with all applicable rules and regulations to prevent human exposure an harm.

### V. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EVALUATION

As identified in Section IV of this IS/MND, the proposed project has the potential to result in significant impacts to air quality, biological, and cultural resources, site, geology, hydrology and water quality, and noise. With application of the recommended mitigation measures provided in Section VI, potential impacts would be reduced to levels considered less than significant. Impacts having the potential to degrade the environment or adversely affect humans would be avoided with implementation of the mitigation measures.

**Growth Inducing Impacts**

The proposed project is intended as a public service improvement project to accommodate existing demands of the local population. The proposed project does not include construction of any new, permanent housing or commercial activities, and is not expected to induce any new residential or commercial growth. Improvements are intended to meet the needs of the current population, including the existing residential community—to provide recreational amenities, such as a day-use equestrian center. The project would provide recreational improvement function to a public recreational area and is not expected to result in any growth-inducing impacts.
VI. MITIGATION MEASURES
Mitigation measures are required in the following CEQA issue areas (air quality, biological, and cultural resources, site, geology, hydrology and water quality, and noise) where potentially significant impacts have been identified, and where those impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Air Quality**

| AQ-01 | Develop and Implement a Fugitive Dust Emission Control Plan. The project developer shall develop and implement a Fugitive Dust Emission Control Plan (FDECP) for construction work. Measures to be incorporated into the plan shall include, but are not limited to the following: |
|       |       | - Water the unpaved road access and other disturbed areas of the active construction sites at least three times per day, or apply CARB certified soil binders. |
|       |       | - Install wheel washers/cleaners or wash the wheels of trucks and other heavy equipment where vehicles exit the site or unpaved access roads. |
|       |       | - Increase the frequency of watering, or implement other additional fugitive dust mitigation measures, to all disturbed fugitive dust emission sources when wind speeds (as instantaneous wind gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour (mph). |
|       |       | - Travel route planning shall be completed to identify required travel routes to minimize unpaved road travel to each construction site to the extent feasible. |

| AQ-02 | Restrict engine idling. Diesel engine idle time shall be restricted to no more than 10 minutes duration. This is not required for trucks that require engines to be on while waiting onsite, such as concrete trucks. |

| AQ-03 | Use on-road vehicles that meet California on-road standards. All on-road construction vehicles operating within California shall meet all applicable California on-road emission standards and shall be licensed in the State of California. This does not apply to construction worker personal vehicles. |

| AQ-04 | Activities and operations on unpaved roads areas should be minimized to the extent feasible during high wind events to minimize fugitive dust. |

| AQ-05 | Unpaved areas shall be watered as needed (or other measures implemented) to control dust on a continual basis. |

**Biological Resources**

| BR-01 | Qualified biologist(s) shall be retained to review grading and re-vegetation plans, to supervise all grading and planting, excavation, and other ground disturbing activities and to oversee all aspects of construction monitoring that pertain to biological resource protection. |

