3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EVALUATION

Project Title:	Chatsworth Reservoir Wetland/Riparian Mitigation Program
Lead Agency Name and Address:	City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks 1200 W. 7th Street, Suite 700 Los Angeles, CA 90017
Contact Person and Phone Number:	David Attaway, Environmental Supervisor (213) 928-9130
Project Location:	The proposed project site is located on an approximately 140 acre area within the Chatsworth Reservoir property. The property is located in the northwestern portion of the San Fernando Valley, northeast of the intersection of Roscoe Boulevard and Valley Circle Drive in the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California
Project Sponsor's Name and Address:	Browning Ferris of California, Inc. 14747 San Fernando Road Sylmar, California 91342
General Plan Designation:	Open Space
Zoning:	[Q]OS-1XL
Description of Project:	See Section 2, Project Description.
Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:	See Section 2, Project Description.
Other Public Agencies whose Approval is Required:	California Department of Fish and Game U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would potentially be affected by this project (i.e., the project would involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact"). However, any potentially significant impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agricultural Resources	☒ Air Quality
☒ Biological Resources	☒ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Land Use/Planning
☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise	☐ Population/Housing
☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation/Traffic
☐ Utilities/Service Systems	☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance	

Determination:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have an impact on the environment that is "potentially significant" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.

Signature

4/03/08
Date

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained if it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.

4. "Negative Declaration: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from a "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less-than-Significant Impact". The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced.)

5. Earlier analyses may be used if, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration [Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following.
   (a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where earlier analyses are available for review.
   (b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   (c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, when appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:

   (a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

   (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☑	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☑	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Explanation (a, c): Less Than Significant Impact. The project will result in the creation of 37 acres of new wetland and riparian habitat in an undeveloped area of the Chatsworth Reservoir property. Some of these newly created areas will be visible from adjacent residential neighborhoods. Removal of a portion of the perimeter concrete drainage channel surrounding the reservoir levee and establishment of native plant materials will soften views from outside the property. Some viewers may consider that these environmental benefits will enhance the scenic and aesthetic quality of the area, but others may initially perceive a different view as a potential negative impact. Short-term, temporary impacts due to equipment operation, dust and noise will occur during construction and are likely to be perceptible at the property line in some areas (see below).

Explanation (b): No Impact. Some trees may be removed for restoration of the concrete-lined channel but this removal will not adversely affect the scenic vista. A substantial number of new trees will be planted within the proposed conservation easement area. No rock outcroppings will be affected by the project. There are no historical buildings or scenic highways in the project area.

Explanation (d): No Impact. There are no elements of the project that would create a new source of substantial light or glare either during the day or night.

The project will not cause significant long-term impacts to visual and aesthetic resources.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural uses?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Explanation (a-c): No Impact. The proposed project would occur in and adjacent to a former water supply reservoir as described above and would not affect any farmland, agricultural uses or lands subject to Williamson Act contracts. There will be no impact to agricultural resources.

3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☑	☐

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☑	☐	☐
c)	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 that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☑	☐
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☑	☐
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☑	☐

Explanation (a): Less Than Significant Impact. All new development is subject to the "clean air" requirements of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California Air Resources Board, and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). A project is deemed inconsistent with air quality plans when it results in population and/or employment growth that exceeds growth estimated in the Air Quality Management Plan. The project includes construction of new wetland and riparian area, which would not cause growth in population or employment. Additionally, the site is currently designated as Open Space under the City of Los Angeles' General Plan and is zoned OS Open Space in the City's Zoning Ordinance, anticipating future development of the site for recreational purposes. Therefore, the project is consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan and impacts would be less than significant.

Explanation (b): Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. The construction activities will involve the use of gasoline and diesel powered on-road and off-road equipment (e.g. trucks, tractors, compactors) for a period of approximately five months. Such equipment will emit air pollutants. Construction also will result in emissions of PM10 from grading and earthmoving activities. Construction activities will be subject to Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), which requires persons engaging in earthmoving and construction activities to employ best available control measures to minimize fugitive dust emissions. The exhaust emissions from the construction equipment that will be used for the project and the PM10 emissions resulting from construction have been quantified and are below the thresholds of significance for construction emissions set forth in the SCAQMD CEQA Handbook, assuming that the number and types of equipment and hours of operation are implemented as described in the January 28, 2008 report prepared by ENVIRON (Attachment E). A summary of the construction emissions estimates is provided in Table 2.

