

ENVIRONMENTAL (INITIAL STUDY) CHECKLIST

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

PROJECT TITLE: Topanga State Park General Plan

PROJECT ID#

PCA#

Contact Person: Christine Beck, Environmental Coordinator

Location: Topanga State Park, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Checklist Date: March 2010

Project Description:

To meet requirements set forth in Section 5002.2 of the Public Resources Code and Section 4332, Title 14 of the California Administration Code, California Department of Parks and Recreation is preparing a General Plan for the Park. The Plan will delineate a number of management zones and corridors, and develop goals and guidelines for specific areas of the Park. The document will guide the Park's development as well as address recreational, operational, interpretive, and resource management opportunities and constraints consistent with the classification of *State Park* as set forth in section 5019.53 of the Public Resources Code and with Department Resource Management Directives. The Plan will also provide goals and guidelines for the appropriate types, locations, and designs of facilities that may be proposed in the future, which may include new parking areas, campgrounds, visitor centers, interpretive kiosks, restrooms, and other visitor amenities.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT <u>IMPACT</u>	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH <u>MITIGATION</u>	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT <u>IMPACT</u>	NO <u>IMPACT</u>
1. AESTHETICS				
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS

a and c) Due to the severe topography at several locations, the scenic vistas, and the rock outcroppings present in the Park, aesthetic effects are likely, even with minor trail or facility improvements.

b) Currently there are no designated state scenic highways within the Park; however, Topanga Canyon Boulevard (State Route 27) is considered "eligible" for listing by CALTRANS. Also Mulholland Drive is designated as a scenic corridor in the Santa Monica Mountains General Management Plan. The City of Los Angeles adopted the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan in order to preserve and enhance the "parkway's outstanding and unique scenic features". No impacts to either of these roadways are expected.

MITIGATION

It is anticipated that design measures will incorporate sensitive placement, aesthetic treatments and revegetation, which minimize visual effects. Specific mitigation measures will be identified in the EIR.

2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT <u>IMPACT</u>	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH <u>MITIGATION</u>	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT <u>IMPACT</u>	NO <u>IMPACT</u>
--	---	---	---	---------------------

Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS

No agricultural or forest land present.

MITIGATION

No mitigation is proposed.

3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied on to make the following determinations.

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan or regulation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

d) At all project sites, dust may be raised during construction and some operational activities. Also, Park visitors may be exposed to excessive levels of air pollution due to the location of the Park in a non-attainment air basin.

MITIGATION

Standard project requirements will be utilized to minimize potential air quality impacts due to dust during construction.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a sensitive, candidate, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by §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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS

The Park is located within the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area and is considered a regional bio-corridor. Sensitive habitats and species are present in the Park. Both direct and indirect impacts to sensitive species and habitats, including wetlands will be detailed in the EIR and will likely be less than significant with mitigation.

a) There are two fish species that are federally listed as endangered occurring within the Park: tidewater goby (*Eucyclogobius newberryi*) and southern steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus*). The goby is currently found at the mouth of Topanga Creek and the steelhead is found within Topanga Creek. Future efforts to restore the lagoon at the mouth of Topanga Creek are expected to benefit both of these species.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

MITIGATION

a) Sensitive species will be avoided during the design, construction, and operational phases of the proposed project. Facility design and proposed mitigation measures will be discussed in general terms in the Preliminary General Plan/EIR. Presence/absence surveys for all potentially occurring sensitive/listed species will be conducted in areas identified for new visitor facilities. If sensitive species are present, minimization measures will be implemented such as avoidance of the fish spawning season and/or bird nesting season.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in §15064.5? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to §15064.5? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS:

a-c) The Park is rich in archaeological and historic resources in areas of existing recreational use including Trippet Ranch, the mouth of Topanga Canyon and various trails. With the implementation of grading for facilities, there is a slight chance of disturbing unknown buried resources.

