II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROPOSED PROJECT

The subject of this EIR is to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the proposed development of the La Paz Ranch property, a 15.2-acre undeveloped area located within the Civic Center area of the City of Malibu. The project address is 3700 La Paz Lane, Malibu, California 90265. For a detailed description of the Project Site and surrounding locale, see Section IV.A, Overview of Environmental Setting.

The Project Site is presently comprised of two legal parcels identified herein as Parcel A and Parcel B. The Proposed Project includes the development of three ~~separate commercial development projects~~ parcels for a total development of 132,058 sf of commercial floor area, including commercial office and retail space and a City Hall. The architecture is envisioned as Mediterranean with modern updates, with maximum building heights not exceeding 24 feet at the base of the roof level and ~~34~~32-feet in height as measured from the highest point of articulated roof elements. A summary of the total proposed development for all three parcels combined is as follows:

- 112,058 square feet of commercial retail and office space;
- 20,000-square foot City Hall;
- 609 parking spaces.

PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

In addition to the Proposed Project, two Project Alternatives were evaluated in the EIR (see Section VII, Alternatives to the Proposed Project):

1. The No Project Alternative. This alternative assumes that no new development or construction would occur on the project sites.

2. The Preferred Alternative. This alternative assumes a reduced density development (without the proposed City Hall on Parcel C), representing an approximate 25% percent reduction in density as compared to the Proposed Project.

These two alternatives were developed with the intent to inform the Decision-Makers of a reasonable range of alternatives that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of its significant effects~~the probable environmental impacts in the event that the Proposed Project is (a) not approved, or (b) is approved without the City Hall. These alternatives were deemed to be reasonably foreseeable events that may result if the Project does not get approved as currently proposed~~. Alternative locations were not considered viable ~~alternatives~~ because the there were no other available locations in the Malibu Civic Center for a new City Hall nor for the Applicant to acquire an undeveloped property comparable in size and zoning in the City of Malibu~~proposed Project~~

~~Site is currently vacant, is owned by a private developer, and is zoned for future commercial uses. Thus, developing the Proposed Project at another location would not preclude development at this site. In addition, given the fact that the Proposed Project includes the development of a City Hall, the Malibu Civic Center is the most logical location as it is centrally located and would be complimentary to other adjacent civic center and commercial uses~~.

AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Notice of Preparation Comment Letters (NOP)

In response to the NOP that was circulated on September 29, 2006, the lead agency received eight response letters. The NOP response letters are contained in Appendix A to this EIR. The letters received from state and regional agencies generally acknowledge receipt of the NOP and address the environmental issues that are germane to each agency. The Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse distributed the NOP to relevant State agencies and issued State Clearinghouse No. 2003011131 to record and track the EIR. The California Department of Fish and Game's concerns regarding potential impacts upon biological resources are addressed in Section V.C Biological Resources. The California Department of Transportation's (Caltrans) concerns regarding the project's potential impacts upon the state highway system, including State Route-1 (PCH) are addressed in Section V.K Transportation and Circulation. The South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) concerns regarding construction and operational air quality emissions are addressed in Section V. B. Air Quality. The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines (January 1, 1997) are addressed in Section V.K Transportation and Circulation. The Los Angeles County Fire Department's concerns regarding requirements for fire protection and emergency medical service are addressed in Section V.J-1 Public Services – Fire Protection. The Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy's concerns regarding the need for conservation of open space areas is addressed in Section V.C Biological Resources, and Section VII. Alternatives to the Proposed Project.

The areas of concern raised by Heal the Bay, a non-profit organization, focus on the historic water quality problems in Malibu Creek, Malibu Lagoon, and Surfrider Beach, and their desire that the City of Malibu develop an Integrated Water Resource Management Plan and apply other project specific measures for the protection of Malibu Creek/Lagoon. These concerns are addressed in Section V.F Hydrology/Water Quality.

Draft EIR Comment Letters

The Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment between September 29, 2006 and November 13, 2006. In response, the lead agency received a total of 11 comments; seven letters were from state, regional, or local agencies and four were from interested individuals including one homeowner association (see Appendix I Draft EIR Comment Letters). The comments received from these sources identify 9 general areas of controversy with regard to the Proposed Project. A summary of the major points of controversy follows.

1. Groundwater/Hydrology

The Project proposes use of an alternative on-site wastewater treatment system (AOWTS) to handle sewage generated by the Project. The AOWTS proposes a network of underground wastewater treatment tanks to remove solids and other materials from the waste stream prior to discharging treated effluent on site using a system of leach fields and subsurface drip disposal areas. Controversy exists regarding the potential for impacts to groundwater and hydrology from operation of the proposed OWTS. Specifically, commenter's have disputed the wastewater discharge and assimilation rates, and evapotranspiration rates, as well as reported conclusions regarding the anticipated rise in groundwater levels identified in various engineering and design studies and hydrology reports prepared for the Proposed Project. Specific performance standards that the proposed OWTS will be required to meet in order to obtain required Waste Discharge Permits were identified by the RWQCB, who also commented that the current design of the OWTS does not meet these standards. The need to identify the Proposed Projects' contribution to and effect on existing and proposed adjacent septic systems was noted, and the benefits of a cumulative hydrology study for the Civic Center Area were also identified. Generalized questions were raised regarding the long-term maintenance of drainage improvements, the preferred timing for submittal of required plans to the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, and the potential for impacts to surface driveways from expansive soils in leach field areas.

The design of the proposed OWTS was modified following circulation of the Draft EIR (see Section III.C Project Description – Project Characteristics, and Section V.I-4 Public Utilities – Wastewater). Noted revisions reflect a change in the location of subsurface drip disposal areas and the configuration of the proposed wastewater treatment system. A Conformance Review of the OWTS design was completed by the City of Malibu Environmental Health Department on 10-4-06. It requires the Proposed Project to meet specific conditions including obtaining all necessary permits and approvals from the RWQCB and the City of Malibu Public Works/Engineering Services and Environmental and Community Development Department prior to final approval of the OWTS. A discussion of these issues is included in Section V.I-4 Public Utilities – Wastewater, and Section IX Response to Comments (see Response to Comments No's. 7.2, 10.10, 11.5, 11.6, 11.7, 11.8, 11.9, and 11.10) of this Revised Final EIR.