Table 2: Summary of Construction Emission Estimates

	Total Construction Emissions (tons)				
	CO	ROC	NO_x	SO_x	PM_{10}
Total Emissions	**0.40**	**0.13**	**1.1**	**1.1E-03**	**0.36**
SCAQMD CEQA Significance Thresholds	**24.75**	**2.5**	**2.5**	**6.75**	**6.75**
Exceeds Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

To reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant, the following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the proposed project:

Mitigation Measures:

MM 3-1. To assure that construction emissions remain less than significant, BFI will limit the equipment used to the number and types of equipment and the hours of operation as described in the January 28, 2008 report from ENVIRON (Attachment E).

MM 3-2. The project will comply with the rules of the SCAQMD pertaining to emissions from grading and earth moving operations. Operation in compliance with these rules is consistent with the applicable air quality plan.

Explanation (c): Less Than Significant Impact. Once construction activities are complete, there will be no further need for mobile construction equipment and there will be no permitted equipment at the project site. Accordingly, there will be no net increase of any criteria pollutant. There are no projects within approximately one mile that would cause related impacts resulting in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.

Explanation (d): Less Than Significant Impact Due to the limited duration of construction activities, the distance to sensitive receptors (nearest residence), and the fact that project emissions are less than the SCAQMD significance levels for construction emissions, the mitigation project is not expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Explanation (e): Less Than Significant Impact. There will be diesel exhaust emissions associated with grading and construction, but given the distance to the nearest residences, such emissions are not expected to result in objectionable odors.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the DFG or USFWS?	☐	☑	☐	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the DFG or USFWS?	☐	☑	☐	☐
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, *etc.*) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?	☐	☐	☑	☐
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☑	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☑	☐
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☑	☐

Explanation (a): Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. A query of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) (Simi Valley East, Canoga Park, Oat Mountain and Calabasas 7.5-minute USGS quadrangles) was conducted initially in 2005 and again in

2007 for recorded occurrences of special-status species in the vicinity. The California Native Plant Society's On-line Inventory (CNPS 2007) was also consulted for information on special-status plants known to occur in Los Angeles and Ventura Counties. A target list of special status plant and animal species was developed and evaluated for their potential to occur within the project area (Attachment F1). CNDDB occurrences of special status species within a 5-mile radius of the project area were plotted on a quad sheet base (Attachment F1). All special-status species recorded within a five mile radius of the site were evaluated for their potential to occur in the project area. Several plant species including the Santa Susana tarplant (*Deinandra minthornii*), the many-stemmed dudleya (*Dudleya multicaulis*), Blochman's dudleya (*Dudleya blochmaniae* ssp. *blochmaniae*) and the San Fernando Valley spineflower (*Chorizanthe parryi* var. *fernandina*) have been recorded or potentially occur in coastal scrub habitats in the project vicinity. Special-status animal species recorded within a 5-mile radius of the project area include the tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*), burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), arroyo toad (*Bufo californicus*), two-striped garter snake (*Thamnophis hammondii*), San Diego desert woodrat (*Neotoma lepida intermedia*), coast (San Diego) horned lizard (*Phrynosoma coronatum*) and western spadefoot (*Spea hammondii*).

