

## 5.1 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

### 5.1.1 Existing Conditions/Environmental Setting

#### 5.1.1.1 *Vegetation Communities*

The initial vegetation mapping and gnatcatcher and cactus wren distribution data of the Peninsula were prepared by Atwood et al. (1994) and updated and verified during the first phase of the NCCP program (Ogden, 1999). The vegetation map was compiled from 1 inch = 1,200 feet color aerial photographs and from field mapping efforts that used U.S. Geological Survey topographic maps enlarged to a scale of 1 inch = 1,000 feet. The vegetation mapping was ground-verified, and vegetation polygons were assessed for plant cover. A vegetation category was assigned to each polygon according to plant species cover based on Holland (1986). These vegetation data were digitized into the geographic information system (GIS) database. Additional source data were also obtained from representatives of the local chapters of the CNPS, Audubon Society, and Endangered Habitats League, as well as digital information from the major landowners and Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). These data sources were collated and reviewed for spatially relevant information for inclusion in the GIS database. Ogden updated this base vegetation map using project-specific vegetation data from existing environmental reports. Minor updates to the vegetation map were made during formation of the public review draft of the Subarea Plan document to account for changes in vegetation cover associated with recently completed development projects (URS Corporation, 2003). Approximately 8,558.7 acres of land occur in Rancho Palos Verdes, including native habitats, non-native habitats, agricultural lands, disturbed areas, and developed lands. These communities are listed in Table 5.1-1 and described below (see Figure 5.1-1).

Sensitive habitats within the Rancho Palos Verdes NCCP planning area are those that are considered rare in the region, support sensitive species of plants and animals, and/or are subject to regulatory protection through various federal, state, or local policies or regulations. In the case of habitats in Rancho Palos Verdes, these include all wetland habitat types (riparian scrub), as well as all upland scrub habitats. No native grasslands have been delineated in Rancho Palos Verdes, but if patches of native grasslands occur, this habitat would also be considered sensitive if the patch exceeded 0.3 acres and supported at least 10 percent cover of native grassland plant species. Habitats dominated by non-native plant species (non-native grassland, exotic woodland, and disturbed vegetation) are generally not considered sensitive. Non-native grassland, however is considered sensitive where it occurs in large, contiguous areas because it may provide vital foraging habitat for raptors and support other sensitive plant and wildlife species. Because most grassland in southern California are now dominated by non-native annual grasses, conservation of some non-native grassland is necessary to achieving NCCP planning goals for multiple habitat preserve design. Patches of non-native grassland that exceed 5 acres are considered to have some conservation value. Smaller patches of non-native grassland that are contiguous with larger areas of biological open space are also important because they contribute to a habitat mosaic that can be used by sensitive species.

#### 5.1.1.1.1 Coastal Sage Scrub

Coastal sage scrub is composed of low, soft-woody subshrubs approximately 1 meter (3 feet) high, many of which are facultatively drought-deciduous (Holland, 1986). This association is typically found on dry

sites, such as steep, south-facing slopes or clay-rich soils slow to release stored water. Dominant shrub species in this vegetation type may vary depending on local site factors and levels of disturbance.

**Table 5.1-1  
Vegetation Communities in  
Rancho Palos Verdes <sup>1</sup>**

Vegetation Community	Acres
Coastal Sage Scrub Sub-associations	
CSS – Artemisia Dominated	93.0
CSS – Baccharis Dominated	7.2
CSS – Encelia Dominated	7.9
CSS – Eriogonum Dominated	13.9
CSS – Rhus Dominated	225.0
CSS – Salvia Dominated	21.0
CSS – Undifferentiated	635.5
Saltbush Scrub	7.3
Southern Cactus Scrub	96.9
Southern Coastal Bluff Scrub	137.0
Grassland	955.3
Riparian Scrub	2.5
Exotic Woodland	75.4
Disturbed Vegetation	88.3
<b>Subtotal Vegetation</b>	<b>2366.2</b>
Other	
Cliff Face	8.8
Disturbed	162.4
Agriculture	17.6
Developed	6,003.7
<b>Subtotal Other</b>	<b>6192.5</b>
<b>Total Acreage</b>	<b>8,558.7</b>

1. Vegetation inventory from Ogden (1999) with minor updates in 2003 associated with Ocean Trails and Ocean Front Estates projects.

Insert Figure 5.1-1

Natural Vegetation of Rancho Palos Verdes

## **SECTION FIVE**

---

Dominants within the study area include California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), ashy-leaf buckwheat (*Eriogonum cinereum*), California sunflower (*Encelia californica*), coyote bush (*Baccharis pilularis*), lemonadeberry (*Rhus integrifolia*), purple sage (*Salvia leucophylla*), and black sage (*Salvia mellifera*). Other less-frequent constituents of this community include California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum* ssp. *fasciculatum*), goldenbush (*Isocoma menziesii*), toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*), laurel sumac (*Malosma laurina*), coyote bush (*Baccharis pilularis*), and bladderpod (*Isomeris arborea*).

Numerous CSS sub-associations have been identified in Rancho Palos Verdes and classified according to the dominant species. Such sub-associations include *Artemisia*-dominated scrub, *Eriogonum*-dominated scrub, *Salvia*-dominated scrub, *Encelia*-dominated scrub, *Baccharis*-dominated scrub, and *Rhus*-dominated scrub. These sub-associations correspond to the California sagebrush series, California buckwheat series, black sage series, purple sage series, and California *encelia* series, and/or coyote bush series, as described in Sawyer and Keeler-Wolf (1995). These sub-associations have been delineated and digitized into a GIS database. Where the CSS cannot be clearly differentiated by a single dominant species, it was classified as “undifferentiated” CSS. There are approximately 1,003 acres of CSS in the city, of which 93 acres are *Artemisia*-dominated scrub, 14 acres are *Eriogonum*-dominated scrub, 21 acres are *Salvia*-dominated scrub, 8 acres are *Encelia*-dominated scrub, 7 acres are *Baccharis*-dominated scrub, 225 acres are *Rhus*-dominated scrub, and 635 acres are undifferentiated.

The shrub layer in this community ranges from a continuous canopy with little understory cover to a more open canopy with widely spaced shrubs and a well-developed understory. Native understory species present in this association include foothill needlegrass (*Nassella lepida*), purple needlegrass (*Nassella pulchra*), golden yarrow (*Eriophyllum confertiflorum*), wishbone bush (*Mirabilis californica* var. *californica*), and common goldenstar (*Bloomeria crocea*). Common non-native species in open or disturbed sage scrub include wild oat (*Avena* spp.), tocalote (*Centaurea melitensis*), foxtail chess (*Bromus madritensis* ssp. *rubens*), and Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*), among others. Disturbed CSS is also present in Rancho Palos Verdes. A disturbed qualifier is placed on CSS (or any other native habitat) based on mechanical disturbance (e.g., vegetation clearing and off-road vehicle activity). Disturbed CSS typically has a high percentage of non-native species and is fragmented to some degree.

### **5.1.1.1.2 Southern Cactus Scrub**

Southern cactus scrub is a low, dense scrub (less than 2 meters [6.6 feet]) with succulent shrubs consisting primarily of prickly pear species (*Opuntia littoralis*, *O. oricola*) and coast cholla (*Cylindropuntia prolifera*) as dominant constituents (Magney, 1992; Sawyer and Keeler-Wolf, 1995). Although the dominant species are succulent, woody species can also be present as co-dominants with the succulents. Typical woody species in this association include California sagebrush, California buckwheat, California sunflower, bladderpod, and wishbone bush. Southern cactus scrub ranges from coastal southern Santa Barbara County southward to northern San Diego County and inland to the cismontane valley areas of San Bernardino and Riverside Counties (Magney, 1992). Southern cactus scrub occurs mostly on steep, south-facing slopes in sandy soils or rocky areas below 1,200 meters (3,937 feet) elevation (Magney, 1992; Sawyer and Keeler-Wolf, 1995). Examples of this community occur on the Rancho Palos Verdes City Hall site and in the Ocean Trails project open space. Approximately 97 acres of southern cactus scrub occur in Rancho Palos Verdes.

## **SECTION FIVE**

---

### **5.1.1.1.3 Saltbush Scrub**

Saltbush scrub is dominated by quailbush (*Atriplex lentiformis*) and the non-native species *Atriplex glauca*. Shrubs are less than 3 meters (10 feet) with closed to open canopies (Sawyer and Keeler-Wolf, 1995). Saltbush scrub corresponds to the mixed saltbush series, as described in Sawyer and Keeler-Wolf (1995). The understory consists of ruderal species, such as black mustard (*Brassica nigra*), wild radish (*Raphanus sativus*), and cliff aster (*Malacothrix saxatile*). Approximately 7 acres of saltbush scrub were mapped in the Portuguese Bend area of Rancho Palos Verdes.

### **5.1.1.1.4 Cliff Faces**

Cliff faces are steep, sometimes vertical slopes with little vegetative cover. Constant erosion from wind and rain prevents vegetation establishment. Typically, there is little soil available for plants to become established. Cliff faces in the city are found along the sea cliffs, in the landslide area, west of Coolheights Drive, and north of Forrestal Road. Cliff faces can also occur as inclusions in coastal bluff scrub habitat. Cliff faces occupy 9 acres of land in Rancho Palos Verdes.

### **5.1.1.1.5 Southern Coastal Bluff Scrub**

Southern coastal bluff scrub is a low, sometimes prostrate scrub that occurs at localized sites along the coast south of Point Conception (Holland, 1986). Plants in this association cling to nearly vertical rock faces just above the surf. The coastal bluff scrub community is widespread along the California coastline as a very narrow band, often not extending more than a few meters inland (Holland and Keil, 1990). Dominant plants are mostly woody and/or succulent species, such as California sagebrush, California buckwheat, ashy-leaf buckwheat, lemonadeberry, coast cholla, and coast prickly pear. Other less-frequent constituents of this community include boxthorn (*Lycium californicum*), bright green dudleya (*Dudleya virens*), aphanisma (*Aphanisma blitoides*), seacliff buckwheat (*Eriogonum parvifolium*), sea blite (*Suaeda taxifolia*), and bladderpod. Development along the southern California coastline has reduced this community throughout its range. Potential inclusions within coastal bluff scrub are CSS and beach habitat. Coastal bluff scrub occupies 137 acres along the steep ocean cliffs of Rancho Palos Verdes.

### **5.1.1.1.6 Grassland**

Non-native annual grasses and other annual species dominate grasslands in the city. Small patches dominated by native perennial bunchgrasses were observed within the annual grassland, as discussed below, but were generally too small in extent to map adequately. Annual or non-native grassland generally occurs on fine-textured loam or clay soils that are moist or even waterlogged during the winter rainy season and very dry during the summer and fall. This association is characterized by a dense to sparse cover of annual grasses, often with native and non-native annual forbs (Holland, 1986). The number of natives versus non-natives is site-specific and varies according to rainfall and other factors (Heady, 1995). Estimates for the proportion of non-native species in this association range from 29 to 80 percent (White, 1967; Bentley and Talbot, 1948; Heady, 1956, 1995; Holland and Keil, 1990). Talbot et al. (1939) report that annuals comprise approximately 94 percent of the herbaceous cover in annual grassland; Ewing and Menke (1983) state that annuals comprise 50 to more than 90 percent of the vegetative cover in annual grassland and that most of the annuals are non-native species. Species

composition varies within annual grassland and is a function of climatic conditions, soils, and allelopathic effects of aboveground plant residue (e.g., mulch) (Evans and Young, 1989; Heady, 1995; Bartolome et al., 1980).

Annual grassland is a disturbance-related community most often found in old fields or openings in native scrub habitats. This association may have replaced native grassland and CSS at many localities throughout the study area. Typical grasses within the study area include wild oat, foxtail chess, ripgut grass (*Bromus diandrus*), barley (*Hordeum murinum ssp. leporinum*), and Bermuda grass (*Cynodon dactylon*). Characteristic forbs include red-stem filaree (*Erodium cicutarium*), mustard (*Brassica* spp.), tarweed (*Centromadia* spp.), tocalote, and cliff aster. Within annual grassland, grasses are less than 1 meter (3 feet) high and form a continuous or open cover. Emergent shrubs and trees may be present as well (Sawyer and Keeler-Wolf, 1995).

Native grasses in the study region are characterized by the perennial, tussock-forming needlegrass species (*Nassella* spp.). Native and introduced annuals occur between the needlegrass, often exceeding the bunchgrasses in cover (Holland, 1986). Native grasses in Rancho Palos Verdes occur in small areas within annual grassland and CSS habitats and have been mapped as such. Grassland communities totaling 955 acres cover large areas in the city.

#### 5.1.1.1.7 Riparian Scrub

Riparian scrub varies from a dense, broad-leaved, winter-deciduous association dominated by several species of willow (*Salix* spp.) to an herbaceous scrub dominated by mule fat (*Baccharis salicifolia*) (Holland, 1986). Typical willow species on site include black willow (*S. gooddingii*) and arroyo willow (*S. lasiolepis*). Understory vegetation in this association is usually composed of non-native, weedy species or is lacking altogether. Riparian scrub may represent a successional stage leading to riparian woodland or forest or may constitute a stable community. Riparian scrub occurs in Agua Amarga Canyon and south of Palos Verdes Drive South on the Ocean Trails project property. This association occupies approximately 2.5 acres of land in Rancho Palos Verdes.

#### 5.1.1.1.8 Disturbed Vegetation

Disturbed vegetation refers to plant associations that occur on highly disturbed sites in urbanized areas (e.g., along roadsides, footpaths, in parking lots, or in previously graded areas) that support weedy broadleaf species. Areas with disturbed vegetation are typically characterized by heavily compacted soils that limit the species that can thrive here (Holland and Keil, 1990). Typical species associated with disturbed vegetation include horseweed (*Conyza canadensis*), sow thistle (*Sonchus oleraceus*), knotweed (*Polygonum* spp.), mallow (*Malva* spp.), Russian thistle, sweet fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*), castor bean (*Ricinus communis*), goosefoot (*Chenopodium* spp.), and tocalote (*Centaurea melitensis*). Other common species that can be found in disturbed areas, as well as other communities, include mustards, star thistle, rye grass (*Lolium* spp.), burclover (*Medicago polymorpha*), wild radish, milk-thistle (*Silybum marianum*), and cocklebur (*Xanthium* spp.), among others. True ruderal species are those found mainly or solely in areas with previous surface disturbance (California Exotic Pest Plant Council, 1999; Beatty and Licari, 1992). Disturbed vegetation occupies 88 acres in Rancho Palos Verdes.

### 5.1.1.1.9 Disturbed Areas

Disturbed areas are lands where the vegetation has been significantly altered by frequent disking or mowing for fire protection and vegetation control and little to no vegetation cover remains. Typical plant species found scattered in disturbed areas include Russian thistle, black mustard, storksbill (*Erodium* spp.), and annual grasses, among others. Disturbed areas primarily consist of maintained firebreaks and occupy 162 acres in the city.

### 5.1.1.1.10 Exotic Woodland

Exotic woodland includes non-native trees and shrubs planted in Rancho Palos Verdes in the past. Some of these introduced species are invasive and have dispersed into the adjacent grassland and native habitats. Exotic species include everblooming acacia (*Acacia longifolia*), Sydney golden wattle (*Acacia cyclops*), Peruvian pepper tree (*Schinus molle*), Brazilian pepper tree (*Schinus terebenthifolia*), black locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia*), myoporum (*Myoporum laetum*), gum tree (*Eucalyptus* spp.), and pines (*Pinus* spp.). Most of the exotic woodlands occur in the Portuguese Bend and Lower Filiorum areas and occupy 75 acres.

### 5.1.1.1.11 Agriculture

Agriculture includes actively cultivated lands and lands that support nursery operations. Only two areas in Rancho Palos Verdes are actively farmed, comprising 18 acres. These two areas are in the western portion of the city near the Rancho Palos Verdes City Hall.

### 5.1.1.1.12 Developed Areas

Developed areas in the city are lands that have been permanently altered by human activities and that support no native vegetation. These areas include roads, buildings, ornamental landscapes, and other areas where the land has been altered to such an extent that natural vegetation cannot become reestablished. Areas graded for development in the late 1990s (i.e., Ocean Trails and Ocean Front Estates) were mapped as they were being developed, but a portion of these areas are in the process of being revegetated with CSS and other native vegetation. Developed areas occupy 6,004 acres in the city.

### 5.1.1.2 Sensitive Species

Sensitive species, through the circumstance of natural distribution or habitat destruction, have declined in population to a level so low that professional biologists are concerned about the longevity or vitality of the species. Sensitive species include species listed by the State or federal Wildlife Agencies under the ESA, by CDFG as an SSC, or on the CNPS' inventory of rare or endangered plants (CNPS, 2001). The distribution of sensitive species is based on cumulative sighting data compiled during the Phase I NCCP program and focused rare plant surveys conducted in spring 1998. Butterfly habitat was also assessed during the Phase I NCCP program. Only recently has El Segundo blue butterfly been documented in Rancho Palos Verdes. All the sensitive species are associated closely with scrub habitats on the Peninsula. Sensitive species in the Subarea Plan area are described below (see Figure 5.1-2).

