SECTION E

DETERMINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION should 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 the mitigation measure(s) described below will be applied to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION should be prepared.

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

Mitigation Measures

A deed restriction shall be recorded, limiting development of the site to that indicated on the Plans provided to Padre, dated August 1, 1986:

- Construction of the primary residence, including the minimum grading required to meet County and State building codes;
- Construction of the cottage, including the minimum grading required to meet County and State building codes;
- Improvements to existing roads to meet County road standards;
- 10,000 gallon water tank; and
- Installation of the roadway culvert.

All other portions of the site may not be developed unless a comprehensive biological impact assessment is completed. The assessment shall include spring botanical surveys, focused wildlife surveys, wetland delineation, impact analysis and mitigation measures. All feasible mitigation measures shall be fully implemented to reduce impacts to biological resources to a level of less than significant. This measure should be enforced through a deed restriction, which would apply to all future development, including that exempt from CEQA.

Matt Ingram

Signature of Preparer

12/9/02

Date

SECTION B

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Job: PD-1956 **Requester:** Terry Newman

Applicant: Bakke & Mathis **Date:** July 7, 1999

Survey Type: Field **Rationale:** Oak Trees/stream

Site Description: A field visit of the site (Parcel no. 701-0-050-06) was conducted on December 9, 2002. The site is located on the southern (north-facing) slope of Serrano Canyon, in the Santa Monica Mountains. The site supports mostly purple sage scrub, dominated by Californi sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), purple sage (*Salvia leucophylla*), big-pod ceanothus (*Ceanothus megacarpus*) and laurel sumac (*Malosma laurina*). However, the scrub community in the steep northern slopes of the site is also dominated by green-bark ceanothus (*Ceanothus spinosus*) and bush mallow (*Malacothamnus fasciculatus*) and may be considered a mixed coastal sage-chaparral community. A small ephemeral tributary of the Serrano Canyon drainage occurs in the western and northern portions of the site.

		N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
6.	Biological Resources								
	a. endangered, threatened, or rare species			X				X	
	b. wetland habitat			X				X	
	c. coastal habitat		X				X		
	d. migration corridors		X				X		
	e. locally important species/communities			X				X	

*N No Impact
LS Less Than Significant Impact
PS-M Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated
PS Potentially Significant Impact

SECTION C

DISCUSSION OF RESPONSES

a. Plant or animal species listed under either the Federal or California Endangered Species Acts reported by the California Natural Diversity Data Base (RAREFIND 2 Output for the Triunfo Pass 7.5' Quadrangle map) within 5 miles of the site include:

- Marcescent dudleya (*Dudleya cymosa* ssp. *marcescens,* Federal Threatened, State Rare) – reported from Little Sycamore Canyon, 1.6 miles to the east.
- Santa Monica Mountains dudleya (*Dudleya cymosa* ssp. *ovatifolia*, Federal Threatened) – reported from Arroyo Sequit, 3.1 miles to the east-southeast.
- Southern steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*, Federal Endangered) – reported from Arroyo Sequit, 3 miles to the east.

Suitable habitat for marcescent dudleya occurs on a small rocky cliff near the ephemeral stream in the northern portion of the site. This species was not observed during the site visit; however, surveys were not conducted and this species is very difficult to detect in winter. Currently, development of this portion of the site has not been proposed. However, future non-discretionary development may result in impacts to marcescent dudleya (if present).

b. Two drainage swales occur on the site, including a small ephemeral tributary to the Serrano Canyon drainage, and a small swale that enters the central portion of the site from the east. Patches of wetland vegetation (mulefat, mugwort, sycamore, arroyo willow) occurs in the ephemeral tributary in the northern portion of the site. Due to the short duration of saturated soils (a few days per year), small area, lack of rare species, low density and lack of dominance of riparian vegetation, these wetlands are not considered significant for the purposes of General Plan Policy 1.5.2.3. However, areas downstream of the site (Serrano Canyon and Big Sycamore Canyon) do support significant wetlands. Currently, the only proposed development of this drainage is a roadway culvert at the location of an existing unpaved road. The culvert would not result in impacts to wetlands. However, future non-discretionary development may result in potentially significant impacts to wetlands.

c. Potential impacts to the coastal zone include degradation of nearshore habitat associated with sedimentation from grading. However, the site is sufficiently distant from the coast and grading is limited to about 50 cubic yards, such that impacts are expected to be less than significant.

d. Serrano Canyon may be used as local wildlife movement corridor. In addition, abundant deer, coyote and mountain lion tracks were found on the site, indicating some wildlife movement occurs on the existing unpaved roads. Development of the site may result in a loss of cover and introduction of human activities and domestic pets, and may result in some reduction in wildlife movement through the site. However, such movement appears opportunistic to avoid heavy brush and many alternate paths are available in the area, such that no reduction in the numbers or long-term viability of local wildlife populations is expected.

e. Special-status species reported from in the vicinity of the site include Plummer's mariposa lily (*Calochortus plummerae*) and golden eagle. In addition, Catalina mariposa lily (*Calochortus catalinae*) was observed at two locations on the site, outside the proposed development areas. Due to the timing of the winter site visit the status of Plummer's mariposa lily and Catalina mariposa lily on the site cannot be fully determined. However, the proposed development would result in the loss of less than one acre of suitable habitat for these species, such that potential impacts (if any) are expected to be less than significant. However, future non-discretionary development may result in potentially significant impacts to these species.

   The site supports about ten coast live oak trees, with about five along the southern site boundary and five along the ephemeral drainage. This species is protected under the Zoning Code. One coast live oak tree (two trucks of about 35 inches in girth each) is located at the site of the proposed cottage, and may be removed. Future non-discretionary development may result in the loss of additional oak trees. Provided the applicant complies with the Tree Protection Regulations (Section 8107-25 of the Zoning Code), loss of oak trees is considered a less than significant impact.

SECTION D

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on the information contained within Sections B and C:	YES/MAYBE	NO
1. Does the project have the potential to significantly 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?	X	____
2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts will endure well into the future).	____	X
3. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (Several projects may have relatively small individual impacts on two or more resources, but the total of those impacts on the environment is significant).	____	X
4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	____	X