None of the targeted special-status plants were observed in the Proposed conservation easement area during reconnaissance-level surveys conducted in summer 2005 as part of the initial site characterization work associated with mitigation plan development (Attachment F2). However, most of the conservation easement area burned during the September 2005 Chatsworth/Topanga fire. A systematic plant survey was conducted on September 7, 2007 to identify late season blooming species that might occur in the area. During those surveys, several locations of Santa Susana tarplant were located in the Chatsworth Reservoir property but none of these are within the proposed conservation easement area (Attachment F3). No focused surveys for special-status animals have occurred in the conservation easement area, but members of the Southwestern Herpetologists Society have conducted regular monitoring of fixed coverboard locations, primarily focused on reptiles, over a period of several years on the Chatsworth Reservoir property. Those surveys identified four special status animals in the Chatsworth Reservoir property; western spadefoot, coast horned lizard, two-striped garter snake and tri-colored blackbird. Other special-status animals with potential to occur in the project vicinity include southwestern pond turtle, San Diego desert woodrat, and several birds considered species of special concern. An historical occurrence of arroyo toad was reported from Chatsworth drain below Chatsworth Reservoir in 1970. The CNDDB states that this occurrence is thought to be extirpated. Members of the Southwestern Herpetologists Society have not observed the arroyo toad during any surveys of the area and they do not expect it to occur due to lack of suitable habitat and presence of the California toad.

Site grading and construction activities will not directly impact any special status plant species because none have been observed in the proposed conservation easement area. There are locations of Santa Suzanna tarplant just outside of this area that could be indirectly affected by equipment during construction and planting activities. Depending on the extent of disturbance, this could adversely affect the local population of Santa Suzanna tarplant. Individual southwestern pond turtles, San Diego desert woodrats and nesting birds could be impacted during construction activities if they are found within the work area. Loss of individual pond turtles or San Diego woodrats is not likely to have a substantial adverse effect on the species but minimization measures could reduce the extent of this potential effect. Active nests of birds-of-prey and other migratory birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treat Act and under Section 3503.5 of the Fish and Game Code. Removal or disturbance of an active migratory bird nest during construction activities is therefore considered a potentially significant impact. Since

the resulting restoration project is expected to have a net benefit on native plant and wildlife species, there should be long-term favorable effects on special status species.

To reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant, the following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the proposed project:

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4-1. Prior to initiation of construction, BFI will ensure that the populations of Santa Suzanna tarplant located near the construction area are delimited with orange construction fencing. The exact location of the fence shall be determined by a qualified biologist based on appropriately-timed (August/September) pre-construction surveys for the species.

MM 4-2. BFI will contract with a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction surveys for the southwestern pond turtle, San Diego desert woodrat and nesting birds within the construction area. The surveys will be conducted by a qualified biologist within 30 days prior to initiation of construction. Surveys for nesting birds will be expanded up to 300 feet beyond the construction area if determined necessary by the biologist to ensure that construction activities will not cause abandonment of an active nest. If any woodrat nests, pond turtles, or active bird nests are observed within the proposed work area, the biologist will consult CCDFG on measures to avoid or minimize disturbance to these animals. It may be possible to move woodrats and/or turtles out of harms way. If active bird nests are discovered, a buffer zone may be required around the nest to minimize disturbance until such time that the young have fledged. Once the biologist determines the nest is no longer active, construction activities can resume within the established buffer zone.

MM 4-3. BFI will contract with a qualified biologist to be on-site during construction to monitor effects on local wildlife, ensure protection measures (e.g. fences) are maintained, recommend minimization measures as needed, and generally oversee implementation of the mitigation program.

MM 4-4. BFI will install orange construction fencing around the perimeter of the existing wetland to ensure that heavy equipment and other construction vehicles do not impact the habitat during construction. The onsite biologist will determine if additional exclusion techniques (e.g. drift fencing) are warranted to protect local wildlife during construction.

Explanation (b) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The overall purpose of the project is to enhance and restore riparian, wetland and woodland habitat; plans have been formulated to avoid direct disturbance of existing riparian wetland and woodland areas during project grading and construction to the extent feasible. However, riparian vegetation has become established in the section of concrete channel proposed for removal and also in the channelized reach of Woolsey Creek that will be realigned as part of the project. Some of this colonizing riparian vegetation will be removed or disturbed during project construction.

To reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant, the following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the proposed project:

Mitigation Measures:

MM 4-5. Native plant materials will be salvaged from on-site sources and used for revegetation

of the restoration areas as well as areas temporarily disturbed during construction. BFI will ensure success of the wetland/riparian mitigation program by obtaining written confirmation from the Corps and CDFG that the required success criteria have been met and wetland and riparian habitat has been created.

