
I. INTRODUCTION/SUMMARY

A. INTRODUCTION

The subject of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is a proposed Single-Family Residence in Studio City (proposed project). A detailed description of the proposed project is included in Section III, *Project Description*, of this Draft EIR.

Since the proposed project will require approval of certain discretionary actions by the City of Los Angeles (City), the proposed project is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), for which the City is the designated Lead Agency. The Department of City Planning administers the process by which environmental documents for projects are prepared and reviewed. On April 25, 2008, the Los Angeles Superior Court filed a Grant Writ (BS107912) regarding a previous residential design proposed by the Project Applicant in 2005 on the proposed project site that determined that a fair argument exists, based on substantial evidence that the project may have significant unmitigated effects on the environment, and that preparation of an EIR is required based on fair arguments presented regarding the following three CEQA environmental issues:¹

- Aesthetics—visual character and quality of the area, scenic resources in the viewshed of a scenic highway corridor
- Biological Resources—impacts on riparian plant community
- Geology/Soils—springs on the project area, proximity to a known (Benedict Canyon) fault, and potential significant adverse impacts from project fill

On the basis of these procedures, it was determined that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, and an EIR should be prepared.

As described in Sections 15121 and 15362 of the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Section 15000 et seq.), an EIR is an informational document that will inform public agency decision makers and the public of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to a project. The purpose of this EIR, therefore, is to focus the discussion on those potential effects on the environment of the proposed project that the Lead Agency has determined are or may be significant. In addition, feasible mitigation measures are required, when applicable, that could reduce or avoid significant impacts.

This Draft EIR was prepared in accordance with Section 15151 of the State CEQA Guidelines, which defines the standards for EIR adequacy as follows: an EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision makers with information that enables them to make a decision that intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR would summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection; but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure.

¹ Judge Ann I. Jones, Los Angeles Superior Court. 25 April 2008. Grant Writ. BS107912.

Environmental Review Process

In compliance with Section 21080.4 of the California Public Resources Code, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the proposed project was prepared by Department of City Planning and distributed to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, responsible agencies, and other interested parties (Appendix A, *Notice of Preparation*). The NOP was sent to the State Clearinghouse on February 9, 2016, and distributed to 62 federal, state, regional, and local agencies. The NOP was circulated for a 30-day review period that began on February 9, 2016, and closed on March 10, 2016. The NOP was mailed directly to 20 interested parties and to 92 property owners and residents within a 500-foot radius of the proposed project site. The NOP was also posted on the City's website, at: <http://planning.lacity.org/eir/nops/TOCNOP.htm>. The NOP was available for review and posted at the Los Angeles Central Library, located approximately 8.6 miles southeast of the proposed project site at 630 West 5th Street; the Studio City Branch Library, located approximately 2.4 miles northwest of the proposed project site at 12511 Moorpark Street; and the Sherman Oaks Martin Pollard Branch Library, located approximately 4.5 miles west of the proposed project site at 14245 Moorpark Street.

The Department of City Planning received two (2) letters from Native American representatives, two (2) letters of comment from public agencies (Native American Heritage Commission and LA Sanitation, Wastewater Engineering Services Division) and three (3) comment letters from other interested parties (Appendix C, *Notice of Preparation Comment Letters*; Table I.A-1, *NOP Public/Agency Comment Matrix*).