| BR-02 | Construction shall occur only during daylight hours, if possible, to minimize exposure of sensitive receptors to air emissions during facility construction. |
### Table 1: Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact/s Conditions</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disturbances to any urban wildlife species that are primarily active at night.</td>
<td>BR-03</td>
<td>Wherever possible, construction personnel shall utilize existing access roads or previously disturbed areas to reach the project area or to stage their vehicles and equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Least Bell’s Vireo has a high potential to inhabit areas adjacent to the project area. Construction work within 300 ft (91.5 m) of suitable habitat for the vireo will occur outside the vireo-breeding season between March 15 and September 15. If work is necessary within 300 ft (91.5 m) of suitable vireo habitat during the breeding season, the project biologist shall perform weekly surveys in the area to determine whether any nesting vireos are present. If no nesting activity is observed, work may continue. If a nest is present, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service shall be notified of the location of the nest, a 300 ft (91.5 m) buffer around the nest shall be clearly demarcated, and construction in the area shall be avoided until the nest is no longer active. A project biologist with authority to stop construction shall be present on site during breeding-season construction to ensure the limits of construction do not encroach into suitable vireo habitat or within 300 ft (91.5 m) of a nesting vireo.</td>
<td>BR-04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-construction surveys shall be performed for Federal and State-listed threatened and endangered species with the potential to be within the project area. Territories shall be delineated on aerial photographs.</td>
<td>BR-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The contractor shall be prohibited from harassing, killing, collecting, or intentionally harming any species of wildlife, fish, or vertebrate.</td>
<td>BR-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To minimize potential impacts to native habitat, all project landscaping shall include native vegetation that requires minimal irrigation and safe care (e.g., no pesticides or fertilizers), designed to assist in filtration of runoff from natural and artificial sources. The latter contribution includes runoff from installation of new impervious surfaces from the project (e.g., walkways and vehicle parking areas).</td>
<td>BR-07/ HWQ-04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During construction or operation of the proposed project, no existing mature trees shall be disturbed, or removed. Tree branch/root trimming may be necessary during construction, but must be performed under the supervision of a certified arborist.</td>
<td>BR-08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During construction, contractors shall keep construction and staging areas orderly, free of trash and debris. For operations, new trash receptacles shall be placed in convenient areas (with adequate signage) to prevent wildlife access and to minimize habitat contamination.</td>
<td>BR-09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This mitigation ensures compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Bird Nesting Survey: If any project construction activity (including staging and grading) is to be initiated during the bird breeding season (February 1 through September 15), a qualified ornithologist shall determine whether any active bird nest is within 500 feet (152.4 m) of the intended activity, no more than 30 days and no less than 7 days prior to initiation of the activity.</td>
<td>BR-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1: Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact/s</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bird nesting surveys conducted prior to March 1 may be conducted in a manner primarily intended to identify active nests of special-status bird species (particularly raptors). All reasonable measures shall be taken to avoid construction activity within 500 feet of an active nest of a raptor, or within 300 feet of an active nest of any other bird species. (This measure has been broadened to include the entire project site; and provides compliance with Section 3503 and 3503.5 of the <em>California Fish and Game Code</em>.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-11</td>
<td>During construction, all ground disturbances, stockpiling of materials, storage of construction equipment, construction and grading activities, and vegetation removal shall be prohibited outside of the project area. Fencing and signage prohibiting activities within the adjacent riparian woodland area shall be installed during all grading and construction activities in order to avoid disturbance to, or removal of, habitat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-12</td>
<td>To minimize impacts to native habitat, non-native plants - such as giant reed (<em>Arundo donax</em>), mustard (<em>Brassica sp.</em>), and caster bean (<em>Ricinus communis</em>) - shall be eradicated from the project area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disturbance of existing cultural resources</th>
<th>CR-01</th>
<th>A qualified archeologist who meets the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for an Archeologist (see 36 CFR Part 61) shall monitor any earthmoving that will involve previously undisturbed soil. Earthmoving includes grubbing and ground clearing, grading, and excavation activities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR-02</td>
<td>In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project construction, all earth disturbing work shall be temporarily suspended within the project's archaeological area of potential effect (APE) until a qualified archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. As deemed necessary by the project archaeologist, a Tongva/Gabrielino representative should monitor any mitigation excavation associated with Native American materials. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. If human remains are unearthed, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 require that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Geology and Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction and operation activities potentially contributing to excessive runoff and soil erosion</th>
<th>GS-01/ HWQ-05</th>
<th>All facilities shall be designed to accommodate the natural filtration/attenuation of runoff to the maximum extent possible—with vegetated buffers and swales—in order to prevent erosion and to preserve more stable soil conditions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GS-02</td>
<td>During construction, erosion and siltation may impact adjacent wetland areas. Appropriate Best Management Practices shall be utilized to minimize such impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact/s</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-03</td>
<td>During the rainy season, the project construction shall cease during rain events.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-04</td>
<td>Design and construction of the proposed project would conform to recommendations in the geotechnical evaluation to minimize impacts caused by seismic activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

| HWQ-01   | The construction contractor shall obtain a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction storm water permit. |
| HWQ-02   | The construction contractor shall prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to reduce the potential for accidental release of fuels, pesticides, and other materials. The construction contractor shall submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the California Water Resources Board in Sacramento. The SWPPP would be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer. This plan shall include the designation of refueling locations, emergency response procedures, and definition of reporting requirements for any spill that occurs. Equipment for immediate cleanup will be kept at the staging area for immediate use. This plan shall also include pesticide application activities such as storage, handling of herbicides, and application methods. |
| HWQ-03   | Construction contractors shall use Best Management Practices to prevent erosion and sedimentation to avoid significant adverse impacts to surface water quality. |
| HWQ-04/BR-07 | See BR-07. |
| HWQ-05   | The restroom shall be designed to accommodate drainage in such a manner that water is conserved and erosion is prevented (e.g. by the use of vegetated buffers around facilities where appropriate). |