2. Biological Resources

The 15.2 acre Project Site contains both non-native shrubs and annual plants (comprising approximately 95% of the on-site vegetative cover) and two native vegetation plant communities – coastal sage scrub and California sycamore tree cells (comprising approximately 5% of the on-site vegetative cover). Development of the Proposed Project would result in grading the entire Project Site and permanent removal of coastal sage scrub habitat and sycamore woodland relic cells, as well as the non-native eucalyptus trees, and non-native annual grasslands. The Proposed Project development would include 25% open space and 40% landscaping, with one and two-story buildings and associated parking covering the remaining portion of the site. Questions have arisen regarding the required comprehensive biological survey and a wetland delineation, the adequacy of proposed mitigation measures (including the need to incorporate fuel modification areas into the EIR, and to provide an open space dedication/easement), and alternatives to the Proposed Project if Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) exists on the Site.

In response, an aerial photo depicting the fuel modification envelopes overlain on the project site plan has been added to the Final EIR as Figure V.J-1. The project's fuel modification requirements are identified in Mitigation Measure No. 3 in Section V.J, Public Services, Fire Protection. A Technical Memorandum was prepared by Teracor Resource Management on 27 March 2007 (see Appendix D-1) updating the Biological Resources Evaluation. The findings of the Technical Memorandum confirmed that the status of biological resources on-site remains as reported in the Draft EIR, clarified that the subject site does not support wetlands, and concluded that no California black walnut trees exist on the Project Site. A discussion of these issues is included in Section V.C Biological Resources, and Section IX Response to Comments (see Response to Comments No's. 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.6, and 5.7) of this Revised Final EIR.

3. Traffic

Questions and comments regarding the analysis of traffic impacts in the Draft EIR focused on various points, including the need to analyze traffic impacts on southbound PCH during summertime, weekend, and holiday timeframes (as well as during the fall/spring when school is in session). In response, supplemental baseline traffic counts were conducted in August 2007 to capture the summer traffic volumes at all 9 study intersections that were included in the original traffic study for the Draft EIR (see Appendix J). The supplemental counts confirmed that no appreciable change in the traffic volumes at the 9 study intersections would result, as discussed in Section IX Response to Comments (see Response to Comments No. 3.1). Other comments questioned the traffic counts reported in the Traffic Study, the 1.5% annual traffic growth rate assumption used to analyze impacts of future traffic, the list of projects used in the analysis of cumulative traffic impacts, and identified the need to revise the Traffic Study to include a Highway Safety Study on the county portion of Malibu Canyon Road. Generalized questions were raised regarding the potential for traffic impacts to residents egressing onto Malibu Canyon Road from adjacent residential streets (i.e., Malibu Crest, Harbor Vista, and Malibu Knolls Road), and about specific traffic impact mitigation measures, including who would pay for improvements to Webb Way. Other comments questioned the lack of mitigation for traffic impacts at Cross Creek Road and Civic Center Way, and clarified that Caltrans has not approved the proposed mitigation on PCH for traffic impacts at the intersection of Cross Creek Road & PCH. A discussion of these issues is included in Section V.K Transportation and Circulation, and Section IX Response to Comments (see Response to Comments No's. 7.3, 8.3, 8.4, 8.5, 8.6, 8.7, 8.8, 8.9, 8.10, and 10.11) of this Revised Final EIR.

4. Public Utilities - Water Service/Public Services – Fire Protection/On-Site Water Features

Questions were raised as to whether the Proposed Project will cause diminished water services potentially impacting the existing community, and regarding details of proposed mitigation in the Draft EIR involving off-site improvements to assure adequate fire protection. Since the circulation of the Draft EIR, it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Fire Department and Los Angeles County Waterworks District 29 that adequate water pressure and supply needed to assure the required fire flow to the Proposed Project can be accommodated by existing water mains and required water infrastructure improvements. Section V.J-1 Public Services – Fire Protection, of the Draft EIR has been revised to clarify the required on-site water infrastructure improvements, and to specify revised mitigation

measures requiring both on-site and off-site water infrastructure improvements. A discussion of these issues is included in Section IX Response to Comments (see Response to Comment No. 8.2) of this Revised Final EIR. Questions have also been raised regarding the potential for impacts from proposed water features including unwanted noise, odors, insect and animal populations, duck droppings, and West Nile Virus. A discussion of these issues is included in Section IX Response to Comments (see Response to Comment No. 10.12) of this Revised Final EIR.

5. Noise/Light

Some of the commenter's have questioned why their residential neighborhood on Harbor Vista Drive did not get included in the noise study, and expressed concern regarding the potential for noise impacts from the Proposed Project to reach homes in Malibu Knolls. Additionally, other concerns have been expressed regarding noise and light impacts including: (1) impacts from existing adjacent commercial uses (Malibu Country Mart); (2) the need for restrictions to limit hours of truck deliveries, nighttime lighting and skateboarding; and, (3) the need for specific photovoltaic standards to be applied when reviewing lighting plans for the Proposed Project. It should be noted that the skateboard park and adjacent commercial uses are located off-site and are not part of the project. Noise and light generated from these uses are a part of the existing ambient noise and light environment discussed in Section IV. Overview of Environmental Setting, Section V.H Noise, and Section V.A Aesthetics of the EIR. A discussion of these issues is included in Section IX Response to Comments (see Response to Comments No's. 8.1, 9.1, 9.2, and 9.3) of this Revised Final EIR.

6. Alternatives Analysis

The alternatives to the Proposed Project included in the Draft EIR were The No Project Alternative and the Preferred Project Alternative. Controversy exists as to whether additional alternatives should have been considered in the Draft EIR given the limited range of alternatives considered, and in light of the potential for significant biological resource impacts to result from implementation of the Proposed Project or the Preferred Alternative Project. In response, Section VII Alternatives to the Proposed Project was revised to identify a surface level parking alternatives rejected as infeasible during the scoping process, and four additional alternatives to the Proposed Project that were also considered. A discussion of these issues is included in Section VII Alternatives to the Proposed Project, and Section IX Response to Comments (see Response to Comments No's. 5.4, 10.6, and 10.7) of this Revised Final EIR.