Insert Figure 5.1-2  
Covered Species Distributions

## SECTION FIVE

### ***Aphanisma blitoides***

#### **Aphanisma**

USFWS: No status

CDFG: No status

CNPS: List 1B, 2-2-2

*Aphanisma* is a small, annual herb that occurs on sandy soils near the coast in coastal bluff scrub and CSS (CNPS, 2001). It occurs at elevations from 3 to 60 meters (10 to 200 feet) and is found from Santa Barbara County to northern Baja California, Mexico, and is on all the Channel Islands except San Miguel (Junak et al., 1995). This fleshy species blooms from April to May. *Aphanisma* is in steep decline on the mainland and on the islands (CNPS, 2001). Mainland populations are declining because of recreational use of beaches and development along the coast (Reiser, 1994). *Aphanisma* was located in Rancho Palos Verdes in the coastal bluff scrub from Portuguese Point along the coast to the Rancho Palos Verdes/San Pedro city limit.

### ***Atriplex pacifica***

#### **South Coast Saltscale**

USFWS: No status

CDFG: No status

CNPS: List 1B, 3-2-2

South coast saltscale occurs in coastal bluff scrub, CSS, and alkali playas (CNPS, 2001). This small, wiry, prostrate, annual herb grows in openings between shrubs in xeric, often mildly disturbed locales. This species occurs from Ventura County to Sonora and Baja California, Mexico, and on San Clemente, Anacapa, Santa Catalina, Santa Cruz, San Nicholas, and Santa Rosa islands (Reiser, 1994). South coast saltscale is severely declining throughout its coastal range on the mainland (Reiser, 1994). In Rancho Palos Verdes, this species has been detected on Portuguese Point and along the coast between Halfway Point and Shoreline Park.

### ***Calandrinia maritima***

#### **Seaside Calandrinia**

USFWS: No status

CDFG: No status

CNPS: List 4, 1-2-1

Seaside calandrinia typically occurs on sandy bluffs near the beach and sandy openings in CSS at elevations below 300 meters (1,000 feet) (Reiser, 1994; Hickman, 1993). It occurs from Santa Barbara County to Baja California, Mexico, and is found on Anacapa, Santa Barbara, San Clemente, Santa Catalina, Santa Cruz, and Santa Rosa Islands (Reiser, 1994; CNPS, 2001). In Rancho Palos Verdes, seaside calandrinia occurs on the coastal bluffs in Abalone Cove and immediately west of Portuguese Bend to the Rancho Palos Verdes/San Pedro city limit.

## SECTION FIVE

### *Calochortus catalinae*

#### **Catalina Mariposa Lily**

USFWS: No status

CDFG: No status

CNPS: List 4, 1-2-3

Catalina mariposa lily is a perennial bulb species that flowers from February to May (CNPS, 2001). It occurs below 700 meters (2,300 feet) in open chaparral, cismontane woodland, valley and foothill grassland, and CSS (Hickman, 1993; Reiser, 1994; CNPS, 2001). Catalina mariposa lily occurs in CSS near the Rancho Palos Verdes City Hall, in the canyon north of Barkentine Road, in the Forrestal area, in the northern part of the Portuguese Bend landslide near the closed portion of the Crenshaw Road extension, at the West Bluff and Upper La Rotonda Preserves in Ocean Trails, and in the Switchbacks enhancement area north of the intersection of Palos Verdes Drives North and East.

### *Calystegia peirsonii*

#### **Peirson's Morning-glory**

USFWS: No status

CDFG: No status

CNPS: List 4, 1-2-3

Peirson's morning-glory is found in chaparral, CSS, chenopod scrub, and woodlands (CNPS, 2001). It is a perennial herb from a rhizome and blooms from May to June. The elevation range of this species is 30 to 1,500 meters (100 to 5,000 feet; CNPS, 2001). Peirson's morning-glory was previously known only from Antelope Valley in the San Gabriel Mountains of Los Angeles County (Hickman, 1993); recent studies, however, indicate that this species frequently intergrades with other *Calystegia* species (CNPS, 2001). This species has not been observed in Rancho Palos Verdes but is known to occur in the San Pedro area of the Peninsula.

### *Centromadia parryi ssp. australis*

#### **Southern Tarplant**

USFWS: No status

CDFG: No status

CNPS: List 1B, 3-3-2

Southern tarplant occurs in the margins of salt marsh margins, mesic valley and foothill grasslands, vernal pools, and alkaline areas below 425 meters (1,400 feet) elevation (CNPS, 2001). It ranges from Santa Barbara County to northern Baja California, Mexico, and possibly occurs on Santa Catalina Island (CNPS, 2001; Reiser, 1994). This summer blooming annual occurs mostly in seasonally moist saline grasslands. Southern tarplant is severely declining throughout its range because of development and recreation (Reiser, 1994). This species has not been detected in Rancho Palos Verdes but occurs northeast of the city near Machado Lake.

## SECTION FIVE

### *Convolvulus simulans*

#### **Small-flowered Morning-glory**

USFWS: No status

CDFG: No status

CNPS: List 4, 1-2-2

Small-flowered morning-glory is found between 30 to 700 meters (100 to 2,300 feet) on clay soils typically devoid of shrubs, in chaparral, sage scrub, and grassland (Reiser, 1994; Hickman, 1993). Occurrences have been recorded in San Diego, Orange, Riverside, Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Kern, San Joaquin, Contra Costa, San Benito, and Stanislaus Counties, as well as on Santa Catalina and San Clemente Islands and in Baja California, Mexico (CNPS, 2001). In Rancho Palos Verdes, small-flowered morning-glory occurs at two locations: north of Forrester Drive and northwest of the terminus of Coolheights Drive.

### *Crossosoma californicum*

#### **Catalina Crossosoma**

USFWS: No status

CDFG: No status

CNPS: List 1B, 2-2-2

Catalina crossosoma is a deciduous shrub that can reach 5 meters (16 feet) high. This shrub is usually found on dry, rocky slopes and canyons in CSS below 500 meters (1,600 feet) elevation (CNPS, 2001; Hickman, 1993). It is known from the Peninsula, San Clemente and Santa Catalina Islands, and Guadalupe Island, Mexico (Hickman, 1993). Catalina crossosoma has been detected at three locations in Rancho Palos Verdes: north of Pirate Drive, and on the ridgeline and in the canyon west of Gando Drive, south of Crest Road.

### *Dichondra occidentalis*

#### **Western Dichondra**

USFWS: No status

CDFG: No status

CNPS: List 4, 1-2-1

This perennial herb generally occurs at elevations from 50 to 500 meters (165 to 1,650 feet) on dry, sandy banks in CSS, chaparral, grassland, or southern oak woodland and often proliferates on recently burned slopes (CNPS, 2001, Reiser, 1994). This species occurs in Sonoma and Marin Counties, disjunct to San Barbara County, and south along the coast to northern Baja California, Mexico (Reiser, 1994). In Rancho Palos Verdes, western dichondra occurs northwest of Coolheights Drive in CSS.

## SECTION FIVE

---

*Dudleya virens* spp. *virens*

**Bright Green Dudleya**

USFWS: No status

CDFG: No status

CNPS: List 1B, 2-2-2

Bright green dudleya is a succulent perennial with a basal rosette of leaves from a caudex (i.e., a short woody stem at or below the ground; Hickman, 1993). This species occurs on steep slopes in chaparral, coastal bluff scrub, and CSS habitats below 400 meters (1,300 feet) (CNPS, 2001; Hickman, 1993). It is known from Los Angeles County, San Clemente, San Nicholas, and Santa Catalina Islands, and Guadalupe Island, Mexico (Hickman, 1993). In Rancho Palos Verdes, bright green dudleya occurs along the coastal bluffs from Point Vicente east to the Rancho Palos Verdes/San Pedro city limit.

*Erysimum insulare* ssp. *suffrutescens*

**Suffrutescent Wallflower**

USFWS: No status

CDFG: No status

CNPS: List 4, 1-2-3

Suffrutescent wallflower is a perennial herb that occurs at elevations of less than 150 meters (500 feet) (Hickman, 1993). It is found in coastal bluff scrub, coastal dunes, and CSS habitats along the coast from San Luis Obispo County to Los Angeles County (CNPS, 2001). Suffrutescent wallflower occurs on the Peninsula but has not been detected in Rancho Palos Verdes.

*Lycium brevipes* var. *hassei*

**Santa Catalina Island Desert-thorn**

USFWS: No status

CDFG: No status

CNPS: List 1B, 3-3-3

Santa Catalina Island desert-thorn is a deciduous shrub that can reach 4 meters (13 feet) high (Hickman, 1993). It is found on coastal bluff slopes in coastal bluff scrub and CSS habitats at elevations below 300 meters (1,000 feet) (CNPS, 2001; Hickman, 1993). This species was rediscovered on the Peninsula in 1976. Historical localities include San Clemente and Santa Catalina Islands. In Rancho Palos Verdes, Santa Catalina Island desert-thorn occurs on Portuguese Point.

*Pentachaeta lyonii*

**Lyon's Pentachaeta**

USFWS: Endangered

CDFG: Endangered

CNPS: List 1B, 3-3-3

Lyon's pentachaeta is an annual herb that blooms from March to August (CNPS, 2001). It occurs in openings in chaparral and valley and foothill grasslands near the coast at elevations below 150 meters (500 feet) (CNPS, 2001; Hickman, 1993). This species is known from Los Angeles and Ventura Counties (i.e., Santa Monica Mountains and Simi Hills) and Santa Catalina Island. Currently, fewer than 20

populations are known to occur (CNPS, 2001). Lyon's pentachaeta has not been reported in Rancho Palos Verdes.

***Suaeda taxifolia*****Woolly Seablite**

USFWS: No status

CDFG: No status

CNPS: List 4, 1-2-1

Woolly seablite is a herbaceous perennial usually restricted to coastal salt marsh; it rarely grows in peripheral scrublands adjacent to salt marshes or as isolated plants along beaches (Reiser, 1994). This species occurs along the coast from Santa Barbara County to Baja California, Mexico, and on Santa Barbara, San Clemente, Santa Cruz, Santa Catalina, San Nicholas, and Santa Rosa Islands and on Guadalupe Island, Mexico (CNPS, 2001). In Rancho Palos Verdes, woolly seablite occurs as isolated plants along the peninsula shoreline from Torrance Beach to San Pedro.

***Glaucopsyche lygdamus palosverdesensis*****Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly**

USFWS: Endangered

CDFG: No status

The Palos Verdes blue butterfly (PVB) is a rare subspecies of the silvery blue butterfly (Perkins and Emmel, 1977; Arnold, 1987). The PVB is restricted to open CSS habitats that support either ocean milk vetch (*Astragalus trichopodus* var. *lonchus*) or deerweed (*Lotus scoparius*), which are this species' larval food plants (Mattoni, 1992). Currently, PVB is known to occur only at the Naval Fuel Depot in San Pedro (between Western Avenue and Gaffey Street, south of Palos Verdes Drive North; Mattoni, 1992), at Malaga Dunes, and was recently reintroduced at the Chandler Preserve. Historical occurrences of PVB in Rancho Palos Verdes include locations near "The Switchback" area of Palos Verdes Drive East, locations within the landslide moratorium area (Edward's Canyon in Area 4, Portuguese Canyon, and Forrestal [Klondike] Canyon), and Agua Amarga (Arnold, 1984, 1986, 1987, 1990; Mattoni, 1992). Habitat for PVB is typified by open CSS and ecotone areas between sage scrub and grassland. Milk vetch is the primary larval host plant present in Rancho Palos Verdes. Deerweed does not generally occur in Rancho Palos Verdes and is restricted mostly to the northeast slope of the Peninsula. Milk vetch is an early successional or disturbance-associated species and would therefore decline if there is an extended period without disturbance (e.g., fire). Habitat loss and fragmentation associated with agriculture and residential development, fire suppression (e.g., fuel modification activities), severe weather conditions, and over-collecting by butterfly enthusiasts have contributed to the current endangered status of this species (Arnold, 1987; Mattoni, 1992). Federal Designated Critical Habitat includes "The Switchback" area of Palos Verdes Drive East and Agua Amarga Canyon (USFWS, 1980; Federal Register Vol. 45, No. 129, pp. 44942).

## SECTION FIVE

### *Euphilotes battoides allyni*

#### **El Segundo Blue Butterfly**

USFWS: Endangered

CDFG: No status

The El Segundo Blue (ESB) is a rare subspecies of the square-spotted blue butterfly (Subfamily Polyomattinae) restricted to remnant coastal dune habitats at four locations: Ballona Wetlands south of Marina del Rey, Los Angeles International Airport Dunes, Chevron El Segundo Preserve and adjacent habitat in El Segundo, and Torrance Beach/Malaga Cove (Mattoni et al., 1997). Coast buckwheat (*Eriogonum parvifolium*) is the larval food plant of this subspecies. The historical distribution of ESB included dune habitats in Redondo and Manhattan Beaches. A recovery plan for ESB has been prepared with the Malaga Cove population as the most southern management unit (Torrance Recovery Unit) of the recovery plan. The Malaga Cove population is small, between 10 and 30 individuals using between 50 and 100 individuals of *E. parvifolium* (R. Arnold, pers. comm.). There is no dune habitat within the jurisdiction of Rancho Palos Verdes, but coast buckwheat is known to occur within the coastal bluff scrub habitat between Point Vicente and Abalone Cove. Dr. Richard Arnold conducted a butterfly survey in summer 1998 with negative results for ESB in this area of the city. Subsequent biological surveys in 2000 for proposed development of the York Long Point site detected a population of ESB in coastal bluff scrub habitat (RBF, 2001).

### *Phrynosoma coronatum blainvillei*

#### **San Diego Horned Lizard**

USFWS: No status

CDFG: SSC

This subspecies is endemic to extreme southwestern California (Stebbins, 1985) from south of the Transverse Ranges to Baja California. This species is relatively widespread and locally common from the coast to the western edge of the desert, where extensive suitable habitat is still available—mostly in Orange and San Diego Counties (San Diego Herpetological Society, 1980). This horned lizard has been reported in the Malaga Cove area of the Peninsula (Mattoni et al., 1997) but was not observed during any of the gnatcatcher studies or spring plant surveys. It occurs from sea level to elevations of over 8,000 feet and frequents a variety of habitats from coastal dune, sage scrub, and chaparral to coniferous and broadleaf woodlands (Stebbins, 1985). It is most often found on sandy or friable soils with open scrub. Habitat requirements include open areas for sunning, bushes for cover, and fine loose soil for rapid burial. Harvester ants are the primary food item of the horned lizard and indicate potential for occurrence of the lizard in an area. This taxon is primarily active in late spring (April to May) and early summer (June to July), after which individuals typically aestivate. Threats to this species include urban development, conversion of habitat to agriculture, collecting of individuals for the pet trade, and reduction of food base because of introduced Argentine ants (*Linepithema humile*) displacing native ant species (Jennings and Hayes, 1994; Brattstrom, 1997; Holway et al, 2002).

## SECTION FIVE

### *Poliophtila californica californica*

#### Coastal California Gnatcatcher

USFWS: Threatened

CDFG: SSC, NCCP focal species

The California gnatcatcher population in the U.S. is estimated to exceed 3,400 pairs (USFWS, 1996). The Peninsula supports a remnant population of 26 to 56 pairs considered isolated from the remainder of the U.S. population (Atwood et al., 1994, 1998; Atwood and Bontrager, 2001). The center point locations of gnatcatcher territories within the GIS database include cumulative data gathered during the Manomet Center five-year study. The primary cause of this species' decline is the cumulative loss of CSS vegetation to urban and agricultural development (Atwood, 1993). This species' habitat is being formally protected and managed through the NCCP program, ESA Sections 10 (HCP processes) and 7 (agency consultations on federal lands). Federal Designated Critical Habitat for the gnatcatcher includes suitable habitats throughout the Peninsula. This species is probably extirpated from much of Ventura and San Bernardino Counties and declining proportionately with the continued loss of CSS habitat in the four remaining southern California counties within the coastal plain. The territory size requirements of the gnatcatcher vary with habitat quality and distance from the coast. Documented home ranges have varied from 1 to 7 acres on the Peninsula (Impact Sciences, 1990; Atwood et al., 1995). Over five years, gnatcatcher productivity and survival have varied on the Peninsula. Annual reproduction has varied from 2.3 to 3.9 fledglings per pair. Annual adult survival has varied from 23 to 70 percent; juvenile over-winter survival varied from 20 to 43 percent. Studies of the species' habitat preferences on the Peninsula and elsewhere indicate that California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*) and flat-topped buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*) are the primary plants used by gnatcatchers when foraging for insects (Atwood et al., 1995; Impact Sciences, 1990; RECON, 1987; ERCE, 1990; Ogden, 1992a). Breeding gnatcatchers on the Peninsula are noticeably absent from most sage scrub dominated by lemonade berry (*Rhus integrifolia*).