MITIGATION

a) All proposed projects will be reviewed for potential effects to significant historical resources. All significant historical resources will be mapped, recorded, and evaluated to determine their eligibility for placement on the National Register of Historic Places. Projects will be designed and implemented to avoid significant impacts to potentially eligible historic resources in compliance with the *Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. If significant impacts are unavoidable, mitigation measures will be implemented.

b-c) Prior to any actions that have the potential to disturb an area containing a possible archeological site, additional research and testing will be carried out to determine if buried cultural remains exist. Any new facilities will be designed and constructed to avoid archaeological resources to the extent possible. If impacts to archaeological remains are unavoidable, then a recovery plan will be developed and implemented. During construction, if an underground resource is discovered then work will be redirected until a State Archaeologist can determine appropriate significance and mitigation for the site.

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: | | | | |
| 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.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems, where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS

a) The project is located in southern California, an area known for seismic activity. It is not anticipated that construction of the facilities described in the General Plan would expose people or property to a high risk of danger due to seismic activity; although the risk of a landslide in the event of a catastrophic seismic event cannot be completely eliminated.

b-c) During construction and until revegetated slopes mature, the project will have a greater risk of soil erosion and landslides.

f) Paleontological resources are known to exist within the Park and will be recorded and/or preserved when located.

MITIGATION

b-c) Appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented to reduce the loss of topsoil. These BMPs will be further identified / discussed in the EIR.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS

The Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) required the California Air Resources Board to prepare a Scoping Plan to achieve reductions in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in California. California’s Scoping Plan was approved in December 2008 and includes measures such as expanding and strengthening existing energy efficiency programs as well as building and appliance standards and adopting and implementing measures pursuant to existing State laws and policies, including California’s clean car standards, goods movement measures, and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard. Vehicles used in the construction and operation of the proposed project will release GHGs, however given the population density of the South Coast Air Basin, emissions associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

MITIGATION

No mitigation is proposed, however newly constructed or renovated buildings would likely incorporate “green” technologies to the greatest extent practicable. These might include solar panels, native plant landscaping, rain water collection systems and/or installing dual pane windows.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials, substances, or waste into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites, compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5, and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Be 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? If so, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from wildland fires, including areas where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS

a) Project alternatives may include demolition, rehabilitation and/or reconstruction of buildings in lower Topanga. These buildings may contain hazardous materials such as asbestos.

g) Trippet Ranch is an emergency evacuation center for the community of Topanga.

h) Fire is a natural process in southern California Mediterranean ecosystems. Wildfires in the Santa Monica Mountains can be fanned by Santa Anas, hot, dry winds that move through the region every fall and winter. Due to local topography in the Santa Monica Mountains, fires can spread rapidly and extensively during Santa Anas.

MITIGATION

a) All removal and transport of hazardous materials would comply with State hazardous waste laws and procedures.

g) California Department of Parks would cooperate with local emergency response agencies to ensure that the proposed project would not hinder emergency evacuation procedures that involve the use of Trippet Ranch.

h) All fire management policies for the Park will use an ecosystem sustainability approach in recognizing the role of fire in sustaining healthy ecosystems and maintaining biodiversity. Parks will use vegetation maps, fire history maps, topographical maps, street maps, aerial photography, Geographical Information Systems, and other tools to develop risk assessments, which will identify and prioritize appropriate treatments. Parks will also work with other appropriate government agencies to implement wildfire management in the Park. Parks will discuss educational and preventative measures with the public to

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT NO IMPACT

minimize the risk of wildfires originating within and adjacent to the Park. These will include interpretive school programs, internet sites, fuel reduction around structures, and other actions. Lastly, the Parks emergency response plan would be updated to include any new facilities constructed under the proposed plan.

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial on- or off-site erosion or siltation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in on- or off-site flooding? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from flooding, including flooding resulting from the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS

a, c, d-f) Although new visitor facilities are proposed, the project would also include the removal of impervious surfaces such as asphalt and a wetland restoration component at lower Topanga. Topanga Canyon Creek is currently on the 303(d) list of impaired water bodies for lead. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated the following beneficial uses for the creek: Warm and Cold Freshwater Habitats, and Wildlife Habitat.

MITIGATION

a) Any projects constructed under the General Plan would require conformance with accepted BMPs for water quality and stormwater runoff and meet all applicable State Water Quality standards. As stated above, this project may increase water

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT NO IMPACT

quality in Topanga Creek through riparian and lagoon restoration efforts and the removal of developed areas within lower Topanga Canyon.