Table I.A-1
NOP Public/Agency Comment Matrix

Commenter	Location in EIR Where Comment Is Addressed
Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC)	Information related to most likely descendants and the information contained in the Sacred Lands File is addressed in Section IV.C, <i>Cultural Resources</i> . This letter has been redacted from Appendix C to preserve confidential information.
Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation	Information regarding resources of importance to the Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation is addressed in Section IV.C, <i>Cultural Resources</i> . This letter has been redacted from Appendix C to preserve confidential information.
Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians	Information regarding resources of importance to the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians is addressed in Section IV.C, <i>Cultural Resources</i> . This letter has been redacted from Appendix C to preserve confidential information.
LA Sanitation, Wastewater Engineering Services Division	Information characterizing wastewater requirements, sewer availability, stormwater requirements, green streets, construction requirements, and solid resource requirements are addressed in Section III, <i>Project Description</i> . Responses to this letter regarding neighborhood concerns about LID Ordinance requirements and the City of Los Angeles Green Streets Policy are addressed in Section II, <i>Environmental Setting</i> .
Neighbor (DeWitt)	Comments that were provided regarding neighbor concerns in relation to the view corridor, sensitivity to the surrounding landscape, and anticipated tree removal, and darker roofing materials are addressed in Section III, <i>Project Description</i> . Responses to this letter regarding neighbor concerns in relation to the resident deer population on the proposed project site are addressed into Section IV.B, <i>Biological Resources</i> .
Neighbor (Harte)	Comments that were provided regarding neighbor concerns in relation to Parkland and MSPSP restrictions are addressed in Section II, <i>Environmental Setting</i> . Responses to this letter regarding neighbor concerns about streams, wildlife corridors, trees, and other biological resources are addressed in Section IV.B, <i>Biological Resources</i> . Detailed discussion of existing biological resources on the project site are addressed in Appendix IV, <i>Biological Resources</i> .

**Table I.A-1
NOP Public/Agency Comment Matrix**

Commenter	Location in EIR Where Comment Is Addressed
	<i>Technical Report.</i> Responses to this letter regarding neighbor concerns about a joint easement to access the property and existing conditions regarding utilities are addressed in Section II, <i>Environmental Setting</i> . Responses to this letter regarding neighbor concerns about utility easements are addressed in Section III, <i>Project Description</i> . Responses to this letter regarding neighbor concerns about “echo” factor are addressed in Section IV.E, <i>Noise</i> . Responses to this letter regarding neighbor concerns about the stability of the hillside are addressed in Section IV.D, <i>Geology & Soils</i> . Responses to this letter regarding neighbor suggestions for a swap property are addressed in Section VI, <i>Alternatives</i> .
Neighbor (Dillard)	Comments that were provided in relation to the LA MS4 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Permit and the Enhanced Watershed Management Plans ^{2,3} are addressed into Section III, <i>Project Description</i> .

This Draft EIR will be circulated for a 45-day review and comment period by the public and other interested parties, agencies, and organizations. This Draft EIR will be provided to the State Clearinghouse for distribution to responsible and trustee agencies. In addition, a public Notice of Availability (NOA) of the EIR will appear in the *Los Angeles Times*, and will be mailed directly to interested parties requesting the document (in either electronic or hard copy format). The dates of the public review period are Thursday, July 14, to Monday, August 29, a period of 45 days. The Draft EIR is available for public review on the Department of City Planning’s website (<http://planning.lacity.org/> [click on “Environmental” and then “Environmental Impact Report”]). In addition, copies of this Draft EIR are available during the public review period at three local libraries:

Los Angeles Central Library
630 W. 5th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 228-7000

Mon: 10-8, Tue: 10-8, Wed: 10-8, Thu: 10-8, Fri: 9:30-5:30, Sat: 9:30-5:30, Sun: 1-5

Studio City Branch Library
12511 Moorpark Street
Studio City, CA 91604
(818) 755-7878

Mon: 10-8, Tue: 12-8, Wed: 10-8, Thu: 12-8, Fri: 9:30-5:30, Sat: 9:30-5:30, Sun: Closed

Sherman Oaks Martin Pollard Branch Library
14245 Moorpark Street
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423
(818) 205-9716

Mon: 10-8, Tue: 12-8, Wed: 10-8, Thu: 12-8, Fri: 9:30-5:30, Sat: 9:30-5:30, Sun: Closed

² California Environmental Protection Agency, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. Accessed 29 March 2016. Storm Water – Municipal Permits. Available at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/water_issues/programs/stormwater/municipal/index.shtml#los_angeles

³ California Environmental Protection Agency, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. Accessed 29 March 2016. Watershed Management Programs. Available at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/water_issues/programs/stormwater/municipal/watershed_management/index.shtml

All comments or questions on the Draft EIR should be directed to the Department of City Planning:

Milena Zasadzien, City Planner
Los Angeles Department of City Planning
6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Room 351
Van Nuys, California 91401
milena.zasadzien@lacity.org

Following the public review of the Draft EIR, a Final EIR will be prepared in response to comments received during the public review period. The Final EIR will be available for public review prior to its consideration for certification by the City.