7. Deferred Mitigation

The Proposed Project would require numerous future approvals and permits from the City of Malibu, as well as the Regional Water Quality Control Board (a responsible agency under CEQA) to reduce potential impacts from construction and operation of the Proposed Project to insignificant levels. Controversy exists as to whether subsequent approvals constitute deferral of mitigation, which is not allowed under the CEQA. The specific mitigation measures at question in the Draft EIR include: (1) a landscape plan; (2) grading plans; (3) final feasibility approval of the onsite wastewater treatment system ("OWTS"); (4) a water quality mitigation plan ("WQMP"); (5) grading and drainage plans; (6) detailed plans for the

OWTS; and, (7) permits from the RWQCB. The EIR includes adequate environmental analysis that identified potentially significant impacts. The subsequent approvals identified in the EIR as mitigation measures may require more detailed analysis to demonstrate that the Project would meet the performance based standards prescribed by the regulatory agencies responsible for issuing permits. A discussion of these issues is included in Section IX Response to Comments (see Response to Comment No's. 10.4 and 10.5) of this Revised Final EIR.

8. Adequacy of Mitigation Measures

Some of the commenter's have questioned whether impacts to planning and zoning regulations from Proposed Project inconsistencies with yard/setback and height requirements will be adequately mitigated by the approval of the Development Agreement. In addition, some commenter's have concerns that noise, light, privacy, access, and air quality impacts to adjacent residences have not been adequately mitigated. In response to concerns over individuals being able to access the Malibu Knolls residential area by way of the intervening hillsides, Section V.J Public Services – Police Protection has been revised to include a mitigation measure proposed by the Applicant requiring a 6-foot high wrought iron fence along the northern perimeter of the Proposed Project. A discussion of these issues is included in Section V.J-2 Public Services – Police Protection, and Section IX Response to Comments (see Response to Comment No's. 2.7, 8.11, and 10.13) of this Revised Final EIR.

9. Content in the Draft EIR

Some of the commenter's have identified that the EIR should have included other specific information such as the Development Agreement for the Proposed Project, the findings required for making a public benefit and amenity determination, the findings required for approving a division of land, and the square footage needed to make the project feasible. Other questions have arisen as to whether or not a Civic Center Specific Plan should be approved before the Proposed Project can be approved. A discussion of these issues is included in Section IX Response to Comments (see Response to Comment No's. 2.2, 2.3, 2.8, 8.12, 10.8 and 10.14) of this Revised Final EIR.

Comments Received/Project Changes Following the Planning Commission Public Hearings

After the Final EIR was published, and following the January 22, 2008 Planning Commission public hearing on the Proposed Project, but before certification of the Final EIR, several comments were received by the City of Malibu on the Proposed Project. In addition, the Applicant submitted supplemental material replacing the on-site wastewater treatment system (OWTS), as described in the Draft EIR, with a water reuse system (presented as a Wastewater Management Master Plan – WMMP) designed to be compliant with the California Department of Public Health requirements applicable to the use of recycled water (Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations), the City of Malibu regulations applicable to on-site wastewater treatment systems, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements. Accordingly, the following sections in the Final EIR have been revised to account for these changes:

Project Description

Aesthetics

Biology

Geo and Soils

Hydrology/Water Quality

Public Utilities

Public Services

Alternatives

Preparers and Persons Consulted

Response to Comments

Appendices

Importantly, the revisions identify that potential environmental impacts from implementation of the WMMP as a part of both the Proposed Project and the Preferred Alternative Project would be the same or reduced when compared to the potential impacts of the Proposed Project and the Preferred Alternative Project identified in the Draft EIR. As summarized in Section II, Project Description, and further analyzed in greater detail in Section V, Environmental Impact Analysis, of this Revised Final EIR, the changes proposed to the Project are relatively minor and would not result in any new significant environmental impacts. Pursuant to Section 15088.5(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines:

"A lead agency is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review under Section 15087 but before certification. As used in this section, the term "information" can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement. "Significant new information" requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

(1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.

(2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.

(3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.

(4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. (Mountain Lion Coalition v. Fish and Game Com. (1989) 214 Cal.App.3d 1043)