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with the applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS

All projects proposed within the Coastal Zone will comply with the local coastal program. No habitat conservation plan has been approved for the City or County of Los Angeles.

MITIGATION

No mitigation is proposed.

11. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that is or would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS

The site does not contain any known valuable mineral resources.

MITIGATION

No mitigation is proposed.

12. NOISE

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generate or expose people to noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Generate or expose people to excessive ground-borne vibrations or ground-borne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project (above levels without the project)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
d) Create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project, in excess of noise levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Be 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? If so, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS

a-b) Primarily during construction, use of heavy equipment and tools would increase noise levels above the current baseline in all project areas. Additionally, if large trucks are required to bring equipment to the site, there would be an increase in noise along the access roads. There are sensitive noise receptors located adjacent to and within the Park including residential neighborhoods and Park visitors.

c-d) The proposed project will create both permanent and temporary increases in the ambient noise levels. These noises include the ingress and egress of vehicles to the facilities and general noises people make when recreating at campgrounds, day-use areas and along trails.

MITIGATION

Parks will endeavor to minimize the adverse effects of construction noise and vibration to all sensitive receptors. This will include voluntary compliance with local standards for construction noise near existing residential areas and may include monitoring and/or avoidance of excessive noise in close proximity to sensitive habitats. The details of the proposed mitigation will be developed in the EIR.

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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

The proposed project will not directly affect the construction or displacement of population or housing.

MITIGATION

No mitigation is proposed.

14. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
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 following public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS

This is a government (State Park) project and would require a long-term financial commitment for maintenance and operation and possibly require additional staff support. The cost would be partially offset by user fees. Park rangers provide law enforcement protection and the California Department of Forestry provides fire protection to the Park and its users. Additional assistance may be required from this agency to protect the new use areas in the event of a wildland fire.

MITIGATION

Mitigation will be further defined in the EIR but is likely to include coordination with the City and County of Los Angeles. The Park's emergency response plan would be updated to include new use areas.

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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical affect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS

Facility improvements proposed under the General Plan will improve the Park visitor's recreational experience. Approval of the General Plan; however may require changes in trail use designations, which would limit the level of visitor use for that particular trail (e.g., multi-use trail changed to hiking only trail or vice versa). This might cause an increase or decrease of particular users on trails outside the Park. Construction of a campground or visitor center would require subsequent CEQA review.

MITIGATION

Additional information, design measures, and mitigation will be further identified in the EIR.

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Cause a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Contain a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or a dangerous intersection) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) that would substantially increase hazards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENT

Although it is not anticipated that the project would cause a substantial increase in traffic in relation to existing traffic, a traffic study has not yet been completed. The significance of this issue will be resolved in the EIR.

MITIGATION

Mitigation measures will be proposed, if necessary, in the EIR.

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment restrictions or standards of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Would the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Would the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination, by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project, that it has adequate capacity to service the project's anticipated demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT <u>IMPACT</u>	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH <u>MITIGATION</u>	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT <u>IMPACT</u>	NO <u>IMPACT</u>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations as they relate to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

Limited stormwater or drainage facilities may also be constructed as part of the project. For any new facilities in Lower Topanga a "dry" sewage system would have to be installed (e.g. composting toilets).

MITIGATION

No mitigation is proposed.

III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

Would the project:

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (<i>Cumulatively considerable</i> means the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probably future projects?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on humans, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS

The project site supports several sensitive plant communities and animal species as well as sensitive cultural resources. It is anticipated that potential impacts to sensitive species that utilize the wetland and riparian areas, will be fully mitigated, if affected. Additionally, sensitive cultural resources will be avoided, protected, and interpreted. The full extent and significance of impacts to cultural resources, sensitive species, and habitats including wetlands will be detailed in the EIR and may drop to less than significant with mitigation. However, a worst case scenario may show the impacts as significant, even with mitigation. It is the intention of California State Parks to mitigate the adverse effects to these resources to the fullest extent feasible.

IV. PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION

On the basis of the Initial Study,

- I find that the proposed project could not have an adverse effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect because the mitigation measures described in the attached Mitigation appendix will be required. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

PREPARER: Christine Beck

TITLE: Associate Park and Recreation Specialist DATE: 3-24-2010