### *Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus*

#### Cactus Wren

USFWS: No status

CDFG: SSC, NCCP focal species

Coastal southern California populations of cactus wren are seriously endangered throughout the coastal plain from Ventura to the Mexican border (Rea and Weaver, 1990). This species is common throughout the deserts of the Southwest. Coastal populations breed in CSS dominated by extensive stands of tall prickly pear or cholla cacti. Once widespread in coastal southern California, by 1990 cactus wrens had been reduced to fewer than 3,000 pairs scattered into colonies of widely varying size; many colonies are isolated by distance from other colonies (Ogden, 1992b). The Peninsula cactus wren population was relatively stable at approximately  $58 \pm 5$  pairs during the mid-1990s (Atwood et al., 1998). Reproduction averages above three fledglings per pair, and adult survivorship varies from 57 to 73 percent; juvenile over-winter survivorship varies from 9 to 36 percent. Home range size for Peninsula cactus wrens varies from 1 to 3 acres.

***Perognathus longimembris pacificus*****Pacific (Little) Pocket Mouse**

USFWS: Endangered

CDFG: SSC

Historic records of this smallest subspecies of little pocket mouse extend along the immediate coast from Marina del Rey in Los Angeles County, south to the Mexican border. Only eight definite localities have been documented, most of which were subsequently lost to development (USFWS, 1994). Few records are known after the 1930s, and the species was not definitively identified by trapping studies after 1971 until a small population was discovered on the Dana Point Headlands, Orange County in 1993 (Brylski, 1993). Habitats of the Pacific pocket mouse include coastal strand, sand dunes, ruderal vegetation on river alluvium, and open CSS on marine terraces. Three populations were subsequently located on Camp Pendleton in northern San Diego County. Potential habitat beyond Camp Pendleton is very limited and highly fragmented by coastal land development and agriculture. No populations of Pacific pocket mouse have been detected on the Peninsula, despite several trapping surveys within potentially suitable habitat. This species is not expected to be currently extant in Rancho Palos Verdes (Dudek and Associates, 1994; Marquez and Associates, 1995; BonTerra Consulting, 1997; Ogden, 1999). Several authors have noted that this species is found in fine, alluvial, sandy soil near the ocean and adjacent terraces dominated by open sage scrub (Brylski, 1993). The Pacific pocket mouse remains in its plugged burrow during the day and is active only at night. Its peak activity tends to occur early in the night. It becomes torpid during periods of food stress or low temperatures. It is inactive above ground from October to January, varying with food reserves and minimum night temperatures. Breeding occurs from January to August, peaking from March to May. Litter size ranges from two to eight, with usually one or two litters per year. Pacific pocket mice are predominantly granivorous, eating mostly seeds of grasses and forbs.

**5.1.1.3 Regionally Important Habitat Areas**

A key step in developing an NCCP plan for the City was to prioritize the most critical biological resource areas for potential conservation so that (1) conservation is maximized, (2) acquisition, restoration, and management funds are efficiently used, and (3) relatively less important habitat areas can be developed. Regionally Important Habitat Areas (RIHA) were identified through the overlay of vegetation and target species information; they include areas where there is relatively extensive native vegetation supporting concentrations of target species. Linkage Planning Areas that provide a habitat connection between larger habitat areas were also identified. Approximately 55 percent (1,292 acres) of the existing naturalized vegetation in Rancho Palos Verdes was identified as RIHAs.

**5.1.2 Environmental Impacts/Environmental Consequences**

This section analyzes the adequacy of the Proposed Project with respect to the environmental impacts related to implementation of the conservation of species and habitats pursuant to issuance of Section 10(a) of the ESA and Section 2835 of the California Fish and Game Code. The biological objective of the Subarea Plan is to maintain the range of natural biological communities and species native to the region and to conserve viable populations of endangered, threatened, and key sensitive species (covered species) and their habitats, thereby preventing local extirpation. The Subarea Plan does not override the necessity for further environmental review for individual actions at the project level. A take authorization would not

automatically be granted to individual projects; rather, each discretionary action would be subject to further environmental review to determine whether the specific action is consistent with the Subarea Plan and IA.

### 5.1.2.1 *Criteria for Determining Significance*

This document is intended to comply with both Council of Environmental Quality Regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1508.27; NEPA) and CEQA requirements. NEPA requires an examination of the environmental consequences of the project. It addresses significance through examination of the overall effects of the totality of the impacts. Section 1508.27 states that the “significance of an action must be analyzed in several contexts such as society as a whole (human, national), the affected region, the affected interests, and the locality. Significance varies with the setting of the proposed action.” However, CEQA (Section 15065) states there then would be a mandatory finding of significance if a project would “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”. The following analysis is presented to comply with CEQA. Species and habitats would be covered by the Subarea Plan to the extent that conservation measures meet the criteria outlined in Section 10(a) of the ESA and Section 2800 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code. From the perspective of the ESA, the following biological findings must be made for each species under consideration for coverage in the permit:

- Take would be incidental to otherwise lawful activities.
- Take would be minimized and mitigated to the maximum extent practicable.
- Take would not reduce appreciably the likelihood of survival and recovery of the species in the wild.

### 5.1.2.2 *Endangered Species Act Adequacy Analysis*

The following criteria are used to determine the adequacy of coverage (as defined through Section 10[a] of the ESA and Section 2800 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code) of the biological resources in the study area:

- *Conservation and management of a major population.* A major population is large enough to be self-sustaining or at least support enough breeding individuals to contribute to overall population stability. Although some populations may not meet the size criteria, they may still be considered a major population if they are important for long-term survival of the species (e.g., areas used as habitat linkages).
- *Conservation and management of a critical location.* Critical locations are areas that must be protected for adequate conservation under the preserve design. Critical locations may coincide with major populations but may also include dispersal corridors or breeding sites, as well as areas important for maintaining connectivity with populations elsewhere on the Peninsula.

## **SECTION FIVE**

### **5.1.2.3 Regionally Important Habitat Areas and Linkages**

Approximately 78 percent of the RIHAs are included in the Reserve design, as are all primary habitat linkages between relatively large patches of habitat, including a key linkage constrained by the proposed development within Lower Filiorum. Existing linkages to habitat areas elsewhere on the Peninsula would also be conserved by the Subarea Plan. Planned linkages are consistent with Reserve design guidelines in terms of dimensions and habitat characteristics (Mock et al., 1992; Soule, 1991; Beier and Loe, 1992; Lovio, 1996). Impacts to RIHAs and habitat linkages would be significant, but mitigated by the extent and location of proposed habitat conservation, proposed habitat restoration, and active habitat management within the Reserve.

### **5.1.2.4 Vegetation**

The proposed Reserve design includes 1,504 acres, of which 1,435 acres are dominated by naturalized vegetation (Figure 5.1-1, Table 5.1-2). An additional 663 acres of land categorized as Neutral Lands contribute to Reserve functions as natural open space and cannot be developed, because of extreme slopes, open-space hazard zoning, or official designation as HOA open space. Because Neutral Lands are currently not accessible for active habitat management, they are not included in the Reserve. If agreements can be reached with the property owners to allow management, these lands would be added to the Reserve and be subject to active habitat management to retain and enhance biological resource values. Including the Neutral Lands, approximately 96.3 percent (1,198.5 acres) of existing sage scrub habitats, 78.2 percent (746.8 acres) of existing grassland, and 96 percent (2.4 acres) of existing riparian scrub would be conserved and precluded from future development.

The City has identified 21 City projects and 9 private projects that would be covered by the Subarea Plan, resulting in unavoidable loss of approximately 55.4 acres of CSS and 187.3 acres of non-native grassland within or outside the proposed Reserve (Tables 5.1-3 and 5.1-4). Mitigation for these habitat impacts would be at a 3:1 ratio (conserved acreage to affected acreage) for CSS and a 0.5:1 ratio for non-native grasslands. Mitigation for impacts of City projects (40.2 acres of CSS and 106.3 acres of non-native grassland) would be provided by the dedication of 322.2 acres of City-owned land and 5.6 acres of revegetation within the Reserve (2.1 acres of revegetation has already been completed). Mitigation for impacts of private projects would be provided by dedication of private land or donation of monies to the habitat restoration fund by the private entities.

A total of 13.7 acres of sage scrub habitats and 61 acres of non-native grassland are estimated to occur outside the boundaries of the Reserve and Neutral Lands and are not associated with planned projects detailed in the Subarea Plan (Table 5.1-2). Any potential unanticipated future impacts to habitats outside the Reserve would be mitigated through dedication of additional acreage to the Reserve or restoration of priority areas within the Reserve at a 3:1 mitigation ratio for CSS and a 0.5:1 ratio for non-native grassland.

A small amount of riparian scrub (0.1 acres) is excluded from the Reserve. Additional unmapped riparian habitats, other waters, or native grassland may also occur outside the Reserve. Wetland habitats and streambeds within the Subarea Plan area would be subject to CWA Sections 401 and 404 and Fish and Game Code 1600 permit requirements if they are included within areas proposed for development. Impacted wetlands would be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio. Native grasslands greater than 0.3 acre documented during subsequent project-specific environmental review would be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio.

**Table 5.1-2  
Proposed Conservation Acreage  
by Vegetation Community**

Vegetation Community	Existing (acres)	In Habitat Reserve (acres)	Neutral Lands (acres)	Outside Reserve (acres)	Total Conserved (acres) <sup>1</sup>	Total Percent Conserved <sup>1</sup>
<b>Coastal Sage Scrub Associations</b>						
CSS – Artemisia Dominated	93.0	48.4	33.7	10.9	82.1	88.3
CSS – Baccharis Dominated	7.2	7.2	0.0	0.0	7.2	100.0
CSS – Encelia Dominated	7.9	7.9	0.0	0.0	7.9	100.0
CSS – Eriogonum Dominated	13.9	6.8	7.1	0.0	13.9	100.0
CSS – Rhus Dominated	225.0	127.4	96.0	1.6	223.4	99.3
CSS – Salvia Dominated	21.0	19.2	1.8	0.0	21.0	100.0
CSS – Undifferentiated	635.5	412.2	191.8	31.5	604.0	95.0
Southern Cactus Scrub	96.9	70.9	24.9	1.1	95.8	98.9
Southern Coastal Bluff Scrub	137.0	96.3	39.8	0.9	136.1	99.3
Saltbrush Scrub	7.3	7.1	0.0	0.2	7.1	97.3
<b>Subtotal CSS</b>	<b>1,244.7</b>	<b>803.4</b>	<b>395.1</b>	<b>46.2</b>	<b>1,198.5</b>	<b>96.3</b>
<b>Other Vegetation</b>						
Grassland	955.3	530.7	216.1	208.5	746.8	78.2
Riparian Scrub	2.5	2.4	0.0	0.1	2.4	96
Exotic Woodland	75.4	47.1	9.1	19.2	56.2	74.5
Disturbed Vegetation	88.3	52.1	12.1	24.1	64.2	72.7
<b>Subtotal Other Vegetation</b>	<b>1,121.5</b>	<b>632.3</b>	<b>237.3</b>	<b>251.9</b>	<b>869.6</b>	<b>77.5</b>
<b>Total Naturalized Vegetation</b>	<b>2,366.2</b>	<b>1,435.7</b>	<b>632.4</b>	<b>298.1</b>	<b>2,068.1</b>	<b>87.4</b>
<b>Other</b>						
Cliff Face	8.8	8.8	0.0	0.0	8.8	100.0
Disturbed	162.4	42.2	16.1	104.1	58.3	35.9
Agriculture	17.6	2.89	0.0	14.7	2.9	16.4
Developed	6,003.7	14.5	14.6	5,974.6	29.1	0.5
<b>Subtotal Other</b>	<b>6,192.5</b>	<b>68.39</b>	<b>30.7</b>	<b>6,093.4</b>	<b>99.1</b>	<b>1.6</b>
<b>Total Acreage</b>	<b>8,558.7</b>	<b>1,504.1</b>	<b>663.1</b>	<b>6,391.5</b>	<b>2,167.2</b>	<b>25.3</b>

1. Acreage in Habitat Reserve and Neutral Lands categories combined.

**Table 5.1-3  
Total Loss of Habitat by  
City Projects**

City Project Name	Project Status	Habitat Loss (Acres)		Onsite Mitigation Acreage <sup>1</sup>		Offsite Mitigation Acreage <sup>1</sup>	
		CSS	Grassland	CSS	Grassland	CSS	Grassland
1. Altamira Canyon Drainage Project	Proposed	2.5	3.0	2.5	0.0	5.0	1.5
2. Dewatering Wells (10 Wells)	Proposed	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	7.5	1.25
3. Misc. Fissure Filling	Proposed	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	9.0	1.5
4. Misc. Damaged Drain Repair	Proposed	5.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	7.5
5. Portuguese Canyon Drainage Project	Completed	0.5	N/A <sup>2</sup>	0.0	N/A <sup>2</sup>	1.5	N/A <sup>2</sup>
6. Sacred Cove Geologic Investigation	Completed	0.1	N/A <sup>2</sup>	0.0	N/A <sup>2</sup>	0.3	N/A <sup>2</sup>
7. PVDS Roadway Rehabilitation	Completed	0.2	N/A <sup>2</sup>	0.0	N/A <sup>2</sup>	0.6	N/A <sup>2</sup>
8. PVDS Emergency Washout Project	Completed	0.4	N/A <sup>2</sup>	0.0	N/A <sup>2</sup>	1.2	N/A <sup>2</sup>
9. PVDE Drainage Improvement Project	Proposed	4.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	12.0	6.0
10. Misc. Drainage Improvement Projects	Proposed	10.0	24.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	12.0
11. 25th Street Road Repair (Phase 2)	Completed	0.4	N/A <sup>2</sup>	0.4	N/A <sup>2</sup>	0.8	N/A <sup>2</sup>
12. Abalone Cove Beach Project	Proposed	0.2	1.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.5
13. Tarapaca Sewer Line Relocation	Completed	0.5	N/A <sup>2</sup>	0.0	N/A <sup>2</sup>	1.5	N/A <sup>2</sup>
14. Forrestal Property Trail Clearing	Completed	0.1	N/A <sup>2</sup>	0.0	N/A <sup>2</sup>	0.3	N/A <sup>2</sup>
15. 25th Street Road Repair (Phase 1)	Completed	0.1	N/A <sup>2</sup>	0.1	N/A <sup>2</sup>	0.2	N/A <sup>2</sup>
16. San Ramon Canyon Repair	Completed	1.0	N/A <sup>2</sup>	2.0	N/A <sup>2</sup>	1.0	N/A <sup>2</sup>
17. McCarrell Canyon Outlet Improvement	Completed	0.2	N/A <sup>2</sup>	0.0	N/A <sup>2</sup>	0.6	N/A <sup>2</sup>
18. RPV Trails Plan Implementation	Proposed	5.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	7.5
19. Lower San Ramon Canyon Repair	Proposed	2.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	3.0
20. Active Recreation Area	Proposed	1.0	13.6	0.0	0.0	3.0	6.8
21. Lower Point Vicente	Proposed	1.5	11.2	0.0	0.0	4.5	5.6
<b>Total Acreage of Habitat Loss</b>		<b>40.2</b>	<b>106.3</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>115.0</b>	<b>53.15</b>

1. City would provide mitigation acreage as part of the City-owned lands to be dedicated to the Reserve based on a 3:1 mitigation ratio for CSS and 0.5:1 ratio for non-native grassland, and accounting for onsite habitat restoration of temporarily disturbed habitat areas.
2. City would provide mitigation for non-native grassland loss for proposed projects only. Acreage of impacts and mitigation for non-native grassland is therefore not provided for completed projects.

