

Adoption of the Proposed Project or one of the three alternative scenarios and issuance of a take permit under Section 10(a)(1)(b) of the ESA would preserve permanently portions of habitat areas in Rancho Palos Verdes and would permit take of species on the Covered Species List outside of the Reserve and Neutral Lands. Long-term implementation of the Subarea Plan would result in some changes in local land use patterns, which could result in beneficial environmental changes.

The City conducted an IS in June 2003 to determine potential significant effects of the Proposed Project. During the evaluation, certain impacts of the Proposed Project were found to be less than significant because of the inability of a project of this scope to create such impacts or the absence of project characteristics producing effects of this type. The effects determined not to be significant are not required to be included in the primary analysis section of the Draft EIR/EA. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines, Section 15128, the following section provides a brief description of effects found to be less than significant. A copy of the IS is located in Appendix A. The Proposed Project protects species by conserving habitat, restoring degraded habitat, managing the preserve system, and conducting biological monitoring in perpetuity. The Proposed Project would also issue incidental take permits for covered species to the city; the City then becomes take authorization holder. The benefits of take authorizations held by the City can be shared with individuals or projects in the city. Individual project proponents, however, are still required to conduct project-specific environmental review in compliance with CEQA and include a finding that the project is consistent with the Subarea Plan.

8.1 AESTHETICS

1. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No impact.

2. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No impact.

3. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

No impact.

4. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

No impact.

The Proposed Project would not result in aesthetic impacts, because no ground disturbance or structures are proposed. There is no change between the baseline condition/existing setting and the Proposed Project; there is a less-than-significant effect, and further analysis is unwarranted.

8.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?

No impact.

2. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?

No impact.

3. Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, because of their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?

No impact.

The Proposed Project does not affect existing or zoned agricultural resources. There is no change between the baseline condition/existing setting and the Proposed Project; there is a less-than-significant effect, and further analysis is unwarranted.

8.3 AIR QUALITY

1. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

No impact.

2. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

No impact.

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

No impact.

4. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

No impact.

5. Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

No impact.

The Proposed Project is not anticipated to affect air quality, because there is no change between the baseline condition/existing setting and the Proposed Project; there is a less-than-significant effect, and further analysis is unwarranted..

8.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?

No impact.

2. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

No impact.

3. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries?

No impact.

The Proposed Project would not directly affect cultural resources, because it is not expected to differ significantly from the baseline conditions/existing setting, and further analysis is unwarranted.

8.5 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

1. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

No impact.

2. Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

No impact.

3. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

No impact.

4. Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

No impact.

The Proposed Project would not include construction of buildings or structures that expose people to geologic hazards.

8.6 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

1. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

No impact.

2. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

No impact.

3. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No impact.

4. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, consequently, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

No impact.

5. For a project within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No impact.

6. For a project near a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No impact.

7. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No impact.

8. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

No impact.

The Proposed Project would not create hazards, generate hazardous materials, or expose people to hazardous materials. Because essentially the same potential for development resulting in hazards to human health and public safety would occur under the Proposed Project as under the baseline

conditions/existing setting, there is a less-than-significant impact, and further analysis of this issue is unwarranted.

8.7 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

1. Would the project violate any water-quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

No impact.

2. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

No impact.

3. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

No impact.

4. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

No impact.

5. Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

No impact.

6. Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

No impact.

7. Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

No impact.

8. Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

No impact.

9. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

No impact.

The Proposed Project would not affect hydrology or water quality. Although the Proposed Project may alter the location and density of projected growth in the city, the amount and rate of growth would not be altered. Development that would be focused outside of the Reserve under the Proposed Project would be distributed throughout the city, resulting in similar water-quality impacts to those that would be expected under the baseline conditions/existing setting. Although the locations of discharges may differ somewhat under the Proposed Project, cumulative discharges and ultimate effects on overall water quality within city watersheds would essentially be the same.

8.8 MINERAL RESOURCES

1. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

No impact.

2. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

No impact.

The Proposed Project would not result in the loss of a known or locally important mineral resource.

8.9 NOISE

1. Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

No impact.

2. Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

No impact.

The Proposed Project would not result in an increase in noise or expose people to increased noise or vibration. Local noise ordinances would continue to apply to development activities outside of the Reserve to ensure avoidance, minimization, or mitigation of potential noise impacts to sensitive receptors associated with development.

8.10 POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

No impact.

2. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No impact.

3. Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No impact.

The Proposed Project would not result in increased population or the need for additional housing. Additionally, the Proposed Project would not displace people or existing housing. The City is approximately 90 percent built out, and it is expected that in-fill development would be sufficient to meet the city's regional housing requirements as assessed by SCAG. Implementation of the Subarea Plan may also reduce the costs of environmental mitigation and compliance with federal and state environmental laws and thus lower the cost of future development relative to the present practice of project-by-project permit review. The project is also consistent with and furthers the elements of "smart growth" strategies recommended by SCAG.

8.11 PUBLIC SERVICES

1. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection? Police protection? Schools? Parks? Other public facilities?

No impact.

The Proposed Project would not result in increased need for additional public services, such as fire and police protection, schools, and parks.

8.12 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

1. Would the project cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

No impact.

2. Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

No impact.

3. Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

No impact.

4. Would the project substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

No impact.

5. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

No impact.

6. Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?

No impact.

7. Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

No impact.

The Proposed Project would not cause an increase in traffic congestion, affect levels of service, increase safety risks or increase the need for additional parking, or preclude development of planned roadways, affect emergency access, or conflict with adopted plans, because there is no change between the baseline condition/existing setting and the proposed action. Therefore, there is a less-than-significant impact relating to transportation/circulation, and further analysis is unnecessary.

8.13 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

1. Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

No impact.

2. Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No impact.

3. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No impact.

4. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

No impact.

5. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the projects projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments?

No impact.

6. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No impact.

The Proposed Project would not result in the use or treatment of wastewater, expansion of stormwater drainage or water lines, or creation of solid waste. Green wastes generated from revegetation activities and invasive plant removal would be recycled. Because the threshold for determining significance is the baseline condition/existing setting and there are no effects to public facilities and services beyond what would occur under the baseline condition/existing setting, there is less-than-significant impact, and further analysis is unwarranted. Existing utility easements are considered compatible lands uses within the Reserve.