**Noise**

| Noise generated during construction | N-01 | Construction activities shall comply with local ordinances. Any night time or weekend construction activities shall be coordinated with local ordinances and shall require the construction contractor to obtain a noise permit. |
| N-02 | Surrounding residents shall be notified of the project construction. |
| N-03 | All equipment used during construction shall be muffled and maintained in good operating condition. All internal combustion engine driven equipment shall be fitted with well-maintained mufflers in accordance with manufacturer’s recommendations. |

These mitigation measures would form the foundation of a Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) for the project. CEQA requires public agencies to adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project that have been adopted to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6). The program must be adopted by the public agency at the time findings are made regarding the project. The State CEQA Guidelines allow public
agencies to choose whether its program will monitor mitigation, report on mitigation, or both (14 CCR Section 15097(c)).

The mitigation measures described herein are supplemental to those required as standard procedure for the City and its contractors. The City and its contractors are the parties responsible for: (1) the necessary implementing actions; (2) verifying that the necessary implementing actions are taken; and (3) the primary record documenting the necessary implementing actions.

The mechanisms for verifying that mitigation measures have been implemented include design drawings, project plans, and specifications, construction documents intended for use by construction contractors and construction managers, field inspections, field reports, and other periodic or special reports. All records pertaining to this mitigation program would be maintained and made available for inspection by the public in accordance with the City’s records management systems.

VII. COMPATIBILITY WITH EXISTING ZONING AND PLANS

The project site lies within the Granada Hills-Knollwood Plan area. The proposed project has been designed to be compatible with the underlying zoning and land use designations.

VIII. NAME OF PREPARER

William Jones
Environmental Management Group
Bureau of Engineering

IX. DETERMINATION - RECOMMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

A. Summary

The proposed project is located within Council District 12 in Aliso Canyon Park. The City proposes to construct a 7-acre equestrian day-use and park facility at a former, privately-owned equestrian site within Aliso Canyon Park. The facility is intended to serve a variety of functions, including recreation and water quality improvements. Because the area is an ecological resource, water quality improvements would help conserve and preserve the existing flora and fauna.

B. Recommended Environmental Documentation

Based on the attached Initial Study contained in this document, it has been determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment, provided that all suggested mitigation measures, derived from the separate CEQA review, are incorporated.
The proposed project would potentially result in significant impacts to air quality, biological, and cultural resources, site geology, hydrology and water quality, and noise. However, with application of the mitigation measures provided in this Initial Study, potential impacts would be reduced to levels considered less than significant. Several potentially significant impacts can be rendered insignificant with the required application of certain mitigation measures, as discussed in Section VI of the Initial Study.

On the basis of this initial evaluation, I find that implementation of the proposed project with mitigation would not have a significant effect on the environment, and this Mitigated Negative Declaration should be adopted.

Prepared By: William Jones, Environmental Specialist II

Approved By: Gary Lee Moore, P.E.
City Engineer

By: Jim Doty, Acting Manager
Environmental Management Group
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Attachments
CORRECTIONS

INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

ALISO CANYON PARK IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT
The Draft MND/IS contains twelve mitigation measures intended to protect biological resources that may be potentially be impacted by the project. The mitigation measures are based upon respective biological (vegetation and wildlife) resource assessments (MND Attachments B and C). The preliminary wildlife survey report listed existing and potential wildlife resources on the project site. Among these were three special status species - Mastiff Bat, Coast Horned Lizard and Western Spadefoot Frog.

The final version of the Biological (Wildlife) Resources report includes a recommendation for a bat survey, due to the (low to moderate) potential presence of the Western Mastiff Bat. As a result, the MND will be revised to include a pre-construction bat survey. Other potential sensitive species (Coast Horned Lizard and Western Spadefoot Frog) also have a moderate, potential presence on-site. Current mitigation measures, as listed in the MND, will minimize potential impacts to the other two sensitive species, with the exception of additional mitigation measures on open trenches and increasing construction worker awareness of sensitive biological resources. Based upon recommendations contained in the Final Biological Resources (Wildlife) Report, the following mitigation measures will be added to the mitigation measure table (Table 1) in the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. A revised Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study will be made available on-line at the Bureau of Engineering's website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Biological Resources (Continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>