**Table 5.1-4  
Total Loss of Habitat by  
Private Projects and Mitigation**

Private Project Name	Project Status	Habitat Loss (Acres)		Mitigation by City <sup>1</sup>		Mitigation By Project Applicant <sup>2</sup>	
		CSS	Grassland	CSS	Grassland	CSS	Grassland
<b>Private Projects with City-Provided Mitigation</b>							
		CSS	Grassland	CSS	Grassland	CSS	Grassland
1. Brush Clearance at Windport Canyon	Completed	0.5	N/A <sup>3</sup>	1.5	N/A <sup>3</sup>	0.0	N/A <sup>3</sup>
2. Brush Clearance at 3303 Palo Vista	Completed	0.3	N/A <sup>3</sup>	0.9	N/A <sup>3</sup>	0.0	N/A <sup>3</sup>
3. Portuguese Bend Club Slope Repair	Completed	0.5	N/A <sup>3</sup>	1.5	N/A <sup>3</sup>	0.0	N/A <sup>3</sup>
<b>Subtotal City-Provided Mitigation</b>		<b>1.3</b>	<b>N/A<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>N/A<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>N/A<sup>3</sup></b>
<b>Other Private Projects</b>							
		CSS	Grassland	CSS	Grassland	CSS	Grassland
4. Portuguese Bend Club Remedial Grading	Proposed	3.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	9.0	5.0
5. Hon Geologic Investigation	Completed	0.6	N/A <sup>3</sup>	0.0	N/A <sup>3</sup>	1.8	N/A <sup>3</sup>
6. Crestridge Development	Proposed	2.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	6.0
7. Brush Clearance at Lower Filiorum	Completed	0.5	N/A <sup>3</sup>	0.0	N/A <sup>3</sup>	1.5	N/A <sup>3</sup>
8. Lower Filiorum Development	Proposed	7.3	59.0	0.0	0.0	21.9	29.5 <sup>4</sup>
9. Coolheights Residential Lot Development	Completed	0.5	N/A <sup>3</sup>	0.0	N/A <sup>3</sup>	1.5	N/A <sup>3</sup>
<b>Subtotal Other Private Projects</b>		<b>13.9</b>	<b>81.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>41.7</b>	<b>40.5</b>
<b>Total Acreage of Habitat Loss</b>		<b>15.2</b>	<b>81.0</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>41.7</b>	<b>40.5</b>

1. City would provide mitigation acreage as part of the City-owned lands to be dedicated to the Reserve at a 3:1 mitigation ratio for CSS and 0.5:1 ratio for non-native grassland.
  2. Habitat mitigation at a 3:1 ratio for CSS and 0.5:1 ratio for non-native grassland in the form of habitat contributed to the reserve or funds for habitat restoration within the reserve.
  3. City would provide mitigation for non-native grassland loss for proposed projects only. Acreage of impacts and mitigation for non-native grassland is therefore not provided for completed projects.
  4. Project applicant would dedicate a total of 40 acres to the Reserve area for habitat restoration. The project applicant would provide the remaining 11.4 acres of mitigation off site to meet Subarea Plan requirements.
- \* Please note that some anticipated impacts above are preliminary estimates and could change.

No fuel modification areas for new development would be allowed within the Reserve. Fuel modification impacts to sensitive habitats from new development would be assessed as part of the development impact area and mitigated at a 3:1 ratio for CSS and 0.5:1 ratio for non-native grassland. Impacts to upland scrub, native grassland, and riparian habitats are considered significant but are mitigated by the habitat acquisition and restoration programs described in the Subarea Plan.

Approximately 43.3 acres of habitats (19.2 acres of exotic woodland and 24.1 acres of disturbed vegetation) are excluded from the Reserve and Neutral Lands and would be available for potential development. Impacts to these habitats are considered less than significant because of the dominance of non-native plant species within these habitat associations and their lower biodiversity value compared to native habitats that support sensitive species. Any incremental biological value that these non-sensitive habitats may have would be offset by the proposed Reserve design, habitat restoration, and habitat management programs included in the Subarea Plan. The Subarea Plan would restrict vegetation clearing to the non-breeding season (September 15 to February 15) to preclude disturbing breeding birds in compliance with the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act. BMPs for development activity adjacent to the Reserve are addressed by the Subarea Plan (see Section 6.2.2 of the Subarea Plan).

#### **5.1.2.5 Sensitive Species**

The proposed Reserve design does not include all point locations where covered species have been sighted recently or historically. The GIS database developed for the Subarea Plan (Ogden, 1999) indicates that several species point locations are excluded from the Reserve or Neutral Lands (Table 5.1-5, Figure 5.1-3). If these locations are still occupied by the covered species, a take of a covered species is assumed. In addition to habitat conservation, the restoration activities provided for in this Subarea Plan would increase

the inventory of potential habitat for covered species by about 16 percent above the current inventory within the city. A detailed conservation analysis and justification for incidental take for each covered species is provided in Appendix B of the Subarea Plan. Direct take of sensitive species is considered significant. Mitigation measures for direct impacts to sensitive species included in the Subarea Plan as project features and commitments would reduce the impact to below the level of significance.

Because 93 percent or more of the covered species point locations and 96 percent of their potential habitats would be conserved and the long-term habitat restoration program would likely substantially increase the availability of suitable habitat for covered species during the permit period, it is expected that the populations of covered species would increase over time, particularly for PV Blue Butterfly, California gnatcatcher, and cactus wren. The habitat management program would provide the opportunity for establishment of new populations of covered species where they are currently absent. Other sensitive species not known to be within the Subarea Plan area (e.g., horned lizard and Pacific pocket mouse) would also benefit from implementation of the Subarea Plan if they were to be subsequently detected within the Reserve. The opportunity to reintroduce locally extirpated species, such as the PV blue butterfly and rare plant species, is provided for in the Subarea Plan. Direct impacts to sensitive species are considered significant; however, impacts would be reduced to below the level of significance because of the extent and location of conserved habitat, habitat restoration, and habitat management programs within the Reserve included in the Subarea Plan.

**Table 5.1-5  
Estimated Take OF  
Covered Species Point Locations**

Covered Species	Existing	Conserved 1	Percent Conserved 1	Expected Take
California Gnatcatcher <i>Polioptila californica californica</i>	88	88	100.0	0
Coastal Cactus Wren <i>Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus</i>	99	95	96.0	4
PVB Butterfly <i>Glaucopsyche lygdamus palosverdesensis</i> Historical Sighting	18	17	94.4	1
Historical PVB Butterfly Host Plant, <i>Astragalus trichopodus</i>	84	78	92.9	6
El Segundo Blue Butterfly <i>Euphilotes battoides allyni</i> Sighting	1	1	100.0	0
El Segundo Blue Butterfly Host Plant, <i>Eriogonum parvifolium</i>	19	18	94.7	1
Bright Green Dudleya <i>Dudleya virens</i>	35	35	100.0	0
Aphanisma <i>Aphanisma blitoides</i>	26	26	100.0	0
South Coast Saltscale <i>Atriplex pacifica</i>	8	8	100.0	0
Catalina Crossosoma <i>Crossosoma californicum</i>	3	3	100.0	0
Santa Catalina Island Desert-thorn <i>Lycium brevipes</i> var. <i>hassei</i>	3	3	100.0	0
Southern Tarplant <sup>2</sup> <i>Centromedia parryi</i>	N/A	N/A	96.3	0
Peirson's Morning-glory <sup>2</sup> <i>Calystegia peirsonii</i>	N/A	N/A	96.3	0
Woolly Seablite <sup>2</sup> <i>Suaeda taxifolia</i>	N/A	N/A	99.3	0
Lyon's Pentachaeta <sup>2</sup> <i>Pentachaeta lyonii</i>	N/A	N/A	96.3	0

1. Includes point locations within Reserve and Neutral Lands.
2. Southern Tarplant, Peirson's Morning-glory and Lyon's Pentachaeta are not known to occur in the area and woolly seablite is associated with coastal bluff scrub, which is 99.3% conserved.

Insert Figure 5.1-3

Covered Species Point Locations Not Being Conserved by the Plan

Approximately 19.2 acres of exotic woodland would be excluded from the conservation. Exotic woodlands have the potential to support nest sites of birds of prey (raptors). These predator species occur at relatively low densities because they occupy a higher level in the food chain. The raptor species present in the planning area are urban-adapted species that use typical suburban landscapes found throughout southern California. Destroying active bird nest sites is prohibited by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918. Best management practices for development activity adjacent to the Reserve are addressed by the Subarea Plan (see Section 6.2.2 of the Subarea Plan). Implementation of the Subarea Plan would result in potential incremental losses of raptor foraging habitat (approximately 313 acres total). Potential impacts to breeding raptors and their foraging habitats are considered significant; however, these impacts would be reduced to below the level of significance because of the habitat conservation and restoration provided by the Subarea Plan and the extensive amount of foraging habitat available elsewhere in the region.

General habitat loss and loss of associated species of flora and fauna could potentially result from development of habitats outside the Reserve (estimated at approximately 298 acres). Removing or altering native and non-native habitats may result in the loss of common plant and wildlife species from the areas not designated as Reserve or Neutral Lands. This incremental habitat loss is considered significant; however, impacts would be reduced to below the level of significance because of the amount of proposed habitat conservation and restoration included in the Subarea Plan. Such potential impacts would not be expected to substantially diminish any species distribution, range, or populations in the region to below self-sustaining numbers.

#### **5.1.2.6     *Impacts Associated with Development Edge Effects***

There is potential for indirect impacts to occur as a result of project implementation. The areas where indirect impacts have potential to occur could extend 150 to 350 feet from new development edge into conserved habitat because of such activities as landscape irrigation, pesticide and/or fertilizer drift, fuel management adjacent to development (outside the Reserve), vegetation trampling along trails, temporary disturbance from landslide-abatement activities, maintenance activities within utility easements, and introduction of non-native species (e.g., Argentine ants, cats, dogs, and non-native plant species). Indirect impacts are referred to as “edge effects” (Hockin et al., 1992, Paton, 1993, Noss, 1993, Vissman, 1993, Sauvajot, 1997, Holway et al., 2002). There is also potential for an increase in sediment load to drainages within the Reserve due to vegetation modification adjacent to the Reserve. There is potential for temporary, indirect impacts on animals due to an increase in noise, dust, and light during construction activities and from vehicle noise from adjacent major roadways. There is also potential for the introduction of contaminated urban runoff into drainages. The Subarea Plan addresses BMPs for construction activity adjacent to the Reserve (see Section 6.2.2 of the Subarea Plan).

Argentine ants, regarded as an invasive pest species in southern California, spread with the aid of an increased water supply. Such ants are known to displace native ant species in areas where they are introduced (Newell and Barber, 1913; Williams, 1994). Argentine ants are not a favored food of some native birds and lizards, and their introduction could contribute to a local decline in species that rely on native ants for food (e.g., horned lizard). Recent studies indicate that Argentine ants penetrate 50 to 100 meters (164 to 328 feet) into mesic canyon habitats and less than 25 meters (82 feet) into xeric hilltop habitats (Holway et al., 2002). Correspondingly, the increased water supply associated with an urban

irrigation runoff would likely make the north-facing slopes and canyons (more mesic areas) within the Reserve more susceptible to Argentine ant infestation.

Nest parasitism by brown-headed cowbirds is a concern for breeding songbird species. The Subarea Plan includes funding for cowbird management where deemed necessary. Scientific studies indicate that scrub-associated bird species may be insensitive to edge effects associated with urban development (Stralberg, 2000; Sauvajot, 1997; Sauvajot and Buechner, 1993; Sauvajot et al, 1998; Morrison and Bolger, 2002; Atwood, 1998; Ogden, 1995; Gering and Blair, 1999). These observations may result from the relative hardiness of scrub vegetation and its relative resistance to invasion by non-native plant species in the absence of direct disturbance and from the edge-insensitivity of nest predators, such as snakes (Langen, et al., 1991; Morrison and Bolger, 2002; Sauvajot, 1997; Sauvajot and Buechner, 1993; Sauvajot et al., 1998; Gering and Blair, 1999).

Included in the Subarea Plan's habitat management program are habitat enhancing management measures, such as minimizing nighttime use by people, reducing lighting within the habitat, and strategically placing fencing and signage. Reserve areas to be revegetated under the Subarea Plan and the trail system through the Reserve would facilitate wildlife movement (Mock et al., 1992). Any new trails within conserved habitat would be designed so that habitat impacts are avoided and minimized to the maximum extent practicable. The Subarea Plan assumes up to 5 acres of impacts to CSS and 15 acres of impacts to non-native grassland for the trail program, which would be mitigated at a 3:1 and 0.5:1 ratio respectively.

The existing distribution of native vegetation within the Subarea Plan area is highly fragmented and edge-affected by existing development (Figure 5.1-1). Approximately 61.1 percent (1,323 acres) of existing naturalized plant communities within the Subarea Plan area are within 300 feet of development boundaries (edge). The proposed Reserve design includes approximately 1,355 acres of conserved area (62.6 percent) within 300 feet of existing and potential future development edge. With the proposed Reserve design, approximately 32 acres of area within the Reserve that is currently not considered edge affected would become edge affected. As currently proposed, approximately 663 acres of edge-affected Neutral Lands would not be accessible for active habitat management. Neutral Lands are not in the Reserve and, because of lack of legal access, would not be actively managed; the City, however, would periodically monitor the vegetation status of Neutral Lands to detect any unauthorized vegetation clearing within these open-space areas. Efforts by the City and PVPLC to gain access to Neutral Lands for habitat management are ongoing and would continue where practicable. Active habitat management is intended to minimize and mitigate potential edge effects associated with existing and future development. The proportion of the Reserve affected by edge condition is slightly higher than existing conditions (62.6 versus 61.1 percent). Edge effects in habitat for sensitive species is considered significant, however, impacts are expected to be reduced to below the level of significance by active habitat management and restoration included in the Subarea Plan.

The habitat restoration and management program includes the potential use of chemical control agents and other methods to control exotic species and manage species that may be adversely affecting productivity of covered species (e.g., cowbirds and meso-predators). The Subarea Plan requires Integrated Pest-Management approaches (i.e., use of the least biologically intrusive control methods). Potential impacts to biological resources associated with implementation of habitat restoration and management is considered less than significant because of the benefits expected to result from active habitat management (e.g., increased habitat carrying capacity for covered species and reduced impacts from edge effects).

## **SECTION FIVE**

---

### **5.1.3 Cumulative Impacts**

The primary goal of the proposed action is to provide for a citywide biological Reserve design that would mitigate ongoing and future biological impacts cumulatively. The Subarea Plan's proposed Reserve design and habitat restoration and management program are sufficient to mitigate biological impacts to below a level of significance.

The Subarea Plan meets the following key NCCP planning criteria in the NCCP Planning Guidelines (CDFG, 1993):

1. Conserve target species throughout the planning area:
  - 96 percent of existing habitat is conserved.
  - 93 to 100 percent of cover species locations are conserved.
  - A habitat-restoration program will contribute additional habitat to the Reserve, eventually exceeding current inventory of CSS habitats in the city.
2. Larger reserves are better:
  - The largest, most contiguous habitat areas are included in the Reserve.
3. Keep Reserve areas close together:
  - Reserve planning areas are within a relatively small area and linked by corridors.
4. Keep habitat contiguous:
  - Most contiguous patches of habitat are within the Reserve.
5. Link Reserve areas with corridors:
  - All regionally important habitat linkages are conserved.
6. Reserves should be biologically diverse:
  - 93 to 100 percent of cover species locations are conserved.
  - 96 percent of existing habitat is conserved.
  - All known native habitat types are included in the Reserve (upland scrub habitats [11 subtypes] and riparian scrub).
7. Protect Reserves from encroachment:
  - A habitat-management and -monitoring program is included in the Subarea Plan.
  - A restoration program is included in the Subarea Plan.

### **5.1.4 Mitigation Measures**

The City would need to implement the appropriate amendments to the General Plan, LCP, ordinances, and existing planning documents (e.g., trail and parks plans) to be consistent with the Subarea Plan. The USFWS, CDFG, PVPLC, and City would be responsible for implementing the Subarea Plan as a condition of the IA and Take Authorization Permit.

Generally, the take of a listed species requires impact avoidance, minimization, and mitigation for unavoidable impacts. If additional conservation of species and/or habitat is not possible (usually because there are no remaining blocks of habitat to conserve or because the species' known occurrences are in a developed area), take and impacts can be minimized through habitat restoration and enhancement and

population management; the Subarea Plan includes such mitigation at a 3:1 ratio for impacts to CSS, native grassland, and riparian scrub, and a 0.5:1 ratio for non-native grassland. Unavoidable impacts to sensitive plant communities would be mitigated through habitat acquisition and habitat restoration. All project-specific habitat mitigation would be in the form of providing lands to the Reserve or providing funds toward implementation of habitat restoration within the Reserve. The mitigation ratio for habitat impacts is 3:1 (i.e., sufficient acreage or funds to purchase or restore three times the affected acreage) for CSS, native grassland, or riparian habitats, and 0.5:1 for non-native grassland. Project impacts within the coastal zone would be mitigated within the coastal zone where feasible or reasonable.

Grasslands both inside and outside the Reserve or Neutral Lands would require focused surveys for native grassland patches as part of a project-specific CEQA review. Native grassland patches greater than 0.3 acres within proposed development areas would require mitigation at a 3:1 ratio. Revegetation areas should avoid converting native grassland to other habitat types. A native grassland is defined as a grassland at least 0.3 acres in size that supports at least 50 percent cover of grass species and at least 10 percent cover of native grassland plant species. Delineated native grasslands conserved should be enhanced by controlling non-native species.