Explanation (c-d): Less Than Significant Impact. The overall purpose of the project is to compensate for the loss of federally-regulated wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act. Thus, it will have a net positive effect on such resources by design. Existing wetlands in the project area have been delineated and will be avoided during construction. Following construction, these wetlands will remain and be enhanced as part of the restoration effort. No wetlands will be removed, filled, hydrologically isolated or otherwise adversely affected by this project.

The project will create new movement corridors and provide new opportunities for a diversity of habitats to support various life stages of wildlife species. Temporary disturbance of corridors may result from construction activities but these activities are not expected to interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

Explanation (e-f): Less Than Significant Impact.

The City of Los Angeles has an Oak Tree Ordinance (Sec. 46.00 LAMC; Ord. 153,478) that protects not only oak trees, but also Southern California black walnuts, western sycamores, and California bays with trunk diameters greater than four (4) inches. No trees meeting these specifications will be removed for construction of the project. The Department of Recreation and Parks also has a Tree Preservation Policy, which protects trees by ordinance, as well as designated Heritage Trees, Special Value Trees and Other Common Park Trees. Besides the trees protected by ordinance, the Special Value trees, including boxelder (*Acer negundo* 'Californica'), big leaf maple (*Acer macrophyllum*), Californian walnuts (*Juglans californica* and *J. hindsii*), toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*), native cherry trees (*Prunus ilicifolia, P. lyonii*), cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*, *P. trichocarpa*), and native willow trees (*Salix hindsiana, S. laevigata*, *S. lasiandra*, *S. lasiolepis*) are the only category of trees that may be affected by the project. Some willow and cottonwood trees occur in the channelized sections of the drainages to be restored and therefore will be removed during construction. However, the project will be creating up to 16 acres of new riparian habitat that will adequately offset the minor amount of tree loss anticipated during construction.

There is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan for the Chatsworth Reservoir area. The site has been designated as a nature preserve by the City of Los Angeles. The project will be consistent with that designation.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☑	☐	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☑	☐	☐
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☑	☐	☐
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☑	☐	☐

Explanation (a-d): Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. A focused cultural resources investigation was undertaken for the general project area by John Minch and Associates, Inc. (Attachment D). The investigation included an archaeological records search and follow up field surveys in September 2005. The records search identified three documented archeological sites within the study area. The subsequent field reconnaissance confirmed the location of one historic site and one prehistoric site. The historic site (LAN-651H) consists of a Spanish colonial era kiln that has been previously investigated and sampled. The kiln, a well-known feature among local cultural resource aficionados, was protected by a shed roof mounted on four corner posts until the Chatsworth/Topanga fire of 2005 destroyed the roof. The kiln, however, appears to have survived the fire intact. The site is located well outside of the proposed impact area and can be completely avoided. The prehistoric site that was located (LAN-652) is a milling stone feature on a bedrock outcrop on a slope above the west basin. The second, unconfirmed prehistoric site (LAN-653) is a midden with shell fragments reported to be on an adjacent slope. Both of the prehistoric site locations are situated on high ground outside of the proposed conservation easement area and will not be affected during construction activities.

There are no records of paleontological resources or unique geological features in the project area. The project area has been graded, excavated and otherwise disturbed over the years by the construction of berms, levees, basins, new channels and other features associated with operation and use of the site as a water storage reservoir. However, it is unclear whether there was any Pleistocene ponding in the project area. Such ponding greatly increases the possibility of encountering fossils during ground disturbance activities.

The project work area is situated primarily on low ground that was periodically inundated when it was used as a water storage reservoir. In subsequent years, the ground was graded,

excavated and otherwise disturbed by the construction of berms, levees, basins, new channels and other features associated with reservoir improvements. Native American burial areas are typically located on higher ground; no discovery of human remains has been reported from the years of reservoir operation and improvement and none is expected as a result of this project.

Mitigation Measures:

MM 5-1. A qualified cultural resource expert will be on site to inform construction crews about the site's significance and the need to avoid any of the sensitive areas identified.

MM 5-2. A perimeter construction fence will be installed a suitable distance away from the archeological sites to insure that the areas are not affected during construction activities.