The analysis contained in this Revised Final EIR re-evaluates the project's impacts in light of the proposed changes to replace the Project's OWTS with a wastewater re-use system, and to further respond to comments received during the Planning Commission hearings. The findings and conclusions in this revised Final EIR demonstrate that many of the impact issues previously examined in the January 2008 Final EIR would remain unchanged with the proposed modifications. The analysis further demonstrates that the proposed modifications would alter the design elements of a few project components, but the resulting changes do not generate any new significant environmental effects, or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects which would call, as provided in Section 15088.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines, for the recirculation of the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The following pages summarize the various environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Project. Mitigation measures are proposed for significant environmental impacts, and the level of impact significance after mitigation is also identified.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
AESTHETICS/VIEWS		
Post-Project Views. The Project would introduce new development to a site that is primarily vacant. The Project would be visible from local and distant viewing locations along portions of City streets (e.g. Civic Center Way, Cross Creek Road and Malibu Canyon Road) as well as from various residential and/or commercial land uses located along these streets. Existing off-site trees and vegetation would screen some public and private views of the project from these locations. Visibility of the Proposed Project from these locations is obscured by existing topography, vegetation and existing development within the Civic Center area. As such, the Proposed Project would not result in the obstruction of any public scenic views. The Proposed Project is consistent with the neighborhood in regards to size, design, and height, which includes the surrounding homes and commercial development. Furthermore, building mass impacts are considered to be less than significant as the proposed building heights are consistent with existing commercial development~~permitted for the Project Site~~. **Lighting** The Project has the potential to significantly alter the daytime and nighttime visual qualities and conditions of the site and its vicinities. The Project has the potential to introduce a greater amount of nighttime lighting to the Project Site. The Proposed Landscaping Plan has been revised to include additional landscape cover to buffer vehicle and parking lot lighting effects from impacting adjacent residential properties. Light and glare impacts would be potentially significant but can be mitigated to less than significant levels by implementing mitigation measures.	Implementation of the following mitigation measures would ensure the Proposed Project does not result in any significant aesthetics impacts: 1) All open areas not used for buildings, driveways, parking areas, or walkways shall be attractively landscaped and maintained in accordance with a landscape plan, with native plant species, to the satisfaction of the City Planning Department. The final Landscape Plan shall be in substantial compliance with the Conceptual Landscaping Plan illustrated in Figure V.A-6 and shall include a row of coast live oak trees, which shall be planted 15 feet apart trunk to trunk on center along the northeasterly property boundary and Australian willow and coast live oak around buildings 10 and 11, west of the road. 2) Outdoor lighting shall incorporate low-level lighting fixtures and shall be designed and installed with directional shields so that the light source cannot be seen from adjacent land uses. 3) The exterior of the proposed buildings shall be constructed of non-reflective building materials.	With the incorporation of the mitigation measures identified herein, the Project would be designed and developed in a manner that minimizes the effects of light and glare impacts. Thus, the project would result in less than significant aesthetic impacts.
AIR QUALITY		
Construction Impacts Construction of the Proposed Project would generate pollutant emissions from the following construction activities: (1) grading and excavation, (2) construction workers traveling to and from Project Site, (3) delivery and hauling of construction supplies and debris to and from the Project Site, (4) the fuel combustion by on-site construction equipment, and (5)	**Construction Mitigation Measures** Estimates of daily PM_{10} emissions assume proper implementation of SCAQMD Rule 403. Therefore, the following mitigation measures, as recommended by the SCAQMD, shall be implemented for all areas (both on-site and off-site) where construction would occur, in order	**Construction Impacts** Implementation of the required mitigation measures is estimated to reduce PM_{10} emissions to approximately 85 pounds per day (ppd) during the grading phase of the