The City, PVPLC, Los Angeles County, and Wildlife Agencies would provide funds (\$27 million) for the purchase and dedication of approximately 684.5 acres of privately owned lands considered regionally important to the Reserve. The acreage is distributed as follows:

- 422.3-acre Portuguese Bend parcel (397.3 acres would be included in the Reserve, and 25 acres in the lower active landslide area would be an active recreation area outside of the Reserve that would serve as a public-access point to trails within the Reserve and could include an equestrian facility).
- 43.8-acre Agua Amarga Canyon parcel.
- 218.4 acres of Upper Filiorum parcel.

Approximately 690 acres of non-native grassland and disturbed habitats within the Reserve would be available for habitat restoration. The Subarea Plan has prioritized these potential restoration areas. The City and PVPLC have made a commitment to initiate restoration activities on at least 5 acres annually for the duration of the take permit. Additional restoration would occur as funding sources become available. The cost of habitat restoration is estimated at \$20,000 per acre (2003 dollars). Restoration costs would be reviewed annually and project impact fees adjusted accordingly. Because of Subarea Plan implementation, the inventory of scrub habitats within the Reserve would likely exceed the current amount present in the planning area, allowing for increased habitat carrying capacity for covered species and the opportunity to establish new populations of covered species currently absent from the area.

The City and PVPLC are responsible for funding the long-term habitat restoration, management, monitoring, and reporting programs of the Reserve. In lieu of an endowment, the City would commit \$100,000 per year (to be adjusted for inflation) and certain in-kind services to fulfill its obligations for management and maintenance. The PVPLC would commit \$25,000 per year (to be adjusted for inflation), certain in-kind services, and volunteer time to fulfill its obligations for management and maintenance. Approximately \$15,000 is currently available annually from existing open-space management funds.

### 5.1.5 Levels of Significance after Mitigation

Impacts to biological resources would be mitigated to below a level of significance through dedication of public and private lands supporting sensitive habitats and species and through providing for long-term restoration and management of conserved habitats to minimize chronic impacts associated with adjacent development areas and passive uses of the Reserve.

## 5.2 LAND USE AND RELEVANT PLANNING

The purpose of this section is to identify existing land use conditions, analyze project compatibility with existing and planned uses, evaluate project consistency with relevant planning policies, and recommend mitigation measures to reduce the significance of potential impacts. Information in this section is based on all relevant City, CCC, and SCAG land use plans and policies.

### 5.2.1 Existing Conditions/Environmental Setting

The 13.6-square-mile coastal community of Rancho Palos Verdes is on the southwest side of the Peninsula, which is bounded to the north by Rolling Hills Estates and Palos Verdes Estates and to the southeast by San Pedro, with the high-density urbanized core of South Bay communities farther to the north (see Figure 3-1). Figure 5.2-1 depicts existing land uses in the city.

#### 5.2.1.1 *Existing Land Uses*

Existing land uses in the city are dominated by low-density residential and vacant land. The proposed Reserve design includes approximately 1,504 acres, of which approximately 1,494 acres are vacant land. Table 5.2-1 depicts the acreages of existing land uses within the proposed Reserve area and Neutral Lands. Although Neutral Lands may contribute to Reserve function as natural open space sometime in the future, they are currently not accessible for active habitat management.

Land uses immediately adjacent to the largest portion of the Reserve boundaries consist primarily of low-density residential uses, some high- to medium-density residential uses, and the Pacific Ocean. Smaller portions of the Reserve are adjacent to public facilities and institutions, open space and recreation, and vacant land uses.

#### 5.2.1.2 *Relevant Plans and Policies*

##### 5.2.1.1.1 City of Rancho Palos Verdes General Plan

The City's General Plan, adopted on June 26, 1975, is organized into the following elements, all of which are relevant to the Proposed Project:

- *Natural Environment Element.* This element is a composite of areas requiring considerations of public health and safety and preservation of natural resources.

Insert Figure 5.2-1  
Existing Land Uses in Rancho Palos Verdes

**Table 5.2-1  
Existing Land Uses within  
City of Rancho Palos Verdes and Proposed Project**

Existing Land Use	Reserve Area	Neutral Lands	Outside Reserve	City Total
Agriculture	6.4	0	11.2	17.6
Commercial	0	0	115.1	115.1
Industrial	0	0	0.5	0.5
Low-Density Residential	0	0	4,535.4	4,535.4
Medium- to High-Density Residential	0	0	263	263
Open Space and Recreation	7.2	98.4	452.3	557.9
Public Facilities and Institutions	2.6	2.6	258.7	263.9
Transportation and Utilities	6.6	1.1	103.4	111.1
Under Construction	0	0	11.7	11.7
Vacant <sup>1</sup>	1,481.3	561.0	640.2	2,682.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,504.1</b>	<b>663.1</b>	<b>6391.5</b>	<b>8,558.7</b>

Source: SCAG, 1991, modified by Rancho Palos Verdes Planning Department.

1. Vacant lands are undeveloped lands that are not dedicated as open space.

- *Socio/Cultural Element.* This element identifies the City's goals and policies for preservation of its paleontological, historical, and archaeological resources and for social, service, and cultural organizations.
- *Urban Environment Element.* This element addresses concerns for city areas set aside for development, with consideration for natural environmental concerns. This element also provides goals and policies for circulation, noise, visual aspects, public services, and infrastructure.
- *Land Use Plan.* According to the General Plan, the City's Land Use Plan is a composite of the other elements and focuses on the City's overall development, conservation, and fiscal balance. According to the Land Use Plan, Overlay Control Districts are incorporated into the General Plan to further reduce impacts that could be induced by proposed and existing development in sensitive areas. Major disruptive treatment of these land areas would alter features, including significant natural, urban, and socio/cultural characteristics, that form the city's character and environment.

#### 5.2.1.1.2 Local Coastal Program

The California Coastal Act of 1976 (California Public Resources Code, Section 30000 et seq.) establishes policies guiding development and conservation along the California coast. Under the Coastal Act, the California Coastal Commission (CCC) requires local governments, such as the City, to prepare an LCP for areas within their jurisdiction that are within the Coastal Zone boundary. Portions of the proposed

Reserve area between the coastline and Palos Verdes Drive South and Palos Verdes Drive West are within the Coastal Zone as defined by the Coastal Act. The City has organized its LCP as follows:

- *Coastal Specific Plan (CSP)*. The required LCP Land Use Plan under the California Coastal Act is the City's CSP (as discussed below).
- *Implementing Actions Program*. The City's Development Code (Zoning Ordinance) is its primary Implementing Actions Program for its LCP unless a more detailed CSP is adopted and certified for a component area pursuant to the California Government Code, Section 65450 et seq. The City's Development Code is described below.

### 5.2.1.1.3 City of Rancho Palos Verdes Coastal Specific Plan

The CSP, adopted by the City Council on December 19, 1978, provides a series of policies to guide development, as well as protect natural features in the Coastal Zone along the 7.5 miles of coastline within the City's jurisdiction. Although the Subarea Plan contains focused policies directed toward native lands management, the CSP clearly contains similar elements, thereby enforcing and complementing Plan goals. As previously mentioned, the CSP serves not only as a local Specific Plan but also represents the City's local land use plan component of the LCP. The CSP is composed of five elements: the natural environment, socio-cultural, urban environment, corridors, and fiscal elements. Areas that share common characteristics within the CSP area are divided into eight subregions. Portions of the proposed Reserve area along the coast are in all subregions except Subregion 3.

### 5.2.1.1.4 City of Rancho Palos Verdes Municipal Code

The City's Zoning Ordinance, Title 17 of the Municipal Code, identifies land uses permitted and prohibited according to the zoning category of particular parcels. Zoning is the method the City uses to implement control of land uses in accordance with General Plan goals and policies. Designated land uses based on general zoning categories in the city include cemetery, residential, commercial, institutional, open space, and residential, as shown on Figure 5.2-2. Existing land use designations in acreages within the city and Reserve area boundaries are provided in Table 5.2-2.

In addition to these zoning categories, there are three overlay control districts in the city, each having specific purpose, application, and performance criteria identified in the City's Municipal Code. The overlay control districts are referred to as the "Natural Overlay Control District" (Title 17.40.040), "Socio-Cultural Overlay Control District" (Title 17.40.050), and "Urban Appearance Overlay Control District" (Title 17.40.060). All three districts are represented within the proposed Reserve area.

#### 5.2.1.1.4.1 *Natural Overlay Control District*

##### *Performance Criteria*

According to the City's zoning ordinance, development within the Natural Overlay Control District shall not:

1. Cover or alter the land surface configuration by moving earth on more than 10 percent of the total land area of the portion of the parcel within the district, excluding the main structure and access.

Figure 5.2-2  
Designated Land Uses

**Table 5.2-2  
Designated Land Uses**

Designated Land Use	Reserve Area	Neutral Lands	Outside Reserve	Grand Total
Cemetery	0	0.00	128.5	128.5
Commercial	0.1	6.4	173.4	179.9
Institutional	7.9	17.9	316.1	341.9
Open Space	838.8	354.0	613.3	1,806.1
Residential	657.3	284.8	5,160.2	6,102.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,504.1</b>	<b>663.1</b>	<b>6,391.5</b>	<b>8,558.7</b>

2. Alter the course, carrying capacity, or gradient of any natural watercourse or drainage course that can be calculated to carry over 100 cubic feet per second once in 10 years.
3. Fill, drain, or alter the shape or quality of any water body, spring, or related natural spreading area of greater than 1 acre.
4. Develop otherwise permitted uses within 50 feet of the edge of a watercourse or drainage course that can be calculated to carry more than 500 cubic feet per second once in 10 years.
5. Clear the vegetation from more than 20 percent of the area of the portion of the parcel within the district or remove by thinning more than 20 percent of the vegetation on the parcel, excluding dead material and excluding those brush-clearance activities necessary for fire protection.
6. Use herbicides to control or kill vegetation.
7. Remove vegetation within a designated wildlife habitat area.
8. Cover more than 20 percent of a parcel known to contain sand, gravel, or other materials that may aid natural beach replenishment.
9. Alter the characteristics of the surface soils to allow surface water to stand for over 12 hours; make the soil inadequate as a bearing surface for pedestrian, equestrian, bicycle, or motorized emergency vehicle access; or make the soil unstable and subject to sliding, slipping, or water or wind erosion.
10. Result in chemicals, nutrients, or particulate contaminants or siltation being discharged, by stormwater or other runoff, into a natural or manmade drainage course leading to the ocean or any other natural or manmade body of water.
11. Propose a sewer or wastewater disposal system involving spreading, injecting, or percolating effluent into the ocean or soil of a natural or manmade drainage course if alternative locations are available.
12. Alter, penetrate, block, or create erosion or significant change of the area within 100 feet of an ocean beach or top edge of an ocean bluff or cliff.
13. Alter, penetrate, block, or create erosion on the shoreline measured at mean high tide or alter the characteristics of the intertidal marine environment.
14. Alter, dredge, fill, or penetrate by drilling the ocean floor within City jurisdiction.

15. Alter any land area that has experienced massive downslope movement to reactivate or create conditions that could lead to the reactivation of downslope movement.

#### *5.2.1.1.4.2 Socio-Cultural Overlay District*

##### *Performance Criteria*

According to the City's zoning ordinance, development within the Socio-Cultural Overlay Control District shall not:

1. Result in the blockage or impeding of views and controlled physical access by easement or passage to land and water areas, as well as improvements, covered by this chapter when such views or access are deemed critical to the historical, archaeological, paleontological, scientific, or educational value of the designated site, areas, or improvement.
2. Be related to development of otherwise permitted uses in lands adjacent to and surrounding areas in the district in such a way as to prevent proper functioning of such permitted uses without significant exception to these performance standards, thus tying this district to other uses in a nonseverable manner.
3. Result in modifications to terrain, vegetation, or other natural features that serve to protect designated archaeological and paleontological sites and sensitive areas from the effects of wind and other climatic factors, including natural or manmade water runoff, or that would similarly alter adjacent lands within 200 feet of the boundaries of lands covered by this district in such a way as to render lands within the district susceptible to such impacts.
4. Result in the use or conversions of such designated historical, archaeological, paleontological, scientific, or educational lands, water, or improvements as commercial profit-making ventures open to the general public without application of specific approval and control by the City over hours, types, intensities, purposes, fees, and other operations of such areas or facilities, including organized tours by motor vehicle, bicycle, pedestrian, or boat.
5. Result in the provision of inadequate security protection against vandalism or uncontrolled public exposure to archaeological or paleontological sites under excavation or study, historic structures, or areas undergoing renovation or maintenance, or scientific or educational research being conducted on site.

#### *5.2.1.1.4.3 Urban Appearance Overlay Control District*

##### *Performance Criteria*

According to the City's zoning ordinance, development within the Urban Appearance Overlay Control District shall not:

1. Result in the change in elevation of the land or construction of any improvement that would block, alter, or impair major views, vistas, or viewsheds in existence from designated view corridors, view sites, or view points at the dates of adoption of the General Plan and the CSP in such a way as to materially and irrevocably alter the quality of the view as to arc (horizontal and vertical), primary orientation, or other characteristics.

## **SECTION FIVE**

---

2. Cause removal or significant alteration of structural focal points and natural focal points as defined and designated in the General Plan.
3. Cause the mass and finish grading or any topographic alteration that results in uniform, geometrically terraced building sites contrary to the natural land forms that would substantially detract from the scenic and visual quality of the city, be contrary to the grading criteria contained in Section 17.76.040 (grading permit), or substantially change the natural characteristics of a drainage course, identified natural vegetation, or wildlife habitat area.
4. Create site plans, building, or other improvement designs that would result in other significant changes to the natural topography or prevent or hinder the use of naturalized minimum grading techniques to restore an area to its natural contours.
5. Grade any area or remove vegetation from such an area without replacing such areas with properly drained, impervious surfaces or suitable vegetation within six months of the commencement of such activities.
6. Propose the use of any vegetative materials incompatible with the visual, climatic, soil, and ecological characteristics of the city or that require excessive water.
7. Create a cut or embankment with a slope greater than 3 feet horizontal to 1 foot vertical (3:1) and more than 15 feet in total elevation adjacent to a publicly maintained right-of-way or area unless an agreement with the City for the vegetation and perpetual maintenance of such slope at no cost to the City is executed and bonded.
8. Result in changes in topography or the construction of improvements that would block, alter, or otherwise materially change significant views, vistas, and viewshed areas available from major private residential areas of the community that characterize the visual appearance, urban form, and economic value of these areas.

### ***5.2.1.1.4.4 Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide***

SCAG is the Metropolitan Planning Organization for six southern California counties: Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura, and Imperial. As the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization, SCAG is mandated by the federal government to research and create plans for transportation, growth management, hazardous waste management, and air quality. SCAG reviews the consistency of local plans, projects, and programs with regional plans. Guidance provided by SCAG is intended to assist local agencies and project sponsors to take actions that contribute to the attainment of regional goals and policies.

The Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) prepared by SCAG addresses growth, conservation, and development goals applicable to the Proposed Project. The SCAG Growth Management Chapter of the RCPG identifies goals and policies relevant to the Proposed Project.

## 5.2.2 Environmental Impacts/Environmental Consequences

### 5.2.2.1 *Criteria for Determining Significance*

Pursuant to Appendix G, Environmental Checklist of the CEQA Guidelines, a project would normally have a significant impact on land use and planning if it:

- divides physically an established community,
- conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purposes of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, or
- conflicts with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

### 5.2.2.2 *Established Community*

The City has identified 21 City projects and 9 private projects that would occur within and outside the Reserve boundaries. These projects would result in approximately 48.9 acres of unavoidable loss of CSS (refer to Tables 5.1-3 and 5.1-4 in Section 5.1). Although these projects have been identified in the Subarea Plan for potential development, each individual project would be required to undergo separate CEQA review by the City. As required by the Subarea Plan, CSS impacts resulting from these projects would be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio, with a combination of either onsite restoration, offsite habitat acquisition, or restoration. Because the Subarea Plan does not propose development projects, its implementation would not physically divide the surrounding residential communities but would contribute toward preserving the physical setting and character of the communities; therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

### 5.2.2.3 *Relevant Plans and Policies*

Project consistency with relevant policies of applicable land use plans is presented in Table 5.2-3 at the end of Section 5.2.2.3.

#### 5.2.2.3.1 *City of Rancho Palos Verdes General Plan*

The Subarea Plan would be implemented via a 50-year IA among the City, PVPLC, CDFG, and USFWS. For its part, the City would amend the relevant elements of the General Plan to incorporate the Subarea Plan by reference. As part of the Proposed Project, the City would amend relevant sections of the Rancho Palos Verdes General Plan to:

- identify all Reserve lands and their attendant land use restrictions and
- incorporate the Subarea Plan as part of the General Plan.

Table 5.2-3 provides a consistency analysis of the Proposed Project with relevant goals and policies required by the City's General Plan Elements. As shown in the table, the Subarea Plan would be consistent with General Plan goals and policies; therefore, no significant land use impacts would occur from implementation of the Proposed Project.