MM 5-3. A qualified monitor will remain available during construction in the event that paleontological resources, unique geological features, or human remains are discovered and work will cease in those areas until appropriate measures are determined.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. GEOLOGY and SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	☐	☐	☑	☐
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated in 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 & Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☑	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☑	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☑	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☑	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☑	☐

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	☐	☐	☑	☐
d) Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☑	☐
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternate wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Explanation (a): Less Than Significant Impact. No people or structures are at risk from any geological hazards in the project area, as further described below:

(i) The proposed project area is not located in an Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Hazard Zone. However, it is located approximately 0.5 mile from the potentially active Chatsworth Fault (see Fig 1 in Attachment G). The Chatsworth Fault is a reverse fault which juxtaposes Cretaceous Chatsworth Formation (formerly called Chico Formation) and Paleocene Martinez Formation over Miocene Modelo Formation. The fault trends southwesterly across the reservoir and passes through the right abutment of Dam No. 2 and the left abutment of Dam No. 3. There are no known traces of this fault in the proposed project area.

(ii) In addition to the Chatsworth Fault, which is considered inactive at this time, the two major active faults closest to the project area are (see Fig 2 in Attachment G):

Fault Name	Distance (km)	Moment Magnitude (Mw)
Santa Susana Fault	10.6	6.6
Northridge Fault	14.5	6.9

Based on probabilistic analyses using two different methods: 1) FRISK, and 2) California Geological Survey (CGS) Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Mapping Ground Motion Page (see Attachment G), strong seismic shaking could be expected in the event of a major earthquake on active faults close to the site. However, since the area is proposed to be a wetland, not occupied by humans or inhabited structures, it is anticipated that damage would be minimal.

(iii) The proposed project area is located in a State designated potential, seismically induced

liquefaction zone (see Fig. 5 in Attachment G). However, if liquefaction occurs, it would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death since the project area will be open space that is not occupied by humans or inhabited structures.

(iv) The proposed project area is not located in a State designated potential, seismically induced landslide zone and there are no known landslide risks at the site, which is located on gently sloping ground (see Fig. 5 in Attachment G). The risk of landslides appears to be insignificant.

Explanation (b): Less Than Significant Impact. Since the purpose of the project is to create additional wetlands and restore earthen channels, it is expected that the velocity of the water entering the project area will be decreased thereby allowing sediment to be deposited rather than eroding the project area and adding sediment downstream. There may be some erosion at outlet structures from the wetlands but it appears that erosion would be minimal. Erosion potential during construction will be minimized through the use of appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) as identified in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan that is required for the project and additional measures as described in Section 8 (a) below.

Explanation (c): Less Than Significant Impact. The project area is not located in a designated landslide zone and there are no known landslide risks at the site, which is located on gently sloping ground. The risk of landslides therefore appears to be insignificant. The project area is located in a designated liquefaction zone. However, if liquefaction, subsidence, lateral spreading or collapse occur, damage from any of these phenomena is expected to be less than significant since no people or structures will be at risk in the project area.

Explanation (d): Less Than Significant Impact. Trenching in the project area indicated clay layers at relatively shallow depths (2.5 to 9 feet below the ground surface) (see Attachment G). Further tests would be required to determine if the clay is expansive but even if it were, any damage resulting from expansive clay is expected to be of minimal concern since the proposed project is expansion of wetlands that will not be occupied by humans or inhabited structures.

Explanation (e): No Impact. No septic tanks or alternate wastewater disposal systems are proposed as part of this project; therefore, there will be no impact from soils on wastewater percolation.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	☑

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☑	☐
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or to the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☑
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☑
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☑
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☑
h)	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?	☐	☐	☑	☐

Explanation (a): No Impact. There will be no routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Explanation (b): Less Than Significant Impact. During construction, there is a slight possibility of a fuel spill from construction equipment. In the unlikely event that such a spill occurs, appropriate best management practices as required in the project SWPPP (MM 8-1) would be employed to isolate the spilled fuel, prevent it from entering any sensitive area, and to remove and properly dispose of the spilled fuel. If such a spill were to occur, it would not create a significant hazard to the public since the public does not have access to the site. Any hazard to the environment would be addressed through the best management practices.