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
architectural coating. Estimates of daily particulate matter (PM_{10}) emissions assume proper implementation of South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403. Estimated daily construction emissions would not exceed any of the SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, air quality impacts from construction activities would be less than significant. **Operational Impacts** ***Regional Impacts*** Motor vehicles would be the predominate source of long-term emissions associated with the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would not exceed any of the SCAQMD significance thresholds for criteria pollutants. Regional air quality impacts would therefore be less than significant. ***Localized Impacts*** One-hour Carbon Monoxide (CO) concentrations under "Proposed Project" conditions would range from approximately 5.4 parts per million (ppm) to 7.1 ppm during the weekday and from approximately 6.1 ppm to 6.6 ppm during the weekend at worst-case sidewalk receptors. "Proposed Project" eight-hour CO concentrations are anticipated to range from approximately 3.3 ppm to 4.3 ppm during the weekday and from approximately 3.7 ppm to 4.0 ppm during the weekend. The State one- and eight-hour standards of 20.0 ppm and 9.0 ppm, respectively, would not be exceeded at worst-case sidewalk receptor locations at the study intersections under "Proposed Project" conditions. Thus, less-than-significant impacts are anticipated. **Consistency with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)** The Proposed Project is substantially consistent with the underlying zoning and General Plan designations for the Project Site and would not exacerbate any existing violations of the State one- and eight-hour CO concentration standards. Therefore, the Proposed Project is consistent with the AQMP and impacts would be less than significant.	to reduce PM_{10} emissions to a less-than-significant level. 1. The construction area and vicinity (500-foot radius) shall be swept (preferably with water sweepers) and watered at least twice daily. 2. All unpaved roads, parking and staging areas shall be watered at least once every two hours of active operations. 3. Site access points shall be swept/washed of visible dirt deposition at the end of each workday. 4. On-site stockpiles of debris, dirt or rusty material shall be covered or watered at least twice daily. 5. All haul trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials shall either be covered or maintain two feet of freeboard. 6. All haul trucks shall have a capacity of no less than twelve and three-quarter (12.75) cubic yard. 7. At least 80 percent of all inactive disturbed surface areas shall be watered on a daily basis when there is evidence of wind-driven fugitive dust. 8. Operations on any unpaved surfaces shall be suspended when winds exceed 25 mph. 9. Traffic speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour. 10. Operations on any unpaved surfaces shall be suspended during first and second stage smog alerts. **Operational Mitigation Measures** No operational mitigation measures are required since operation of the Proposed Project would not exceed any of the SCAQMD significance thresholds or the State one- and eight-hour CO standards.	Proposed Project. PM_{10} emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD threshold of 150 ppd under Proposed Project conditions. Thus, construction-related air quality impacts would be less than significant after mitigation. **Operational Impacts** Operation of the Proposed Project would not exceed any of the SCAQMD significance thresholds or the State one- and eight-hour CO standards. Thus, no mitigation measures are required, and operational air quality impacts would be less than significant.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
Impacts to Vegetation Development of the Proposed Project would result in the grading (including remedial excavation and re-compaction) of the Project Site. These operations would remove all native hillside sage scrub habitat and sycamore woodland relic cells. Additionally, non-native Eucalyptus trees and the non-native annual grassland would also be permanently removed. The loss of coastal sage scrub (CSS) is considered ~~to be~~ an adverse, but less than significant impact due to the ~~limited~~ disturbed and isolated nature~~extent~~ of ~~coastal sage scrub~~CSS on ~~the Project Site~~ site. Therefore, no mitigation for loss for loss of CSS is required. The loss of on-site sycamore ~~woodland relic~~ trees is considered to be a potentially significant ~~and temporal impact due to the decades old removal of all understory elements to the woodland and the isolated condition under which the trees persist~~as their removal would conflict with the Malibu LIP Chapter 5. The loss of annual non-native grassland is considered to be a ~~non~~ less than significant impact. Landscaping within the resulting undeveloped areas would offset any adverse impacts to non-native grasslands. ~~, while the r~~Removal of Eucalyptus and other invasive, non-native trees and vegetation (e.g., castor bean, mustard, etc.) is considered to be a beneficial impact. Based on a general biological assessment conducted on the Project Site, no sensitive flora are known to occur on-site. Further, no wetlands or other jurisdictional features are present. Therefore, no significant impacts to ~~sensitive flora~~these resources are anticipated. **Impacts to Wildlife** Construction of the Proposed Project would disturb all wildlife species, which currently reside or utilize the Project Site through the displacement or killing of such species during grading operations. Most wildlife species present on the Project Site are common and urban adapted. Highly mobile wildlife would move off the Project Site during construction, but low mobility organisms (e.g., burrowing mammals, reptiles, etc.) risk destruction. Incidental injuries and kills can be reduced in number with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.	**Vegetation and Wildlife Mitigation Measures** Project specific impacts to biological resources were determined to be potentially significant with respect to nesting bird species. As such, the following mitigation measure is required to mitigate this impact. 1. Nesting birds are protected by both the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) Code and the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Removal of, or encroachment into existing on-site vegetation, should be restricted to off-peak bird nesting season, which typically occurs between February ~~15~~ 1 and August ~~15~~30. Should vegetation/tree removal be required during this period, the Applicant shall obtain the services of a qualified biologist, approved by the City, to conduct a series of nesting bird surveys ~~pursuant to the~~consistent with CDFG recommended nesting bird surveys protocol methods in effect at the time. ~~Specifically, the qualified biologist shall conduct a series of eight (8) surveys, no less than seven (7) days apart, in all areas of the subject parcel that may support nesting birds.~~ Any active nests shall be marked and exclusionary fencing shall be placed at a ~~50~~10-foot radius around the nest (~~200~~ 300 feet for raptors). The exclusionary fencing shall remain in place until such time that the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active. All equipment and human activity shall be excluded from these areas during active nesting without exception. Should the actual construction of nests be observed by the project biologist, he/she may, with direction from the regional CDFG wildlife biologist, remove the nesting materials and/or dissuade further construction of the nest provided no egg-laying has begun.	**Impacts to Vegetation** With implementation of the recommended measures identified herein, impacts to vegetation communities and wildlife habitat would be reduced to less than significant levels. **Impacts to Wildlife** With implementation of the recommended measure identified herein, potential impacts to nesting bird species would be avoided. In addition, with implementation of the additional recommended measures, impacts to on-site wildlife would be further reduced to less than significant levels. The cumulative impacts associated with the Project remain potentially significant and unavoidable.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Most wildlife species present on the Project Site are common and urban adapted. No endangered or threatened wildlife species are known to be present on the Project Site. Therefore, no impacts to any endangered, threatened or otherwise protected species would occur.	