Organization of the Draft EIR

This Draft EIR is organized into nine sections and seven appendices:

- **Section I, Introduction/Summary:** An introduction to the environmental review process and a summary of the project description, alternatives, environmental impacts, and mitigation measures.
- **Section II, Environmental Setting:** An overview of the environmental setting of the proposed project, including existing and surrounding land uses and a list of related projects.
- **Section III, Project Description:** A description of the proposed project including location, site characteristics, project objectives, and required discretionary actions.
- **Section IV, Environmental Impact Analysis:** Each environmental issue contains a discussion of existing conditions, an assessment and discussion of the significance of impacts associated with the proposed project, mitigation measures, cumulative impacts, and level of impact after mitigation.
- **Section V, General Impact Categories:** A summary of significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project, a discussion of potential growth inducing effects, and an explanation of the significant irreversible environmental changes.
- **Section VI, Alternatives to the Proposed Project:** An analysis of a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project. The range of alternatives selected is based on their ability to both feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project and avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects.
- **Section VII, Preparers of the EIR:** Agency and consultant team members who contributed to the preparation of the Draft EIR.
- **Section VIII, Acronyms and Abbreviations:** A list of acronyms and abbreviations used throughout the EIR.
- **Section IX, References:** A list of references cited in the Draft EIR.

- **Appendices**
 - **Appendix A** **Notice of Preparation**
 - **Appendix B** **Initial Study**
 - **Appendix C** **Notice of Preparation Comment Letters**
 - **Appendix D** **Visibility Technical Report**
 - **Appendix E** **Biological Resources Technical Report**
 - **Appendix F** **Cultural Resources Technical Report**
 - **Appendix G** **Distribution List**

B. SUMMARY

The purpose of the Summary is to provide the reader with a clear and simple description of the proposed project and its potential environmental impacts. Section 15123 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that the summary identify each significant impact, its proposed mitigation measures, and the alternatives that would minimize or avoid that impact. The summary is also required to identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public, as well as the issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant effects. This section focuses on the major areas of the proposed project that are important to decision-makers and uses non-technical information to promote understanding.

Summary of the Project

The proposed project includes the construction of a new two-story single-family residence with basement (approximately 3,826 square feet of area) including a stacked stall four-car garage on a 22,282-square-foot undeveloped lot. The project would be designed in a modern style with natural exterior finish materials. The layout of the house would follow the natural grade by creating different levels and outdoor spaces in order to follow the natural topography. The maximum plumb line (vertical) height of the residence envelope would not exceed a maximum height of 30 feet from grade, and the proposed project would meet all setback, residential floor area, and grading requirements pursuant to the Baseline Hillside Ordinance. The project would include a swimming pool, outdoor living areas (barbeque area and patio), a landscaped area, open space, a fence surrounding the property, and an entrance gate. A backyard retention wall (maximum height of 10 to 12 feet) would be designed to protect the building from mudslide and debris, and to divert rainwater. The project would be constructed in accordance with applicable municipal and building codes.

The proposed project would require the removal of three coast live oak trees (*Quercus agrifolia*) and one scrub oak tree (*Quercus berberidifolia*). As a result of the removal of these four native oak trees, nine coast live oak trees would be planted on-site as part of the project's landscaping. The remaining oak trees surrounding the project footprint would be preserved in place using best management practices during construction, such as fencing off the areas under the tree drip line as much as possible to avoid causing compaction from construction.

C. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES TO BE ANALYZED

Based on public and agency comments in response to the NOP and a review of environmental issues by the Department of City Planning, the appropriate scope of the Draft EIR was determined to include five environmental issues:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Noise

D. ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Issues to be resolved include whether or how to mitigate potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed project, and whether one of the alternatives should be approved rather than the proposed project.

E. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The Draft EIR considers a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project to provide informed decisions-making in accordance with Section 15126(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines. As a result of the project formulation process, the City explored alternatives to the proposed project to assess their ability to meet most of the objectives of the proposed project and reduce significant effects of the proposed project. Alternative projects recommended by the scoping process were evaluated as related to the proposed project objectives and their ability to reduce significant impacts as described in Section VI of this Draft EIR. The No Project Alternative that is required under CEQA, as well as three other alternatives, have been carried forward for detailed analysis in this Draft EIR:

- Alternative A: Reduced Project
- Alternative B: Reduced Project with Conservation Easements
- Alternative C: Alternative Location
- Alternative D: No Project Alternative

Alternative B, Reduced Project with Conservation Easements, was determined to be the environmentally superior alternative. These alternatives are described and analyzed in Section VI.

F. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table I.F-1, *Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts*, provides mitigation measures and the level of significance after mitigation for each CEQA issue area determined to have the potential for significant impacts as a result of the proposed project. Table I.F-1 also provides two regulatory compliance measures that would further reduce potential impacts from the proposed project. Impact categories that were found to have no impact, less than significant impacts, or less than significant impacts after mitigation in Table I.F-1 are explained in the Initial Study Checklist (see Appendix B, *Initial Study*). Potentially significant environmental impacts summarized in Table I.F-1 are analyzed in detail throughout Section IV, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, of this EIR.

**TABLE I.F-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

Impact	Mitigation Measures and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Aesthetics		
<i>(a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</i>	Less than significant impact – no mitigation required.	Less than significant
<i>(b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</i>	No impact – no mitigation required.	No impact
<i>(c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</i>	Less than significant impact – no mitigation required.	Less than significant
<i>(d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</i>	Less than significant impact – no mitigation required.	Less than significant
Biological Resources		
<i>(a) Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Species Identified in Local or Regional Plans, Policies, or Regulations, or by the CDFW/USFWS</i>	<p>MM-BIO-1: Impacts to occupied habitat for species afforded protection pursuant to the Fur Bearing Mammals Act will be avoided by ensuring that occupied breeding areas for such species are adequately protected from construction activities during the breeding season. Prior to initial ground-disturbance and vegetation removal activities for all proposed project-related construction activities, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction sweep of the project site for special-status plants and wildlife.</p> <p>In the unanticipated event that special status plants are discovered within the grading footprint, plants will be salvaged or seed collected by a qualified botanist and relocated to suitable habitat within the conserved open space within the property.</p> <p>Pre-construction sweep surveys shall include one diurnal survey for reptiles, birds, and mammals, and one nocturnal survey for roosting bats. Surveys for bats shall be conducted by a qualified bat biologist. Wherever feasible, suitable habitat shall be removed outside the breeding season. Surveys are to be conducted within the maternity season (March 1 to July 31). Alternatively, clearing may occur in the non-maternity season (August 1 to February 28) without bat-specific surveys, provided that no sign of bats are observed around the oaks during pre-construction sweeps. If evidence of bats is present, then the project proponent shall create a non-disturbance buffer of 200 feet around each occupied oak tree. No work shall be allowed within the buffer until a bat biologist has determined that bats have not been observed leaving or entering the oak tree.</p> <p>MM-BIO-2: Impacts to nesting birds afforded protection pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act shall be accomplished by removing vegetation and potentially suitable nesting structures in the non-breeding season (September 1 to December 31), wherever feasible. A qualified biologist shall conduct a breeding bird nest survey for raptors and owls (January 1 to August 31) and small birds (February 1 to August 31) no more than two weeks prior to initial ground-disturbance and vegetation removal activities for all proposed project-related construction activities. Where construction continues into the breeding season, a nesting bird survey shall be conducted for all areas within 300 feet of project construction activities. If active nests are found during preconstruction surveys, the project proponent shall create a non-disturbance buffer of 300 feet around each active nest (500 feet for raptors). On-site monitoring by a qualified biologist shall be required to ensure that construction activities do not result in “take” or “harassment” of breeding birds afforded protection pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.</p>	Less than significant
<i>(b) Riparian Habitat or Other Sensitive Natural Community Identified in Local or Regional Plans, Policies, or Regulations, or by the CDFW/USFWS</i>	<p>MM-BIO-3: Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the project applicant shall demonstrate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That an updated Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA) has been obtained from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). All required avoidance and minimization measures, as finalized through consultations with CDFW, shall be implemented during construction. The final SAA shall specify any and all mitigation requirements, including performance standards, such as: 1) the provision of restoration of the riparian area, 2) a conservation easement through a portion of the proposed project site, 3) the placement of a wildlife guzzler, or 4) the purchase of mitigation bank property. Construction shall avoid the existing riparian vegetation except for the maximum of 0.01 acre needed to place the driveway. Construction crews shall avoid entering the riparian area outside of the project impact area unless a qualified biologist is present. Riparian areas within the buffer shall be avoided, but any temporary impacts shall be restored post-construction with native riparian shrubs. The driveway design shall be engineered to divert run-off away from the riparian area to avoid erosion. Construction crew shall be required to construct temporary erosion controls so that soil is not added to the existing drainage. Landscaping post-construction shall be used to prevent further erosion into the existing riparian area. Potential soil erosion can also be controlled with appropriate structures, such as retaining walls. In the event that construction activities take place during the rainy season, silt fence shall be put in place, near drainages, to minimize erosion. 	Less than significant