Explanation (c-g): No Impact. There will be no use of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials or substances either during construction or following development of the project. The project site is not located within ¼ mile of a school. The project is not located on a listed hazardous materials site compiled pursuant to Government Code 65962.5. The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport. The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Since there is no public access to the project site, the development of the project will not impair implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Explanation (h): Less Than Significant Impact. The Chatsworth Reservoir currently is undeveloped open space surrounded by residential communities and is designated a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone in the Safety Element of the City of Los Angeles' General Plan. Portions of the project site were burned in a 2005 wildfire that began offsite. The development of a wetlands mitigation project will not increase the risk of wildland fires over the risk currently presented by the site.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☑	☐	☐
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☑	☐

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite?	☐	☐	☑	☐
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☑	☐
e)	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?	☐	☐	☐	☑
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☑	☐
g)	Place housing within a 100-yr. flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☑	☐
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impeded or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☑	☐
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a dam or levee?	☐	☐	☑	☐
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Explanation (a): Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The project will result in ground disturbance associated with the grading, some of which will occur within and adjacent to channels. Erosion from the project area has the potential to enter the drainages. However,

all of the potentially affected channels are ephemeral and flow only in response to periods of sustained rainfall or very intense storms. The receiving water body is a large concrete-lined storm drain that accepts untreated urban runoff from the San Fernando Valley. Runoff from the site is eventually tributary to the Los Angeles River. Erosion potential from the site is low since most of the grading would occur on nearly level terrain and during the dry season.

To reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant, the following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the proposed project:

Mitigation Measures:

MM 8-1. Project construction will generally be limited to the non-rainy season (typically April through October) but may extend into the rainy season if appropriate measures to contain sediment are implemented. Since the project entails construction over a site greater than 6 acres, a NPDES construction permit will be obtained from the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. The permit requires the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which specifies the Best Management Practices (BMPs) to be utilized during construction of the project, to prevent erosion and protect surface water against nonpoint source pollution.

MM 8-2. Topsoil will be salvaged and reapplied, which will serve to rapidly provide groundcover of the endemic species during the rainy season following construction, thereby minimizing the risk of erosion. Additional BMPs may be specified within the SWPPP.

Explanation (b): Less Than Significant Impact. The project area has a shallow water table that rises to within the rooting zone during years of normal or above-normal precipitation. This water table is part of a small aquifer bounded on the north and south by bedrock hills. The aquifer typically discharges seasonally into the principal drainage below the confluence of Woolsey and Box Canyons, and probably through bedrock fractures. There are no known wells that withdraw water from this aquifer. The project is expected to increase the consumption of groundwater to a negligible degree through increased transpiration associated with expansion of riparian habitat. However, flows entering the expanded seasonal wetland area will be subject to infiltration there, which will act as a new source of recharge to the aquifer, which is a beneficial effect of the project. Expansion of seasonal wetlands will not affect groundwater levels as the seasonal wetland vegetation will tend to transpire less water than the existing annual grassland vegetation that it is replacing.

Explanation (c): Less Than Significant Impact. Since the project is to create additional wetlands and restore earthen channels, it is expected that the velocity of the water entering the project area will be decreased thereby allowing sediment to be deposited rather than eroding the project area and adding sediment downstream. There may be some erosion at outlet structures from the wetlands but it appears that erosion would be minimal. Erosion potential during construction will be minimized through the use of appropriate BMPs as identified in the SWPPP that is required for the project and additional measures as described in Section 8 (a) above. Therefore, the project will not cause substantial erosion or siltation either on or offsite.

Explanation (d): Less Than Significant Impact. The project will result in an expansion of portions of the existing constructed storm water channels and a small expansion in the terminus of the Woolsey Canyon channel. The affected constructed channels were built to route stormflow around the now abandoned Chatsworth Reservoir. The project will result in the

removal of 500 lineal feet of impervious concrete lined channel, allowing for greater opportunity for storm water infiltration. Construction of the channel split to route portions of higher flows into the expanded seasonal wetland area will subject it to infrequent flooding but also tend to further decrease most peak flows from the project area and allow for additional infiltration. The project will not result in off-site flooding and will not increase peak flows off site. Rather, the project will tend to increase infiltration and decrease peak flows, through infiltration and detention storage, both of which are beneficial effects of the project.