**Additional Measures to Further Reduce Adverse Impacts** Aside from potential direct impacts associated with nesting bird species, impacts upon biological resources at the La Paz site are considered adverse but less than significant. The following protective measures shall be incorporated into the Proposed Project to further reduce potential adverse impacts to biological resources resulting from project implementation. 2. All disturbed and non-vegetated areas of the site must be watered daily during vegetation clearance and grading to minimize the generation of fugitive dust. 3. Prior to the initiation of vegetation clearance and grading, a qualified biologist or ecologist shall monitor the site and attempt to clear the proposed grading area of wildlife. The monitor will be present while all vegetation is removed, and shall direct the equipment operator to avoid impacts to wildlife through normal minimization techniques. 4. Native vegetation shall be used in the landscaping pallet to the greatest extent feasible as ~~approved~~ required by the City of Malibu in the project's landscaping plan pursuant to mitigation measure A-1 at page V.A-14. 5. The lighting plan should be designed in consultation with the City Biologist or a qualified ecologist familiar with best management building practices. All lighting should be of low luminescence, directed downward or toward structures, and shielded to the extent necessary to protect nocturnal biological resources, pursuant to mitigation measure A-2 at page V.A-15. ~~6. Any CSS removed on the property shall require one of the following mitigation measures to offset the loss~~	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	~~of CSS: 1) contribution to a restoration program for CSS in the Santa Monica Mountains to an established conservation organization or governmental agency on a 1:1 creation (2:1 enhancement) per/acre basis; or 2) contribution to an established conservation organization or governmental agency in the Santa Monica Mountains to assist with purchase and set aside of existing CSS habitat in the Santa Monica Mountains on a 2:1 per/acre basis~~. ~~7. Native protected tree species (i.e., CA black walnut and sycamore) removed on site shall be replaced on a 4:1 basis on site and utilized around detention basins, parking lots, and within landscape islands. Trees should be a minimum size of 15 gallon material around detention basins and 24 inch box material in ornamental landscape settings. Prior to removal of any trees, a qualified Biologist, Ecologist, or Certified Arborist shall document the number and size of all native tree species present on-site and proposed for removal, and provide that information to the City of Malibu Biologist. Large, specimen size trees (i.e., equal to or greater than 24 inch diameter at breast height (dbh)) that are multi trunked should be replaced 4:1 for each trunk over 24 inches dbh. No tree removals shall be permitted during bird nesting season (February 15th through August 15th) unless the tree has been thoroughly inspected by a qualified Biologist to determine that no nesting migratory birds are present in the canopy.~~ 6. Native protected tree species (i.e., sycamore) removed on-site shall be replaced in accordance with the Tree Mitigation Plan approved by the City Biologist. The approved plan includes the removal of 6 trees and a replacement on-site at a better than 10:1 ratio. To lessen the impact of cumulative loss of open space,	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	any native vegetation removed on the property shall require one of the following measures to offset the loss: 7. Contribution to a restoration program for CSS in the Santa Monica Mountains to an established conservation organization or governmental agency on a 1:1 creation (2:1 enhancement) per/acre basis; or 8. Contribution to an established conservation organization or governmental agency in the Santa Monica Mountains to assist with purchase and set-aside of existing CSS habitat in the Santa Monica Mountains on a 2:1 per/acre basis.	
CULTURAL RESOURCES		
Impacts to Archaeological and Paleontological Resources Archaeological field surveys concluded that there are no observable cultural resources, including artifacts or altered soil, indicating the presence of prehistoric archaeological remains on the Project Site. Archeological records searches revealed that no archaeological or historic sites exist on the Project Site. Therefore, damage to, destruction, or disturbance of known important cultural, paleontological, or archaeological resources would not be expected to occur. Nevertheless, the potential still exists to uncover unknown significant archaeological and/or paleontological remains during excavation and/or surface grading activities. Thus, mitigation measures are recommended. **Impacts to Historic Structures** No significant physical or aesthetic impacts would occur to prehistoric or historic buildings or structures as no such structures exist on the Project Site.	**Archaeological and Paleontological Resources Mitigation Measures** As the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources, no mitigation measures are necessary. However, the following preventative actions are recommended in order to ensure that the Proposed Project would not result in any unforeseen impacts to archaeological and/or paleontological resources. 1. In the event that archaeological resources are encountered during the course of grading or construction, all development must temporarily cease in these areas until the resources are properly assessed and subsequent recommendations are determined by a qualified consultant. 2. In the event that human remains are discovered, there shall be no disposition of such human remains, other than in accordance with the procedures and requirements set forth in California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources	**Impacts to Archaeological and Paleontological Resources** With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to archaeological or paleontological resources. **Impacts to Historic Structures** No significant impacts to onsite prehistoric or historic buildings or structures would occur.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Code Section 5097.98. These code provisions require notification of the County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission, who in turn must notify those persons believed to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American for appropriate disposition of the remains. Excavation or disturbance may continue in other areas of the Project Site that are not reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains or cultural resources. If undiscovered evidence of prehistoric artifacts is discovered construction activities in the affected areas shall not proceed until written authorization is granted by the City of Malibu Planning ~~Director~~Manager. **Historic Structures Mitigation Measures** Impacts to historic structures would not be significant; therefore, mitigation measures are not required.	
GEOLOGY AND SOILS		
Grading/Excavation Construction of the Proposed Project would entail approximately 42,507 cubic yards (cy) of cut and 23,299 cy of fill. Of this amount, approximately 2,647 cy would involve remedial cut and 771 would involve remedial fill. The Proposed Project includes three subterranean parking structures: one on each Parcel. The subterranean parking structures will require shoring and construction dewatering at a minimum. Shoring and dewatering plans as well as geotechnical reports addressing these issues, must be submitted for review City Geotechnical staff as part of the building plan check stage. **Geotechnical Hazards** The geotechnical Engineering Reports for Parcels A and B have been reviewed from a geotechnical perspective and approved-in-concept by the City's consulting Geologist. Based upon the findings of the geotechnical	1. The proposed project shall be constructed in accordance with the geotechnical engineering recommendations as presented in the Engineering Geological and Geotechnical Engineering Reports (and subsequent Responses to City Comments), for the Proposed Malibu-La Paz Ranch, LLC, Civic Center Way, City of Malibu California, by Gold Coast GeoServices, Inc. 2. All uncertified fill material placed within the fault trenches shall be removed and replaced as 90 percent compacted fill during the planned site preparations and rough grading. 3. Temporary dewatering and discharge activities shall	As provided in the mitigation measures identified herein, approval-in-concept was provided for Parcels A and B with specified conditions to provide subsequent analysis and geotechnical engineering recommendations to determine precise mitigation measures and geotechnical engineering methods necessary to meet acceptable performance standards to address the extent of remedial grading, construction shoring/dewatering methods for the proposed