## **SECTION FIVE**

---

### **5.2.2.3.2 City of Rancho Palos Verdes Coastal Specific Plan**

Table 5.2-3 provides a consistency analysis of the Proposed Project with relevant goals and policies required by the City's CSP. As shown in the table, the Subarea Plan would be consistent with all City CSP goals and policies. The Subarea Plan also proposes to amend the Coastal Permit process (Municipal Code, Section 17.70.020 et seq.) to ensure that Subarea Plan provisions are incorporated into the evaluation process before issuance of any coastal permits. Based on the analysis provided in Table 5.2-3, the Proposed Project would not result in significant land use impacts.

### **5.2.2.3.3 City of Rancho Palos Verdes Municipal Code**

Most of the proposed Reserve area is zoned for open-space and residential uses, with a very small amount of commercial and institutional uses. Preservation and maintenance of open space under the Subarea Plan is consistent with open-space zoning within the Reserve boundaries. Areas within the proposed Reserve not currently zoned as open space would be converted to designated open space under the Proposed Project. Most of these lands are within the Natural Overlay Control District. Conversion of other land use designations to open space would not be a significant land use impact, because it would be consistent with Municipal Code regulations established to avoid or mitigate environmental effects (i.e., the overlay control districts).

Designating land uses within the proposed Reserve area as open space would be compatible with surrounding land uses, which are primarily low-density residential. The PUMP would be developed jointly by the City and PVPLC within two years after signing the Implementing Agreement to address issues such as public access, fencing, lighting (if any), fire and brush management, and minimizing impacts to adjacent neighborhoods; therefore, no significant land use impacts to areas adjacent to the Reserve would be expected.

#### ***5.2.2.3.3.1 Natural Overlay Control, Socio-Cultural Overlay Control, and Urban Appearance Overlay Districts***

The Proposed Project would be consistent with Natural Overlay District performance criteria except for that which does not allow use of herbicides. As discussed in Section 5.1, integrated pest-management approaches outlined in the Subarea Plan would minimize impacts and result in an overall beneficial effect to biological resources; therefore, this inconsistency would not be a significant land use impact. Because the Subarea Plan proposes a higher level of conservation than provided by the performance criteria, the City, where necessary, would modify these criteria where they would conflict with the Subarea Plan.

Other components of the City's Municipal Code that may require amendments to conform to Subarea Plan provisions include the Grading Ordinance (Municipal Code, Section 15.04.010), Fire Code (Municipal Code, Section 8.08), Site Plan Review process (Municipal Code, Section 17.70.020), and Zoning Map (Municipal Code Section 17.88).

#### ***5.2.2.3.3.2 Grading Ordinance***

The City would amend the Grading Ordinance to ensure that all proposed actions conform to Subarea Plan provisions before issuance of any clearing or grubbing permits.

**5.2.2.3.3.3 Fire Code**

At no time would Subarea Plan provisions take precedence over the concerns of public health, safety, and welfare as determined by the L.A. County Fire Department in consultation with the Wildlife Agencies. The City would consult with the L.A. County Fire Department to ensure that proposed fuel zone widths adjacent to the Reserve are adequate. The City's Fire Code would be amended to reflect this.

**5.2.2.3.3.4 Site Plan Review Process**

The City would amend the Site Plan Review process to ensure that Subarea Plan provisions are incorporated into it.

**5.2.2.3.3.5 Zoning Map**

The City's Zoning Map, which is established by the Zoning Code, would be amended to incorporate the boundaries of the Reserve and to reflect any changes to the Overlay Control Districts.

**5.2.2.3.3.6 Subdivision Ordinance**

The City would amend its Subdivision Ordinance to ensure subdivisions conform to Subarea Plan provisions.

**5.2.2.3.4 Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide**

The SCAG Growth Management Chapter of the RCPG identifies goals and policies relevant to the Proposed Project. As indicated in Table 5.2-3, the Subarea Plan would be consistent with these goals and policies; therefore, significant land use impacts related to the RCPG would not occur.

**5.2.3 Cumulative Impacts**

Implementation of the Proposed Project would contribute to open-space preservation because the Subarea Plan takes a regional conservation approach to protect sensitive species and their habitats. Regional conservation implements a proactive approach by identifying areas suitable for conservation and areas suitable for development before future projects are proposed, thereby reducing adverse cumulative impacts to sensitive species. Without the Proposed Project, impacts of future proposals to open space would be evaluated case-by-case without a regional baseline from which to analyze the impacts. The Proposed Project, in combination with other past, current, and future projects, would therefore not result in a significant cumulative impact.

**5.2.4 Mitigation Measures**

Because no significant land use impacts were identified, mitigation measures are not provided.

**5.2.5 Levels of Significance after Mitigation**

Because no significant land use impacts were identified, mitigation measures are not provided.

**Table 5.2-3  
Consistency with Applicable  
Plans and Policies**

ID No.	Applicable Goal/Objective	Project Consistency Discussion
<b>RANCHO PALOS VERDES GENERAL PLAN</b>		
<b>Natural Environment Element</b>		
<b>Goal A</b>	It is the goal of the City of Rancho Palos Verdes to conserve, protect, and enhance its natural resources, beauty, and open space for the benefit and enjoyment of its residents and the residents of the entire region. Future development shall recognize the sensitivity of the natural environmental and be accomplished in such a manner as to maximize the protection of it.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project would provide for comprehensive management and conservation of multiple species and approximately 1,435 acres of natural habitat, which would protect the city's natural resources, open space, and passive recreational opportunities.
<b>Policy 2</b>	Allow only low-intensity activities within Resource Management Districts of extreme slopes (RM 2).	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project does not include any development projects within its boundaries or on areas of extreme slopes. The Subarea Plan allows only low-intensity activities, such as infrastructure improvements, habitat management, and passive recreation, within the proposed Reserve area.
<b>Policy 4</b>	Allow no further development involving any human occupancy within the active landslide area (RM 4).	<b>Consistent.</b> Development activities are not included in the Proposed Project. Individual future projects identified in the Subarea Plan would be required to undergo separate CEQA review by the City.
<b>Policy 14</b>	Maintain the existing natural vegetation of the City in its natural state to the maximum extent possible in all existing and proposed developments, to the extent commensurate with good fire protection policies and encourage the re-establishment of appropriate native plants.	<b>Consistent.</b> See discussion for Goal A of the Natural Environment Element.  Any recreational activities or improvements that can occur within the Reserve would be subject to a PUMP, which would address fire- and brush-management measures to minimize fire hazards. Additionally, the Fire Code ensures that before issuance of building permits, all proposed actions are reviewed for consistency with the Fire Code.
<b>Policy 16</b>	Require all projects with any natural resource management district factors falling within their project boundaries to deal with these areas in detail in an Environmental Impact Report.	<b>Consistent.</b> See discussion for Policy 4 of the Natural Environment Element, above.
<b>Overall Policy 7</b>	Encourage study of and funding to preserve unusual flora and fauna.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Subarea Plan would be implemented through use of public and private funding to preserve endangered and sensitive species within city boundaries.

# SECTION FIVE

## Description of Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

ID No.	Applicable Goal/Objective	Project Consistency Discussion
<b>Socio/Cultural Element</b>		
<b>Goal A</b>	It is the goal of the City to preserve and protect its cultural resources and to promote programs to meet the social needs of its citizens.	<b>Consistent.</b> The preservation of habitats resulting from the Subarea Plan would protect potential cultural resources within the Reserve boundaries, which would allow the city more opportunities to promote programs, such as passive recreational activities, to meet social needs of the community.
<b>Cultural Resources</b>		
<b>Goal A</b>	The City shall strive to protect and preserve all significant archaeological, paleontological and historical resources within the City.	<b>Consistent.</b> The preservation of habitats resulting from the Subarea Plan would protect potential cultural resources within the Reserve boundaries.
<b>Policy 2</b>	Encourage the identification of archaeologically sensitive areas and sites.	<b>Consistent.</b> Archaeologically sensitive areas and sites would be identified during CEQA review of individual future projects within or outside the proposed Reserve area.
<b>Policy 3</b>	Require all projects for new construction, subdivisions, conditional use permits, and variances that occur in archaeologically sensitive areas to have a special archaeological component in their Environmental Impact Reports.	<b>Consistent.</b> See discussion for Policy 4 of the Natural Environment Element, above.
<b>Policy 4</b>	Forward Environmental Impact Reports to the University of California at Los Angeles, the Society for California Archaeology's (SCA) Clearinghouse for this area, and to California State College at Dominguez Hills.	<b>Consistent.</b> This EIR/EA will be sent to all relevant agencies.
<b>Current Social, Service, and Cultural Organizations</b>		
<b>Policy 1</b>	Provide leadership in coordinating a cooperative approach to solving the need for community meetings, cultural events, and recreational facilities.	<b>Consistent.</b> An RTP would be developed jointly by the City and PVPLC to address recreational issues, such as public access, trailhead locations, overlooks, and trail use.
<b>Policy 4</b>	Encourage the building of playing fields for multiple uses by various recreational groups on City land, school sites, and private land, which has not yet been programmed for development.	<b>Consistent.</b> Although playing fields would not be included in the proposed Reserve area, no existing active recreational facilities would be affected by the Proposed Project. Acreage would be available outside the Reserve to provide for the City's active recreation needs.
<b>Social Services</b>		
<b>Policy 8</b>	Develop recreational programs that will address the recreational needs of all citizens, both individually and in groups. This should include the development of a set of criteria, which will enable the City to project and evaluate the	<b>Consistent.</b> Any recreational programs considered within the Subarea Plan boundaries would be developed jointly by the City and PVPLC. Recreational issues to be addressed in an RTP include public access, trailhead locations, overlooks,

# SECTION FIVE

## Description of Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

ID No.	Applicable Goal/Objective	Project Consistency Discussion
	implications of its decisions as to the long-range effectiveness of these programs.	and trail use.
Policy 12	Place special emphasis on the cultural, educational, and recreational needs of individuals, families, and the community and encourage the expansion of existing programs in these areas.	<b>Consistent.</b> See discussion for Goal A of the Natural Environment Element, above.
<b>Urban Environment Element</b>		
Goal A	It is the goal of the City to carefully control and direct future growth towards making a positive contribution to all elements of the community. Growth in Rancho Palos Verdes should be a cautious, evolutionary process that follows a well-conceived set of general guidelines which respond to both holding capacity limitations for the region and environmental factors on the peninsula.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Subarea Plan directs future growth by providing regional comprehensive management and conservation of multiple species and habitats, in addition to identifying areas for existing and future development projects.
<b>Activity Areas</b>		
Goal B	The City shall discourage industrial and major commercial activities due to the terrain and environmental characteristics of the City. Commercial development shall be carefully and strictly controlled, and limited to consideration of convenience or neighborhood service facilities.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project discourages industrial and commercial development by setting aside lands for a biological reserve.
Goal D	The City shall endeavor to provide, develop, and maintain recreational facilities and programs of various types to provide a variety of activities for persons of all age groups and in all areas of the community.	<b>Consistent.</b> See discussion for Policy 4 – Current, Social, Service, and Cultural Organizations of the Socio/Cultural Element.
Goal E	Agricultural uses within the City shall be encouraged, since they are desirable for resource management and open space.	<b>Consistent.</b> Existing agricultural uses within the proposed Reserve area would be compatible uses under the Subarea Plan.
Policy 11	Control the alteration of natural terrain.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project would provide for comprehensive management and conservation of approximately 1,435 acres of natural habitat.
Policy 15	Enforce height controls to further lessen the possibility for view obstructions.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Subarea Plan does not propose development that would obstruct views in the city. The Proposed Project would protect views through preservation of natural open space.
Policy 17	Make an effort through zoning, cooperation with other governmental entities, and acquisition to preserve the rural and open character of the City.	<b>Consistent.</b> Establishment of the proposed Reserve area would contribute to preservation of the rural and open character of the city.

# SECTION FIVE

## Description of Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

ID No.	Applicable Goal/Objective	Project Consistency Discussion
Policy 18	Allow no further development involving any human occupancy within the active landslide area.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project discourages development in areas with steep slopes and high fire, flood, and seismic hazards through establishment of a Reserve area.
<i>Recreational Activity</i>		
Policy 1	Provide access to all public recreational land.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project would not affect access to public recreational land. The Subarea Plan establishes compatible land uses within the proposed Reserve area that include maintenance of existing public recreational uses.
Policy 4	Establish ordinances to require builders and developers to provide lands and/or funds for acquisition and development of land for recreational use. These lands and/or funds shall be based on a standard of providing 4 acres of local parkland per 1000 population.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Subarea Plan would be implemented through partial use of private funding to preserve habitats within city boundaries, thereby providing land for passive recreational uses.
Policy 5	Seek County, State, and Federal funds or sharing funds to acquire lands.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Subarea Plan would be implemented with public and private funding to acquire open space within city boundaries.
Policy 6	Encourage landholders to contribute lands to the City for recreational use.	<b>Consistent.</b> See discussion for Policy 4 - Recreational Activity of the Urban Environment Element, above.
Policy 11	Encourage public use of institutional recreational facilities, where possible.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Subarea Plan includes creation and maintenance of passive recreational uses for public use. The Proposed Project would not affect any existing public active recreation areas.
<i>Agricultural Activity</i>		
Policy 1	Encourage implementation techniques for preservation of agricultural activities.	<b>Consistent.</b> Existing agricultural uses within the proposed Reserve area would be compatible uses under the Subarea Plan.
Policy 2	Assist in the protection or conservation of agricultural sites.	<b>Consistent.</b> See discussion for Policy 1 - Agricultural Activity of the Urban Environment Element, above.
<i>Disposal/Recovery System</i>		
Policy 3	Encourage the retention of all remaining natural watercourses in their natural state.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Subarea Plan would protect and enhance natural watercourses within the proposed Reserve area.

# SECTION FIVE

## Description of Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

ID No.	Applicable Goal/Objective	Project Consistency Discussion
<i>Transportation Systems</i>		
Policy 6	Design path and trail networks to reflect both a local and regional demand, while maintaining the unique character of the Peninsula.	<b>Consistent.</b> See discussion for Policy 1 – Current Social, Service, and Cultural Organizations of the Socio/Cultural Element.
Policy 7	Require, wherever practical, all path and trail networks to be in separate rights-of-way.	<b>Consistent.</b> See discussion for Policy 1 – Current Social, Service, and Cultural Organizations of the Socio/Cultural Element.
Policy 11	Further investigate possible funding sources for acquisition, development and maintenance of paths and trails.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project would be implemented with public and private funding to acquire and manage open habitats within city boundaries. A portion of the funds would be dedicated to path and trail maintenance.
Policy 15	Encourage the establishment of a program designed to educate users and non-users of path and trail networks in terms of safety and courtesy.	<b>Consistent.</b> The RTP would include measures to educate users of path and trail networks about safety and courtesy.
Policy 16	Ensure public access to the Rancho Palos Verdes shoreline.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project would ensure public access to the shoreline within the Reserve in accordance with the PUMP.
Policy 22	Reflect the elements of the City's Conceptual Trails Plan in appropriate City processes and procedures depending on trails categories and status as defined in the Conceptual Trails Plan.	<b>Consistent.</b> The RTP would reflect the elements of the City's Conceptual Trails Plan.
Policy 23	Design and construct trails in accordance with U.S. Forest Service standards wherever possible.	<b>Consistent.</b> The RTP would require consideration of appropriate design standards, including U.S. Forest Service standards.
Policy 24	Construct trails to have a minimal impact on the environment.	<b>Consistent.</b> The RTP would focus on providing trails that minimize impacts to habitats and covered species.
Policy 25	Align trails to provide maximum access to scenic resources.	<b>Consistent.</b> Access to scenic resources would be addressed in the RTP.
<i>Safety</i>		
Policy 17	Ensure the protection of compatible levels of wild animal populations.	<b>Consistent.</b> Long-term protection of species population levels is a primary goal of the Subarea Plan. Current status of population levels for sensitive species is identified to provide a basis for future conservation efforts.
<i>Sensory Environment</i>		
Goal A	It shall be the goal of the City of Rancho Palos Verdes through proper land use planning and regulations, to provide for a quiet and serene	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project would preserve approximately 1,435 acres of natural habitat adjacent to residential neighborhoods, thereby

# SECTION FIVE

## Description of Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

ID No.	Applicable Goal/Objective	Project Consistency Discussion
	residential community with a minimum of restriction on citizen activity.	providing for a quiet and serene residential community.
<b>Goal B</b>	Palos Verdes peninsula is graced with views and vistas of the surrounding Los Angeles basin and coastal region. Because of its unique geographic form and coastal resources, these views and vistas are a significant resource to residents and to many visitors, as they provide a rare means of experiencing the beauty of the peninsula and the Los Angeles region. It is the responsibility of the City to preserve these views and vistas for the public benefit and, where appropriate, the City should strive to enhance and restore these resources, the visual character of the City, and provide and maintain access for the benefit and enjoyment of the public.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project would maintain views and vistas by ensuring preservation and protection of habitats.
<i>Noise</i>		
<b>Policy 3</b>	Regulate land use so that there is a minimal degree of noise impact on adjacent land uses.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project would not introduce new noise sources to adjacent land uses.
<i>Visual Aspects</i>		
<b>Policy 1</b>	Develop controls to preserve existing significant visual aspects from future disruption or degradation.	<b>Consistent.</b> See Goal B of the Urban Environment Element, above.
<b>Policy 3</b>	Preserve and enhance existing positive visual elements while restoring those, which are lacking in their present visual quality.	<b>Consistent.</b> See Goal B of the Urban Environment Element, above.
<b>Policy 6</b>	Develop and maintain, in conjunction with appropriate agencies, public access to paths and trail networks for the enjoyment of related views.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project would create and maintain a recreational trail system consistent with the City's CTP.
<b>Land Use Plan</b>		
<b>Goal A</b>	It is the goal of the City of Rancho Palos Verdes to provide for land uses which will be sensitive to and enhance the natural environment and character of the community, supply appropriate facilities to serve residents and visitors, promote a range of housing types, promote fiscal balance, and protect the general health, safety, and welfare of the community.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project would enhance the city's natural environment and community character through preservation of approximately 1,435 acres of natural habitat. Additionally, although the Subarea Plan does not propose development, it allows for public infrastructure improvements.