Explanation (e): No Impact. The project will not generate additional runoff that would be directed into storm water drainage systems offsite. The project will result in detention storage in the wetland basin. Without the creation of the proposed channel split, flows would spill out of the channel, as they do currently, over into the basin when the water surface elevation in the main channel exceeds 877 feet. Thus, during very large floods there is no net positive impact of the project, as the wetland basin would quickly fill and equilibrate with the water surface elevation in the main channel. Since the project does not result in the construction of structures or in a fundamental change in land use, it will not substantially increase sources of polluted runoff.

Explanation (f): Less Than Significant Impact. Since the project does not result in the construction of structures or in a fundamental change in land use there is no potential for water quality degradation other than that associated with sediment as discussed above. BMPs to guard against surface or groundwater pollution associated with the operation and refueling of heavy equipment will be required as part of the SWPPP.

Explanation (g): Less Than Significant Impact. The Chatsworth Reservoir is a designated 100-year floodplain according to the Safety Element of the City of Los Angeles' General Plan. However, no housing is proposed in this floodplain as part of the project, therefore, the impact is less than significant.

Explanation (h): Less Than Significant Impact. No structures will be placed within the designated 100-year floodplain that would impede or redirect flood flows. The project will result in the removal of 500 lineal feet of impervious concrete lined channel, allowing for greater opportunity for storm water infiltration.

Explanation (i): Less Than Significant Impact. The project does not place people or structures at any greater risk of loss, injury, or death as a result of dam or levee failure over existing conditions because the existing dams and levees around the Chatsworth Reservoir will not be affected by the project and they currently do not protect any homes or structures.

Explanation (j): No Impact. Given its position removed from the coast, the project is not subject to damage by a tsunami. Similarly, there is no potential for impact from a seiche, since the wetland basin, at a maximum would inundate only about 40 acres, and is shallow, infrequently flooded, and removed from offices and residential areas. The surrounding terrain is gentle and not subject to mudflows.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☑	☐
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Explanation (a): No Impact. The project will be located within the existing Chatsworth Reservoir property and the proposed project area currently consists of undeveloped open space surrounded by residential communities. The creation of additional wetland/riparian habitat will not change the existing nature of the property, but rather will enhance and benefit its current use as open space. The project will not divide the surrounding residential communities.

Explanation (b): Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Los Angeles General Plan designates the project area as Open Space. In 1997, the City of Los Angeles designated the Chatsworth Reservoir as a nature preserve and wildlife refuge (Attachment B). The proposed project will increase the extent of wetland and riparian habitat in the area and therefore will not conflict with the Open Space or nature preserve designations.

Explanation (c): No Impact. There is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan that includes the Chatsworth Reservoir area.

10. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Explanation (a–c): No Impact. There are no mineral resources identified in the project area that are of value to the region or residents of the State. There are no locally-important mineral resource recovery sites in the project area delineated on any general plans, specific plans, or other local land use plan. The DWP conducted exploratory investigations to evaluate the availability of clay within the Chatsworth Reservoir property and determined that there were suitable clay resources in the central portion of the former reservoir area but not within the proposed project area.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☑	☐
b) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☑	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐		☑	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing in or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☑
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing in or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Explanation (a-b): Less Than Significant Impact. During development of the project there will be noise impacts from construction equipment and grading operations. Following development of the wetlands, project noise levels will return to natural ambient conditions and will not exceed any City standards. Construction is not expected to expose persons to

groundborne vibrations or noise levels.

Explanation (c): No Impact. Following development of the wetlands, project noise levels will return to natural ambient conditions and will not exceed any City standards.

Explanation (d): Less Than Significant Impact. While there will be an increase in ambient noise levels during construction, they will be temporary (4-6 months) and will not exceed City standards. Once grading activities are completed, noise levels will return to pre-grading conditions and no periodic increases are anticipated.