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
investigation, supplemental response reports, and subsequent conditions imposed through the remarks noted on the City's approval-in-concept for said reports, the site is considered suitable for the planned development. ~~It is assumed that t~~The Project Applicant ~~and site developers~~ will be required to comply with all existing local, City, County, State and ~~Federal~~ federal laws, regulations, codes, and statutes (applicable to the geology, soils seismicity, and proposed ~~septic~~ wastewater treatment system), and conditions outlined in the Project Geotechnical Engineering and Investigation Reports, and subsequent comments and conditions of the approval in concept granted by the City for each Parcel. Compliance and adherence to project design measures mentioned herein will reduce potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant levels. **Groundshaking-Seismicity** Property owners and the general public should be aware that any structure in the southern California region is subject to potentially significant damage as a result of a moderate or major earthquake. The project will increase the potential for human health hazards and destruction of property to occur on the project site during a sizable seismic event. The risks associated with seismic activity are unavoidable and inherent to any location throughout the southern California region. While it is impossible to totally prevent structural damage to buildings and loss of life as a result of seismic events, adherence to all applicable building codes and regulations and site-specific engineering specifications can reduce such impacts to less than significant levels. If engineering studies using state-of-the-practice techniques are employed, the impacts from ground rupture can be accounted for with setbacks and foundation designs to accommodate several inches of movement. Surface rupture potential is considered low to moderate, and the impacts are considered significant but mitigatable. **Secondary Effects of the Proposed On-Site Wastewater Treatment ~~Septic~~ System** The proposed OWTS ~~is designed to treat the sewerage for Parcels A, B and C independently within three separate systems. The OWTS~~ would	be monitored by the dewatering contractor and conducted in strict accordance with the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board's Order No. R4-2003-0111 (Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Groundwater from Construction and Project Dewatering to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties (General Permit No. CAG994004). . 4. As recommended by the Project Geotechnical Engineer, all structures located within the "moderate and high" risk surface manifestation hazard areas that are not situated atop parking structures shall be provided with a minimum 10-foot thick 90% compacted fill blanket. It is recommended that the compacted fill blanket be reinforced with Tensar BX1200 geogrid or equivalent placed at two-foot vertical intervals up to two feet below the planned finish rough grade pad. Recommendations addressing over-excavation, installation of geogrid and backfilling of these areas shall be provided during the plan check approval process that addresses temporary stability of construction excavations and bottoms. 5. The structural engineer shall provide a letter along with supporting information, prior to plan check approval, indicating that the proposed buildings can tolerate the anticipated total and differential movements, or that site-specific geotechnical recommendations ~~mitigations~~ will be required. 6. The proposed structures should be constructed utilizing post-tensioned foundation systems and post-tensioned slabs-on-grade designed by the project structural engineer. 7. The Project Geotechnical Consultant shall provide appropriate geotechnical recommendations for	underground parking structures, and the secondary effects upon liquefaction as a result of effluent from the proposed private wastewater treatment system. As the proposed project cannot be constructed ~~until~~ unless said performance standards are demonstrated to an acceptable factor of safety, impacts after mitigation would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
effectively treat and dispose wastewater generated by the Proposed Project while minimizing impacts to the greatest degree feasible. The proposed AOWTS includes a network of underground ~~septic~~ wastewater treatment tanks proposed to effectively remove solids and floatable oil and grease containing materials from the waste stream prior to discharging effluent on site. The effluent would be processed to meet the minimum requirements of the City of Malibu Uniform Plumbing Code and disposed into a system of leach fields ~~proposed beneath the surface parking lots.~~ and subsurface drip disposal areas. ~~The proposed OWTS is designed to treat the sewerage for Parcels A, B and C independently within three separate systems.~~ The referenced geotechnical investigation and hydrogeological feasibility reports were reviewed by the City's consulting geologist and approved in concept for CDP approval, with conditions to be addressed during the building plan check stages. Based on this review, the project's secondary impacts from the proposed AOWTS could be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of the stated mitigation measures.	restrained walls and include recommendations for damp-proofing or waterproofing and means for removing any water collected (e.g., sump pump), in accordance with the City's Geotechnical Guidelines. 8. Complete grading plans that include the existing and proposed grades, grading yardages, proposed subterranean parking, the limits and depths of removals under the structures and flatwork areas, and grading cross-sections ~~shall be~~ have been submitted to City Geotechnical staff for review. ~~during the grading plan check stage~~. Remedial grading to mitigate liquefaction and other geotechnical hazards must be clearly defined in grading yardages, and illustrated on the Plans. Such plans submitted during final plan check shall reflect the concept plans in the EIR. 9. The Applicant shall obtain final ~~feasibility~~ construction plan approval (CDP) for the proposed onsite wastewater treatment systems (~~QWTS~~OWTS) ~~for Parcel A, Parcel B, and the City Hall Projects~~ from the City Environmental Health ~~Specialist~~Administrator. ~~In accordance with Chapter 18.4(D) of the City's Local Coastal Plan Local Implementation Plan (LCP LIP) the proposed OWTS shall be evaluated for cumulative impacts upon groundwater levels. A cumulative impact analysis shall be submitted and approved by City Geotechnical staff and the City Environmental Health Specialist. Copies of the proposed OWTS, as well as copies of the approved plans and designs of the systems from Ensitu Engineering shall be provided to the City Geologist.~~ Final approval of construction plans is subject to the conditions enumerated in the July 16, 2008 Revised Conformance Review by the City's Environmental Health Administrator. The Environmental Health Administrator found that the	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	OWTS is feasible and meets the City's requirements. The final design must be engineered to meet the effluent limits specified in waste discharge requirements (WDR), taking into account the Malibu Lagoon bacteria and nutrient total maximum daily load (TMDL) requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA).	
HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY		
Hydrology/Flooding Based on the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) flood plain elevations, Parcel A is predominately in an area that is prone to flooding depths of two feet-, and portions of Parcels B and C are in areas prone to flooding depths of one foot. The Project design incorporates finished floor heights raised well above the flood levels determined by FEMA for the development areas and, as such, would not result in significant flooding impacts. Potential flooding impacts will therefore be avoided through site design and remedial grading planning. **On-Site Drainage** The on-site drainage system designed for the Project Site includes a ~~3~~4~~8~~-inch (maximum) reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) along the east side of the Project Site and a 24-inch (maximum) RCP along the west side of the Project Site. The storm drain system and the debris basin have been designed to accommodate water flow and debris from the watershed area north of the Project Site during a 50-year storm. The final drainage plan will be required to be reviewed and approved during approval of the proposed grading and drainage plans. Approval of these plans will ensure all flooding and drainage impacts are addressed on site. As such impacts associated with drainage and flooding will be reduced to less than significant levels. **Water Quality -Construction** During grading and construction activities, there will a potential for surface	The following mitigation measures are required to mitigate any significant hydrology or water quality impacts: 1. The project shall comply with all requirements of the NPDES General Permit. 2. The contractor shall contact the local California State Water Resources Board with any questions concerning Resolution No 2001-046 and to determine if the Project Site will require storm water sampling during construction activities. 3. The Proposed Project shall conform to its WQMP as reviewed by the City of Malibu in concept and comply with the BMPs in the Jensen Design and Survey and the October 2006 approval of the City's Environmental Health Coordinator.~~The Proposed Project shall conform to the requirements established in the City of Malibu's Ordinance 157. Additionally, an approved Water Quality Mitigation Plan (WQMP) is required prior to the issuance of any building permits~~. 4. The Proposed Project shall meet the requirements of the City of Malibu's Flood Plain Management Ordinance, Ordinance No. 110. ~~These requirements include building the proposed development at raised levels.~~	With implementation of the mitigation measures identified herein, impacts to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
water runoff to carry sediment and small quantities of pollutants into the storm water system. The National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requires that a Notice of Intent (NOI) be filed with the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) for construction activities greater than 1 acre (effective March 1, 2003). A ~~Water Quality Mitigation Plan (WQMP)~~Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required to be developed reviewed and approved by the City of Malibu prior to any on-site grading activities. The ~~WQMP~~ SWPPP will identify BMPs such as sandbag barriers, temporary desilting basins near inlets, gravel driveways, dust controls, employee training, and general good housekeeping practices that help prevent water quality contamination. With the implementation of the BMPs, short-term water quality impacts should be reduced to less than significant levels. **Operation** Post-development storm water runoff has the potential to contribute pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and ultimately to the ocean. Prior to development, the City will require an approved WQMP and SUSMP prior to the issuance of any building permits. Compliance with these ~~SUSMP~~ and City Ordinance 157 would ensure that the proposed projects would not result in any significant water quality impacts. In addition, the proposed man-made wetlands, which are proposed to control runoff from developed and paved surfaces, would also serve to minimize the introduction of pollutants of concern to off-site water bodies.	5. A Water Quality Mitigation Plan is required to reduce pollutants from the sites. ~~The WQMP shall be a site specific plan that outlines the potential pollutants and cost effective ways to reduce the discharge of these pollutants.~~ Best Management Practices (BMPs) ~~that may be~~ are required and may include, but are not limited to, the following. Additionally BMP's can be found in the California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks for Municipal and Commercial Activities, dated March 1993. a. Public education b. Good housekeeping practices c. Storm drain stenciling and signs d. Catch basin/storm drain cleaning e. Sweep/vacuum parking and drive areas f. Material storage control. The drainage plan in the WQMP shall substantially conform to the concept grading and drainage plan in Figures V.F-2 and V.F-3. The Water Quality Mitigation Plan shall be implemented through a maintenance covenant and submitted to the City for review on an annual basis for the life of the project. 6. A detention basin shall be provided that is properly designed and maintained to meet both County SUSMP requirements and City Ordinance 157 to retain or filter initial rainfall. 7. Ongoing BMPs outlined in the ~~an~~ approved Water Quality Mitigation Plan shall be implemented by owners and tenants. 8. Long-term, regular maintenance of treatment wetlands shall be required indefinitely. Maintenance should include cleaning of pretreatment areas	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	(dredging of sediment forebays, trash removal, backwashing of sand filters, etc.), harvesting of plant biomass, removal of exotic species and replanting of desired species. All maintenance work shall be scheduled to avoid critical breeding and nesting periods for wetlands species. 9. The Applicant ~~shall~~ has obtained final feasibility approval ~~(CDP)~~ for the proposed onsite wastewater treatment systems (~~QWTS~~OWTS) for Parcel A, Parcel B, and the City Hall Projects from the City Environmental Health Specialist. In accordance with Chapter 18.4(D) of the City's Local Coastal Plan Local Implementation Plan (LCP-LIP) the proposed OWTS shall be engineered to meet the effluent limits specified in WDRs, taking into account the Malibu Lagoon bacteria and total maximum daily load requirements (TMDL's) of the RQWCB and the USEPA. ~~evaluated for cumulative impacts upon groundwater levels. A cumulative impact analysis shall be submitted and approved by City Geotechnical staff and the City Environmental Health Specialist. Copies of the proposed OWTS, as well as copies of the approved plans and designs of the systems from Ensitu Engineering shall be provided to the City Geologist.~~ 10. The Applicant shall apply recycled wastewater for irrigation purposes within landscape areas consistent with the State Water Resources Control Board Draft Recycled Water Policy. 11. A salt management plan shall be prepared and approved as a part of the final wastewater system design consistent with the applicable requirements, guidelines and policies identified in Section 2.12 of the Wastewater Management System Master Plan prepared by Lombardo Associates, Inc., dated July 7,	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	2008. 12. The Applicant shall obtain a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) and a Water Reclamation Requirements (WRR) from the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. Prior to reuse or discharge, the effluent shall be processed to meet the requirements of the City of Malibu Plumbing Code, and the WDR/WRR of the RWQCB. 13. Approval(s) to operate the proposed wastewater reuse system shall be obtained from the California Department of Public Health and the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board pursuant to the provisions of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. The required Engineering Report shall be prepared and submitted to the satisfaction of the California Department of Public Health, and the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. Waste discharged into the wastewater treatment plant shall be limited to discharges from commercial and retail business, and City Hall. No water softener regeneration brines, industrial wastewaters, or volatile organic compounds shall be allowed to be discharged into the system.	
LAND USE AND PLANNING		
The Proposed Project involves the development of a vacant property into three separate parcels~~commercial development projects~~ for a total	Project development will require a number of land use approvals by the appropriate agencies. To ensure land use	Provided the mitigation measures are adhered to, no significant land