**TABLE I.F-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

Impact	Mitigation Measures and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	g. Pollution resulting from servicing and refueling of equipment shall be prevented to the maximum extent feasible by disposing of waste properly and selecting service and refueling areas away from wet areas and surface water. All residues, waste oil, and other materials shall be removed from the proposed project property and disposed of properly.	
<i>(c) Federally Protected Wetlands as Defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act</i>	No impact – no mitigation required.	No impact
<i>(d) Movement of Native Resident or Migratory Fish, Wildlife Species or Corridors, and Native Wildlife Nursery Sites</i>	MM-BIO-1 MM-BIO-2	Less than significant
<i>(e) Local Plans or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources</i>	RCM-BIO-1: Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the project applicant shall apply for and obtain a Tree Removal Permit from the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works. The project applicant shall consult with the Board of Public Works and the Bureau of Street Services to determine the value of the trees and determine the required mitigation and appropriate replacement tree ratios. MM-BIO-4: Prior to construction, a certified arborist shall place “No Work” buffers around coast live oak trees that are not required to be removed in order to implement the proposed project. The minimum buffer size shall be no smaller than the extent of the individual trees dripline. Only foot traffic is allowed within the “No Work” buffer. Activities prohibited within the “No Work” buffer include equipment storage, grading, vegetation removal, equipment movement, trimming, or the placement of fill. Equipment refueling shall not occur adjacent to the buffer.	Less than significant
<i>(f) Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Community Conservation Plans</i>	No impact – no mitigation required.	No impact
Cultural Resources		
<i>(a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?</i>	No impact – no mitigation required.	No impact
<i>(b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?</i>	No impact – no mitigation required.	No impact
<i>(c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature</i>	MM-CUL-1: Construction monitoring by a qualified paleontological monitor shall be implemented during all ground-disturbing activities within the Upper Topanga Formation (site bedrock). Should a potentially unique paleontological resource be encountered, a qualified paleontologist, as defined by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology’s Impact Mitigation Guidelines, shall be contacted to assess the find. ⁴ Ground-disturbing activities include, but are not limited to, drilling, excavation, and trenching within Upper Topanga Formation bedrock. Paleontological Resources Sensitivity Training is required for all project personnel prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities. This brief (approximately 15 minute) field training reviews what fossils are, what fossils might potentially be found, and the appropriate procedures to follow if fossils are found. If fossil localities are discovered, the paleontologist shall assess the find and proceed accordingly. This includes the controlled collection of fossil and geologic samples for processing. Daily logs shall be kept by the qualified paleontological monitor during all monitoring activities. The daily monitoring log shall be keyed to a location map to indicate the area monitored, the date, and assigned personnel. In addition, this log shall include information of the type of rock encountered, fossil specimens recovered, and associated specimen data. All significant specimens collected shall be appropriately prepared, identified, and catalogued prior to their placement in a permanent accredited repository. The qualified paleontologist shall be required to secure a written agreement with a recognized repository, regarding the final disposition, permanent storage, and maintenance of any significant fossil remains and associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data that might be recovered as a result of the specified monitoring program. The written agreement shall specify the level of treatment (i.e., preparation, identification, curation, cataloguing, etc.) required before the fossil collection would be accepted for storage. In addition, a technical report shall be completed. Within 90 days of the completion of any salvage operation or monitoring activities, a mitigation report shall be submitted to the City with an appended, itemized inventory of the specimens. The report and inventory, when submitted to the City, signify the completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources.	Less than significant