Explanation (e-f): No Impact. The project area is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport. The project area is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area either directly (*e.g.*, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (*e.g.*, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Explanation (a-c): No Impact. The proposed project does not involve the construction of any new homes, businesses, roads or infrastructure and is not growth enhancing. There is no housing at the Chatsworth Reservoir. No one will be displaced by the development of the project.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service rations, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☑
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☑
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☑
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☑
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Explanation (a-e): No Impact. The purpose of the project is to create additional wetland and riparian habitat that will enhance existing open space and is consistent with the designation of the area as a nature preserve. The area currently is not open to the public and is not considered to be a public park. There are no current plans to open the site to the public. Accordingly, there is no need for the provision of public services associated with public use of the area or the construction of new facilities that might cause a physical impact. As part of the project, the project proponent will be providing an endowment for long term maintenance of the wetlands and riparian areas, which is designed to address potential long term environmental impacts.

14. RECREATION.					
a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Explanation (a-b): No Impact. The proposed project will have no effect on the use of existing parks or recreational facilities. The project will not include recreational facilities and will not be open to the public. In the event that RAP develops a plan for public use of the area, separate environmental review and approval would be required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15. TRANSPORTATION / CIRCULATION. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (*i.e.*, result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level-of-service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (*e.g.*, sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (*e.g.*, farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☑
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☑
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	☑
g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (*e.g.*, bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Explanation (a-g): No Impact. During construction activities, there will be a temporary increase in traffic due to the delivery of construction equipment to the site and worker commutes. There will be approximately ten pieces of construction equipment, which will be delivered to the site and remain there until no longer needed. It is anticipated that there will be approximately 15 workers and supervisors at the site for a period of up to 5 months. The workers and supervisors will drive to the site in their own cars. Once the project is developed, there will be no traffic other than periodic (quarterly or annual) inspections and maintenance

activities.

The project does not involve any changes to roadways either inside or outside of the Chatsworth Reservoir. Construction equipment will be used exclusively within the fenced area of the Chatsworth Reservoir and will not travel on public streets or leave the site until the project is completed. The project will not affect emergency access to any surrounding uses. The Chatsworth Reservoir is not open to the public and so parking is not provided or required. The wetlands mitigation project will not result in a change in status. Additional trips will occur only during project construction. Therefore, there will be no long-term impacts on the level-of-service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. There will be no regular trips to the project and the project will not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation. The project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?	☐	☐	☑	☐
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☑	☐
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☑

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	☑
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Explanation (a, c, e-g): No Impact. There will be no wastewater discharges from the project. The project will be modifying an existing storm water drainage system by returning portions of the system to natural conditions. The modified system will be designed to handle at least the volumes being handled by the current drainage system. See discussion at 8 (e). No soil will be removed during project grading or construction. Any waste removed during development of the project will be transported to the Sunshine Canyon Landfill, which has adequate capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. All green waste will be used on-site as mulch or recycled. Once the project is established, it is not expected that any waste will need to be transported off-site. The project will comply with all federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Explanation (b): Less Than Significant Impact. Due to its limited water usage and lack of waste water discharges, the project will not require the construction of new water or waste water treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities.

Explanation (d): Less Than Significant Impact. The project will require minimal water for irrigation during the time the vegetation is becoming established (approximately 3-5 years after planting). Once the vegetation is established, irrigation will cease. DWP will provide the irrigation water and no new or expanded entitlements are needed.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☑	☐	☐
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)	☐	☐	☑	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Explanation (a): Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. As discussed in the preceding sections, the project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment. Conditions have been included to protect air quality, hydrology and water quality, biological resources, and cultural resources.

Explanation (b-c): Less Than Significant Impact. The project will not result in potentially significant individual or cumulative direct or indirect impacts on the environment. The project will have a net benefit on the environment through the expansion of wetland and riparian vegetation and enhancement of wildlife habitat.

The project consists of the establishment of a conservation easement, transfer of property, construction and monitoring of new wetland and riparian areas, and establishment of an interest bearing account to fund long term maintenance. There are no similar projects ongoing or planned within the Chatsworth Reservoir area that, together with the project, would have cumulatively considerable impacts.