# SECTION FIVE

## Description of Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

ID No.	Applicable Goal/Objective	Project Consistency Discussion
<b>Fiscal Element</b>		
<b>Goal C</b>	It shall be a goal of the City to take maximum advantage of regulatory legislation to obtain contributions, dedications and reservations (i.e., easements).	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project would be implemented with public and private funding to acquire open habitats within city boundaries.
<b>COASTAL SPECIFIC PLAN</b>		
<b>Natural Environment Element</b>		
<b>Policy 1</b>	Allow only low intensity activities within Coastal Resource Management districts of extreme (35% or greater) slopes (CRM-1).	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project does not include development activities and would result in low-intensity uses (i.e., habitat protection and passive recreation) in District CRM-1 within the proposed Reserve area.
<b>Policy 2</b>	Require any development within the Coastal Resource Management Districts of high slopes (CRM 2) and insufficient information area (CRM 5) to perform at least one, and preferably two, independent engineering studies (performed by a licensed engineer) concerning the geotechnical, soils, and other stability factors (including seismic considerations) affecting the site.	<b>Consistent.</b> Development activities are not included in the Proposed Project. Individual future projects identified in the Subarea Plan would be required to undergo separate CEQA review by the City.
<b>Policy 3</b>	Allow no permanent structures within Coastal Resource Management Districts of extreme hazard (CRM 3A) and be cautious of allowing human passage. The same structural limitation applies to areas of high hazard (CRM 3B) but human passage may be more readily allowed.	<b>Consistent.</b> See discussion for Policy 2 of the Natural Environment Element of the CSP, above.
<b>Policy 4</b>	Allow non-residential structures not requiring significant excavation or grading (i.e., recreational facilities) within Coastal Resource Management Districts of marginal stable areas (CRM 4) and insufficient information areas (CRM 5).	<b>Consistent.</b> See discussion for Policy 2 of the Natural Environment Element of the CSP, above.
<b>Policy 6</b>	Allow no grading or structural encroachments into areas within a flood/inundation hazard Coastal Resource Management District (CRM 7)	<b>Consistent.</b> See discussion for Policy 2 of the Natural Environment Element of the CSP, above.
<b>Policy 7</b>	Prohibit activities which create excessive silt, pollutant runoff, increase canyon-wall erosion, or potential for landslide, within or affecting Coastal Resource Management Districts containing Hydrologic Factors (CRM 8).	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project, which involves conservation of natural open space, would not create excessive silt or pollutant runoff or increase canyon-wall erosion or the potential for landslide.
<b>Policy 12</b>	Consider the acquisition of rights over the offshore tidelands area along the City's coastline if future conditions warrant.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Subarea Plan, which includes offshore tidelands, would be implemented with public and private funding at the State and Federal levels.

# SECTION FIVE

## Description of Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

ID No.	Applicable Goal/Objective	Project Consistency Discussion
<b>Socio/Cultural Element</b>		
<b>Policy 2 Socio</b>	Work with other governmental agencies to facilitate common objectives in a manner which is harmonious with the local community.	<b>Consistent.</b> An IA would be entered into by the City, CDFG, and USFWS regarding implementation of the Subarea Plan, which would contribute to goals of the local community.
<b>Policy 1 Cultural</b>	Consider implementation of appropriate measures to protect the identified cultural resources.	<b>Consistent.</b> The preservation of habitats resulting from the Proposed Project would protect potential cultural resources within the Reserve boundaries.
<b>Urban Environment Element</b>		
<b>Policy 1 Recreation</b>	Provide access to all public recreational land.	<b>Consistent.</b> Public access to recreational areas would be maintained by the Proposed Project. The RTP would address public access, trailhead locations, overlooks, and trail use within the proposed Reserve area.
<b>Policy 3</b>	Encourage local, public, non-profit recreation and cultural activities, which provide outlets for citizens on a non-discriminatory basis.	<b>Consistent.</b> Passive recreational activities allowable under the Subarea Plan would be made available to all citizens on a non-discriminatory basis.
<b>Policy 6</b>	Encourage landholders to contribute lands to the City for recreational use.	<b>Consistent.</b> Subject to approval, approximately 183 acres of private land would be converted to biological open space, which would be available for passive recreational uses under the Subarea Plan.
<b>REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND GUIDE</b>		
<b>Growth Management</b>		
<b>Policy 3.18</b>	Encourage planned development in locations least likely to cause environmental impact.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project encourages planned development outside of regionally important habitat areas and linkages through establishment of a Reserve area.
<b>Policy 3.20</b>	Support the protection of vital resources such as wetlands, groundwater recharge areas, woodlands, production lands, and land containing unique and endangered plants and animals.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project would provide for comprehensive management and conservation of multiple species and approximately 1,435 acres of natural habitat, which would protect the city's natural resources. Potential wetland impacts for individual projects would continue to be regulated through the CWA (Section 404 et seq.), California Fish and Game Code (Section 1600 et seq.), and local regulations.
<b>Policy 3.21</b>	Encourage the implementation of measures aimed at the preservation and protection of recorded and unrecorded cultural resources and archaeological sites.	<b>Consistent.</b> Preservation of habitats resulting from the Subarea Plan would protect potential cultural resources within the Reserve boundaries.
<b>Policy 3.22</b>	Discourage development, or encourage the use	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project discourages

# SECTION FIVE

## Description of Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

ID No.	Applicable Goal/Objective	Project Consistency Discussion
	of special design requirements, in areas with steep slopes, high fire, flood, and seismic hazards.	development in areas with steep slopes and high fire, flood, and seismic hazards through establishment of a Reserve area.
Policy 3.23	Encourage mitigation measures that reduce noise in certain locations, measures aimed at preservation of biological and ecological resources, measures that would reduce exposure to seismic hazards, minimize earthquake damage, and to develop emergency response and recovery plans.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Subarea Plan is designed to mitigate cumulative impacts through preservation of biological and ecological resources.
<b>Open-Space Ancillary</b>		
Goal 9.01	Provide adequate land resources to meet the outdoor recreation needs of the present and future residents in the region and to promote tourism in the region.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Subarea Plan establishes compatible uses within the proposed Reserve area, which includes creation and maintenance of passive recreational uses. The Proposed Project would not affect any existing public active recreation areas.
Goal 9.02	Increase the accessibility to open space lands for outdoor recreation.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project includes creation and maintenance of a recreational trail system consistent with the City's Conceptual Trails Plan.
Goal 9.03	Promote self-sustaining regional recreation resources and facilities.	<b>Consistent.</b> See discussion for Policy 9.01 – Open Space Ancillary Goals of the RCPG, above.
Goal 9.04	Maintain open space for adequate protection of lives and properties against natural and man-made hazards.	<b>Consistent.</b> Approximately 1,435 acres of open space would be maintained with implementation of the Proposed Project, thereby protecting lives and properties against natural and manmade hazards.
Goal 9.05	Minimize potentially hazardous developments in hillsides, canyons, areas susceptible to flooding, earthquakes, wildfire and other known hazards, and areas with limited access for emergency equipment.	<b>Consistent.</b> See discussion for Policy 3.22 – Growth Management of the RCPG, above.
Goal 9.07	Maintain adequate viable resource production land, particularly lands devoted to commercial agriculture and mining operations.	<b>Consistent.</b> Existing agricultural uses within the proposed Reserve area would be compatible uses under the Subarea Plan.
Goal 9.08	Develop well-managed viable ecosystems or known habitats of rare, threatened and endangered species, including wetlands.	<b>Consistent.</b> See discussion for Policy 3.20 – Growth Management of the RCPG, above.
<b>Water Quality</b>		
Policy 11.07	Encourage water reclamation throughout the region where it is cost-effective, feasible, and appropriate to reduce reliance on imported water and wastewater discharges. Current administrative impediments to increased use of wastewater should be addressed.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Proposed Project would be subject to Title 15.34.010 of the Municipal Code, which establishes standards and procedures for design, installation, and management of water-conserving landscapes.

## **SECTION FIVE**

### **5.3 RECREATION**

This section discusses existing recreational facilities, including parks, golf courses, paths, trails, and beach access. Recommendations for new facilities or facility improvements included in applicable City plans are also identified. The impact analysis in this section addresses potential impacts with respect to increased usage of existing facilities, physical effects of proposed recreational uses, and compliance with City plans and policies.

#### **5.3.1 Existing Conditions/Environmental Setting**

Both the private and public sectors provide recreational activities in Rancho Palos Verdes. The private sector provides facilities such as a golf course, tennis courts, equestrian centers, and beach clubs to individuals who either pay a fee or are members of the club operating the facility. The City, County of Los Angeles, and Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District provide public recreational facilities.

Recreational facilities in Rancho Palos Verdes are grouped into active or passive recreation areas. Active recreation areas are highly structured facilities designed with specific activity areas, such as recreation buildings, tennis courts, baseball fields, and children's playgrounds. Passive recreational areas are mostly unstructured to minimize disturbance to natural areas and promote compatible uses, such as trail use by hikers, bicyclists, and equestrians; nature viewing, and limited picnicking. There are no developed or improved public recreational facilities on any of the properties proposed to be included in the Reserve, with the exception of an informal archery range and areas modified by bicyclists. All of the areas proposed to be included in the Reserve presently support passive recreational uses such as trail use and picnicking. Although there are some publicly dedicated trails, most of the trails on the lands slated to be in the Reserve are unimproved, non-dedicated trails, which are used by hikers, bicycle riders and equestrians. There is no data available as to how many persons currently use the trails within the lands that are proposed to be in the Reserve.

##### **5.3.1.1 Existing Parks/Recreational Facilities**

Existing parks and other recreational facilities in Rancho Palos Verdes are shown on Figure 5.3-1. Table 5.3-1 presents the acreage, ownership, and types of recreational uses (active or passive) provided at each facility. As indicated in Table 5.3-1, the City maintains nearly 20 recreation facilities totaling over 550 acres. The County of Los Angeles operates one park and one golf course in the city totaling 197 acres. Ocean Trails Golf Course is a 108-acre facility open to the public. Approximately 75 acres of public open space within the golf course is planned for dedication to the City. A total of 273.5 acres of the facilities in the city are dedicated for active recreational uses, and approximately 488 acres are devoted to passive recreational uses.

##### **5.3.1.2 Relevant Plans and Policies**

###### **5.3.1.2.1 General Plan**

According to the City's General Plan, path and trail networks in Rancho Palos Verdes function as linear recreation facilities, as well as transportation facilities, and provide a connection between recreational open space and other activity areas. The General Plan classifies the components of the path and trails network as bikeways, walkways, potential beach access, and equestrian trails.

## **SECTION FIVE**

### **5.3.1.2.1.1 Bikeways**

The proposed bikeway network in the General Plan, designed to provide for transportation and recreation needs, consists of approximate concentric loops, several bypasses along the loops, and radial branches connecting the primary loops. Suggested alignments of these bikeways are shown on Figure 20 of the General Plan (City of Rancho Palos Verdes, 1975). A major component of the bikeways network in Rancho Palos Verdes is the Peninsula Loop, an informal route frequently used by cyclists to circle the Peninsula. The suggested alignment includes Palos Verdes Drive West, Palos Verdes Drive South/25th Street, Western Avenue, and Palos Verdes Drive North. Three bypasses are identified along the Peninsula Loop alignment to provide scenic and coastal bluff access.

The other major component of the bikeway network is the Hilltop bikeway loop, which is situated near the geographical center of the Peninsula and includes portions of Rancho Palos Verdes and Rolling Hills Estates. The approximate alignment of the Hilltop bikeway loop includes Hawthorne Boulevard, Crest Road, Crenshaw Boulevard, and Indian Peak Road. Two bypasses are identified along the Hilltop loop for scenic purposes and to connect activity areas.

A system of radial bikeway segments designed to link the two loops provides access to the various activity areas on and off the Peninsula. These bikeway segments serve primarily as transportation routes because the steepness and narrowness of these alignments are expected to discourage most recreational cyclists from using these routes. The City's Conceptual Bikeways Plan is discussed within Section 5.3.1.2.5.

### **5.3.1.2.1.2 Walkways**

The General Plan identifies two types of walkways: urban trails and non-urban trails. Urban trails consist of existing and future sidewalks that serve as primary transportation linkages. Non-urban trails provide access to natural open space areas and are used primarily for recreation. Non-urban trails are composed of a coastal bluff system and ridgeline/arroyo system. Trails identified within the coastal bluff system have similar alignments as the bypass bikeway segments identified along the Peninsula Loop. The General Plan suggests that these trails could have nodes at which varied functions may occur, such as beach access, rest areas (restrooms and limited picnicking), and vistas. Trails within the ridgeline/arroyo system traverse areas either undeveloped or partially developed and are not suitable for development because of physical and socio-economic constraints. Suggested alignments for non-urban trails are shown on Figure 21 of the General Plan.

### **5.3.1.2.1.3 Potential Beach Access**

Eleven potential beach access points are identified on Figure 21 of the General Plan. These beach access points are associated with either existing beach access trails or potential future access trails that would tie into the coastal bluff system of non-urban trails.

### **5.3.1.2.1.4 Equestrian Trails**

A 1978 amendment to the General Plan eliminated the equestrian trails depicted on Figure 22 (Conceptual Equestrian Network) of the General Plan.

**Insert Figure 5.3-1**

Existing Parks and Recreation Areas

**Table 5.3-1  
Existing Recreational Facilities in  
Rancho Palos Verdes**

Park	Ownership	Acreage	
		Active	Passive
Abalone Cove Shoreline Park	City		124.3
Clovercliff Park	City		0.2
Del Cerro Park	City		3.9 <sup>1</sup>
Eastview Park	City	9.9	
Fred Hesse Community Park	City	10.4	18.3
Friendship Park	County of Los Angeles		97
Grandview Park	City		17.5
Ladera Linda Community Center	City	11.2	
Martingdale Trailhead Park	City		1.0
Miraleste Recreation and Park District	Miraleste Recreation and Park District		32
Ocean Trails Park(s)	City	10	12
Upper Point Vicente Park <sup>2</sup>	City/U.S. Coast Guard	5.5 <sup>3</sup>	68
Lower Point Vicente Interpretive Center	City	5.0 <sup>4</sup>	21.4
Fishing Access	City		10.53
Wallace Ranch Park	City		0.7
Portuguese Bend Fields	Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District	21.9	
Robert Ryan Community Park	City	11.6	
Shoreline Park	City		53
Vanderlip Park	City		4.7
<b>Subtotal Park Acreage</b>		<b>88.5</b>	<b>464.53</b>
<b>TOTAL PARK ACREAGE</b>		<b>550.03</b>	
Ocean Trails Golf Course	Private	85	23
Los Verdes Golf Course	County of Los Angeles	100	
<b>Subtotal Existing Recreational Facilities</b>		<b>273.5</b>	<b>487.53</b>
<b>TOTAL EXISTING RECREATIONAL FACILITIES</b>		<b>761.03</b>	

<sup>1</sup> Active uses are planned; however, current uses are passive.

<sup>2</sup> Includes 71.04-acre City open space parcel and 3.96-acre Coast Guard parcel.

<sup>3</sup> Acreage designated as Active in the Program of Utilization

<sup>4</sup> The 5-acres of Active use is the developed PVIC facility

## **SECTION FIVE**

---

### **5.3.1.2.2 Coastal Specific Plan**

The CSP identifies corridors that provide access to activity areas by vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The primary access corridor within the CSP area is Palos Verdes Drive West/South/25th Street. This access corridor provides access for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians and has various laterals and loops branching off it that connect developed and undeveloped areas along the coast. Potential access corridors that may be developed are shown on Figure 24 of the CSP (City of Rancho Palos Verdes, 1978).