⁴ Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. n.d. Conformable Impact Mitigation Guidelines. Available at: <http://vertpaleo.org/The-Society/Governance-Documents/Conformable-Impact-Mitigation-Guidelines-Committee.aspx>

**TABLE I.F-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

Impact	Mitigation Measures and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<i>(d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</i>	No impact – no mitigation required.	No impact
<i>(e) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal cultural resource, pursuant to Assembly Bill 52?</i>	<p>MM-CUL-2: The project applicant shall retain a representative of the Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians to observe and monitor all earth-moving, grading, and sub-surface activities. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, evidence shall be provided for placement in the Project file that a Native American monitor has been retained. In the event that subsurface archaeological resources/human remains are encountered during the course of grading and/or excavation, all development shall temporarily cease in these areas until the archaeological resources are properly assessed and subsequent recommendations are determined by a qualified archaeologist. In the event that human remains are discovered, there shall be no disposition of such human remains, other than in accordance with the procedures and requirements set forth in California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. These code provisions require notification of the County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission, who in turn must notify those persons believed to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American for appropriate disposition of the remains. Excavation or disturbance may continue in other areas of the Project Site that are not reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains or archaeological resources. Copies of a subsequent archaeological study or report, detailing the nature of any archaeological discovery, remedial actions taken, and disposition of any accessioned remains shall be submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton.</p> <p>RCM-CUL-1: If human remains are encountered unexpectedly during construction demolition and/or grading activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98. In the event that human remains are discovered during excavation activities, the following procedure shall be observed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stop immediately and contact the County Coroner: 1104 N. Mission Road Los Angeles, CA 90033 323-343-0512 (8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday) or 323-343-0714 (After Hours, Saturday, Sunday, and Holidays) ○ If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the Coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). ○ The NAHC will immediately notify the person it believes to be the most likely descendent of the deceased Native American. ○ The most likely descendent has 48 hours to make recommendations to the owner, or representative, for the treatment or disposition, with proper dignity, of the human remains and grave goods. ○ If the owner does not accept the descendant’s recommendations, the owner or the descendent may request mediation by the NAHC. 	Less than significant
Geology & Soils		
<i>(a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</i> <i>(i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</i> <i>(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</i> <i>(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</i> <i>(iv) Landslides?</i>	No impact – no mitigation required.	No impact
<i>(b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</i>	No impact – no mitigation required.	No impact
<i>(a) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and</i>	No impact – no mitigation required.	No impact

**TABLE I.F-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

Impact	Mitigation Measures and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<i>potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</i>		
<i>(b) 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?</i>	Less than significant impact – no mitigation required.	Less than significant
<i>(c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</i>	Less than significant impact – no mitigation required.	Less than significant
Noise		
<i>(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?</i>	MM-NOI-1: Noise-attenuating barriers, baffles, or blankets shall be installed to reduce noise levels to a maximum of 75 dBA for potential sensitive receptors within 178 feet.	Less than significant
<i>(b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels</i>	No impact – no mitigation required.	No impact
<i>(c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</i>	No impact – no mitigation required.	No impact
<i>(d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project</i>	MM-NOI-1	Less than significant
<i>(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?</i>	No impact – no mitigation required.	No impact
<i>(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?</i>	No impact – no mitigation required.	No impact