### **5.3.1.2.3 Rancho Palos Verdes Parks Master Plan**

The Rancho Palos Verdes Parks Master Plan (1989) contains recommendations for park development in Rancho Palos Verdes and prioritizes each recommendation by placing it in one of the following categories:

- *Immediate.* Acquisitions and developments that should occur as soon as financing is available.
- *Class A.* Acquisitions or development projects recommended to be accomplished within the next two years.
- *Class B.* Acquisitions or development projects recommended to be accomplished within the next five years.
- *Class C.* Acquisitions or development that should be accomplished as funding becomes available.

Applicable recommendations (and their respective classifications) identified in the Rancho Palos Verdes Parks Master Plan are presented in Table 5.3-3 of the recreation impact analysis.

### **5.3.1.2.4 Rancho Palos Verdes Conceptual Trails Plan**

The Conceptual Trails Plan was approved by the City Council on January 22, 1990, and revised by the City Council on December 6, 1991, and September 7, 1993. Its preparation is the first phase of a process to revise the City's Trails Network Plan (adopted in November 1984). The information in the Conceptual Trails Plan, combined with the Conceptual Bikeway Plan, would become the first section of the revised Trails Network Plan.

The purpose of the Conceptual Trails Plan is to identify trail opportunities in the community so that acquisition and development of new public trails, through new development proposals, public works projects, and voluntary efforts, can be integrated into the City's existing public trails network. Except for Category I trails, which are existing, dedicated public trails, the trails contained in the Conceptual Trails Plan are conceptual only.

The Conceptual Trails Plan identifies the following five trail systems:

- Palos Verdes Loop Trail
- Top-of-the-Hill Trail System
- Palos Verdes Drive Trail System
- Coastal Bluff Trail System
- Coastal Access Trails

Each trail segment in each of the five trail systems is described with respect to route, status, standards, use, and access. Trails are divided between two types of routes: “point to point” or “specific course.” Point-to-point routes have defined endpoints, but specific alignments are to be determined during future development. Specific course routes are confined to a particular course because of development, topography, or other constraints, or they follow existing undedicated trails.

The status of each trail is represented by one of the following six categories:

- Category I: Existing, dedicated trails that meet trail standards.
- Category II: Proposed trails and trail segments that cross undeveloped, privately owned land zoned as developable. These trails and trail segments should be implemented when the respective parcels of land are developed.
- Category III: Proposed trails and trail segments which are located on existing trail easements, City property, or street right-of-way and which require implementation or improvements.
- Category IV: Proposed trails and trail segments which cross privately owned land designated as Open Space or Open Space Hazard, or on land owned by a public utility or public agency. These trails and trail segments require the acquisition of easements, and may require implementation or improvements.
- Category V: Proposed trails which would primarily benefit neighborhood residents, and which cross privately owned land. Efforts to implement these trails shall only be initiated by affected property owners or community groups. This City shall provide guidance to those who wish to implement these trails, but it would not initiate efforts to implement them.
- Category VI: Proposed trails and trail segments which have special circumstances, considerations, or constraints.

Trail standards relate to the level of difficulty for each trail and the associated specific criteria for trail width, average and maximum grade, and clearance distance. The Conceptual Trails Plan indicates whether each trail is to be used by pedestrians, equestrians, and/or off-road bicyclists. Street access points, parking areas, and the location of each trail in relation to the overall trail network are described.

#### **5.3.1.2.5 Rancho Palos Verdes Conceptual Bikeway Plan**

The Conceptual Bikeways Plan was adopted by the City Council on January 22, 1990, and revised by the City Council on October 15, 1996. Each bikeway recommended in the plan is described with respect to route, type, status, and access. Routes are identified by street name and beginning and end points. Type of bikeway is defined as either Class I, Class I/Off-Road, Class II, or Class III. Except for Class I/Off-Road, these classifications are consistent with State guidelines for bikeways. See Table 5.3-2 for definitions of these types:

**Table 5.3-2  
Bikeway Types**

Type	Definition
Class I	Special pathway designated for exclusive use of bicycles; usually separated from motor vehicle facilities by a space or physical barrier
Class I/Off-Road	Unpaved bikeways designed for use by "mountain" bicycle enthusiasts that should be separated from roadways by a grade change and landscaping
Class II	A lane on the paved area of a road for preferential use by bicycles
Class III	A roadway with no special lane markings that is identified as a bicycle facility by "bike route" signing only; bicyclists share the roadway with motor vehicles

The Conceptual Bikeway Plan describes bikeways in terms of their implementation status, including specific considerations that may affect implementation of a new bikeway or improvement of an existing bikeway. Each bikeway is described in relation to its place in the overall bikeways network.

The bikeway network presented in the Conceptual Bikeway Plan is similar to the conceptual bikeways network in the General Plan (described above). The Conceptual Bikeway Plan includes the concentric loops of the Peninsula and Hilltop loops and some of the bypasses and radials in the General Plan. The Conceptual Bikeway Plan also includes planned bikeway segments along Montemalaga and Miraleste Drives that are not in the General Plan. All planned Class I bikeways in the Conceptual Bikeway Plan have been constructed since preparation of the plan.

**5.3.1.2.6 City Municipal Code**

According to Title 16, Chapter 20, Section 100, of the City’s Municipal Code, 4 acres of parkland must be dedicated for every 1,000 persons. As of the U.S. Census 2000, the City’s estimated population was 41,145. Based on this estimate, 164.6 acres of parkland would be required for compliance with this ordinance. As indicated in Table 5.3-1, the City currently includes 502.6 acres of parks (excluding the two golf courses) and therefore exceeds this requirement.

**5.3.1.2.7 Program of Utilization**

In March 1976, the U.S. Department of Interior approved the transfer of 79.19 acres of surplus federal property to the City for park and recreation purposes. The 79.19 acres of transferred property included a 74.7-acre portion of Upper Point Vicente Park and a 4.5-acre site, which is now known as Del Cerro Park. At the time, the federal government also approved a Program of Utilization (POU) for use of the 79.19 acres. The 1976 POU identifies a 6.6-acre potentially active recreational area in Upper Point Vicente Park that may eventually include picnic areas, tennis courts, and an athletic field. The remaining 68.1 acres of the 74.7 acres of deeded land in Upper Point Vicente Park was to remain in its natural state for passive recreational uses, including vistas, picnic areas, and trails (City of Rancho Palos Verdes, 1976).

In 1978, the City proposed and received approval for a revision to the boundaries and acreages of the parkland and Civic Center areas obtained in 1976. The revised application re-calculated the acreage for the Upper Point Vicente Park as 68.50 acres. Subsequently, documents were recorded which conveyed to the City 71.04 acres of property in Upper Point Vicente. The remainder of the 83.2-acre

site is comprised of a 3.9-acre parcel owned by the U.S. Coast Guard and 3.23 acres that the City owns outright which functions as a Civic Center (not part of the POU). The 1978 amendment to the 1976 POU did not alter in size or location the proposed 6.6-acre active recreational area.

### 5.3.2 Environmental Impacts/Environmental Consequences

#### 5.3.2.1 *Criteria for Determining Significance*

A project would have a significant impact if it would:

- increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated,
- include recreational facilities or require construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment, and
- 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.

#### 5.3.2.2 *Existing Parks/Recreational Facilities*

As shown on Figure 5.3-1, the proposed Reserve area encompasses portions of the following public recreation facilities:

- Abalone Cove Shoreline Park
- Del Cerro Park
- Grandview Park
- Point Vicente Park and Civic Center
- Point Vicente Interpretive Center
- Shoreline Park
- Ocean Trails Golf Course

According to the Subarea Plan, compatible uses within the Reserve area would include passive recreational facilities, such as trails and overlook areas. Parks primarily for passive recreational use that would be included in the proposed Reserve area include all the above facilities except Point Vicente Interpretive Center and Ocean Trails Golf Course (see Table 5.3-1). Grandview Park, Del Cerro Park, and Shoreline Park currently support passive recreation facilities only. Abalone Cove Shoreline Park is largely a passive recreation facility except for a preschool and playground, which would be excluded from the proposed Reserve area. The Civic Center portion of Point Vicente Park is the only portion of this park that supports active recreational uses, including tennis courts and a model helicopter port. The proposed Reserve area would not include this portion of Point Vicente Park.

Although the Point Vicente Interpretive Center property includes an active-use facility, active-use portions of the property would be excluded from the Reserve area. Portions of the Ocean Trails Golf Course that would be included in the proposed Reserve area are dedicated natural open-space areas and not part of the golf course.

The boundaries of the Reserve area were developed to be consistent with existing uses of public recreation facilities. Additionally, establishment of the Reserve area would increase the amount of public land available for passive recreation. Because of these factors, and because the Proposed Project does not include growth-inducing development, no significant adverse impacts to existing recreational facilities would occur.

### **5.3.2.3 Proposed Recreational Activities/Facilities**

The Proposed Project identifies existing and future recreational uses compatible with management of the proposed Reserve area, but it does not propose development of specific recreational activities or facilities. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not include any recreational facilities that could have an adverse physical effect on the environment and result in significant impacts. Future recreation projects within the Reserve area would be subject to CEQA evaluation and be reviewed for consistency with Subarea Plan goals.

### **5.3.2.4 Relevant Plans and Policies**

#### **5.3.2.4.1 General Plan and Coastal Specific Plan**

The proposed Reserve area would encompass many existing and planned components of the path and trails network identified in the General Plan and CSP. According to the Subarea Plan, compatible land uses within the Reserve would include creation and maintenance of a recreational trail system consistent with the City's Conceptual Trails Plan, including future amendments to the CTP. Before any formalized recreational activities or improvements could occur in the Reserve, a PUMP would be prepared jointly by the City and PVPLC to address issues such as public access, trail use, trailhead locations, and overlooks. An RTP that considers recreational needs and impacts to habitat and covered species would be developed through the PUMP process. Existing trails within the Reserve that are not identified in the Conceptual Trails Plan and are determined to be unnecessary would be closed and restored to CSS habitat. Because the RTP would be developed consistent with policies of the Conceptual Trails Plan, no significant impacts related to conflicts with applicable plans and policies would occur from implementation of the Proposed Project.

#### **5.3.2.4.2 Rancho Palos Verdes Parks Master Plan**

As shown in Table 5.3-3, the Proposed Project would be consistent with all but one of the recommendations presented in the Parks Master Plan. The Proposed Project would be inconsistent with the recommendation to build a municipal golf course at Point Vicente Park/Civic Center because the golf course was envisioned to be located within the proposed Reserve area and would not be a compatible land use under the Subarea Plan. This inconsistency is not a significant impact, however, because this recommendation was invalidated by the policy change associated with the City Council decision on the Long Point Resort Project in 2001, which reflected golf use on the Upper Point Vicente Property.

#### **5.3.2.4.3 Rancho Palos Verdes Conceptual Trails Plan**

The proposed Reserve area would encompass many existing and planned trails identified in the Conceptual Trails Plan. As described above, compatible land uses within the Reserve would include

creation and maintenance of a recreational trail system consistent with the CTP, and no significant impacts would occur from implementation of the Proposed Project.

#### 5.3.2.4.4 Rancho Palos Verdes Conceptual Bikeway Plan

All Class I bikeways identified in the Conceptual Bikeway Plan have been completed. Some of these bikeways are within the proposed Reserve area and would be compatible uses under the Subarea Plan. Any planned Class II bikeways would by definition be along existing roads. The Proposed Project would not preclude any road improvements that would be necessary to provide these bikeway segments; therefore, no significant impacts related to conflicts with the Conceptual Bikeway Plan would occur.

#### 5.3.2.4.5 City Municipal Code

As described earlier, the City currently exceeds the acreage of parklands required by the City's Municipal Code. The Proposed Project would increase the acreage of parklands available for passive recreation and therefore would not result in any significant recreation impacts related to conflicts with the Municipal Code.

#### 5.3.2.4.6 Program of Utilization

The proposed Reserve area would include approximately 68 acres of the City's 79.27-acre Point Vicente Park. This would leave 14.27 acres of the site outside of the Reserve and available for active and/or passive recreational uses. The 14.27-acre non-Reserve area would include the 8.23 acres of City property that is not part of the POU. As a result, the non-Reserve area would utilize 6.04 acres of the 71.04 acres governed by the POU. This would leave 65 acres (91%) of the 71.04-acre POU area as a passive use. Although the acreage of the public land that is subject to the POU has changed from the 1976 POU application (74.7 acres) to the actual acreage deeded to the City via the quickclaim deed recorded in 1979 (71.04 acres), there has been no record of any amendments to the amount of POU land dedicated to active uses versus passive uses. However, if one applies the same percentage of passive and active uses approved through the 1976 POU application, 91% or 64 acres of the POU area should be for passive uses. In addition, the Reserve area would include 6.6 acres of land identified for active recreational use in the 1976 POU. No new active recreational facilities would be permitted within this area under the Subarea Plan. These apparent conflicts with the POU would be a less-than-significant impact to recreation because the Proposed Project would include an amendment to the POU to designate at least 6.6 acres of Point Vicente Park for active recreation outside of the Reserve area. Potential future development of deeded lands outside the Reserve for active recreation in excess of 6.6 acres may require further amendment to the POU and environmental compliance under CEQA and NEPA.

### 5.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative developments would induce population growth and increase the use of existing recreational facilities. The City, however, has sufficient acreage of existing parklands to accommodate the anticipated growth. The Proposed Project would increase the amount of open space available for passive recreation. Therefore, no significant cumulative impacts to existing park facilities are anticipated.

**Table 5.3-3  
Parks Master Plan Recommendations**

Recommendation	Classification	Project Consistency Discussion
<b>Abalone Cove Shoreline Park</b>		
Pave paths from the parking lot accessing the picnic tables along the bluff.	A	<b>Consistent.</b> These paths are outside of the proposed Reserve area.
<b>Del Cerro Park</b>		
Install safety fencing just below the bluff.	Immediate	<b>Consistent.</b> The safety fencing has been installed and would remain with implementation of the Proposed Project.
Add a permanent restroom facility, tot lot and play equipment, and a pedestrian trail.	A	<b>Consistent.</b> The portion of the park where the tot lot and play equipment would be constructed is outside of the proposed Reserve area. Restroom facilities and pedestrian trails would be compatible uses within the Reserve.
<b>Point Vicente Park/Civic Center</b>		
Develop a Senior Citizens Center.	Immediate	<b>Consistent.</b> The City is no longer proposing to develop a Senior Center at this park.
Build a municipal golf course.	A	<b>Inconsistent.</b> In October 2001, the City Council denied use of this area for a golf course. The Proposed Project would maintain this as a passive use area, consistent with the City Council decision and its new policy direction.
Obtain an agreement with U.S. Coast Guard for tour access to lighthouse.	A	<b>Consistent.</b> Access to the lighthouse has been obtained. The lighthouse is outside of the proposed Reserve area.
Add irrigation, turf and fencing to the athletic field.	A	<b>Consistent.</b> These improvements are being considered. If implemented, this would be outside of the proposed Reserve area and its new policy direction.
Add public restroom facility, two paddle tennis courts, pedestrian paths, and permanent amphitheater.	B	<b>Consistent.</b> Any active-use facilities (i.e., tennis courts and an amphitheater) would be constructed outside of the Reserve area. Restroom facilities and pedestrian paths would be compatible uses within the Reserve.
<b>Point Vicente Interpretive Center</b>		
Develop an Educational Center.	Immediate	<b>Consistent.</b> The Educational Center has been completed and is outside of the proposed Reserve area.
Add interpretive signage at Point Vicente Interpretive Center.	A	<b>Consistent.</b> Interpretive signs have been installed and would be compatible with the Reserve.
<b>Shoreline Park</b>		
Acquire the Shoreline County Park site from the County of Los Angeles.	Immediate	<b>Consistent.</b> Shoreline County Park has been acquired by the City and would be included in the Reserve area.

Cumulative developments include recreational facilities with potential to result in physical impacts on the environment. Mitigation necessary for reducing impacts on recreational facilities to a less-than-significant level would be identified project-by-project. Recreational facilities identified as compatible uses within the proposed Reserve area would be developed consistent with Subarea Plan conservation goals; therefore, no significant cumulative impacts are expected.

Conflicts with recreation plans and policies are not anticipated for the cumulative projects and would not occur with the Proposed Project. Project consistency with recreation plans and policies would be evaluated for future developments project-by-project. No significant cumulative impacts related to conflicts with recreation plans and policies are anticipated.

### 5.3.4 Mitigation Measures

Because no significant recreation impacts were identified, mitigation measures are not provided.

### 5.3.5 Level of Significance After Mitigation

Because no significant recreation impacts were identified, mitigation measures are not provided.