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
development of 132,058 square feet of commercial floor area, including commercial office and retail space on Parcels A and B and a City Hall on Parcel C. Parcel A occupies approximately 312,195 sf of land area and is proposed to be developed with 68,997 sf of commercial office and retail uses. The proposed FAR for Parcel A is approximately ~~0.22:1~~0.20:1. Parcel B occupies approximately 248,610 sf of land area and is proposed to be developed with 43,061 sf of commercial office and retail uses. The proposed FAR for Parcel B is approximately 0.17:1. Parcel C is comprised of approximately 100,000 sf of land area and is proposed to be developed with a 20,000 sf City Hall. The proposed FAR for Parcel C is approximately 0.20:1. The overall FAR for the Proposed Project as a whole is 0.20:1. Based on the adjusted gross square footage of the development proposed, ~~zoning code, the project would require~~ a total of ~~527~~ 607 parking spaces would be required by code, including 330 spaces on Parcels A, ~~,~~ 197 spaces on parcel ~~and~~ B, and 80 spaces on Parcel C. The Proposed Project would include approximately 609 parking spaces. As such, ~~, with 346 spaces on Parcel A, 197 spaces proposed on Parcel B and 66 spaces proposed for Parcel C. T~~the project would meet the parking requirements and parking impacts would be less than significant. The Proposed Project is substantially consistent with the Community Commercial land use designation of the General Plan Land Use Element. The Proposed Project is also substantially consistent with the allowable uses and development standards for Community Commercial zoning designation for the Project Site, including the minimum parking requirements. Several discretionary land use and entitlement actions will be necessary for the project to be constructed as proposed. Procurement of all required land use approvals will mitigate any potential land use impacts to a less than significant level.	impacts are less than significant, the following mitigation measures are proposed: 1. Grading and Drainage Plans shall be submitted to the Environmental Building and Safety Division for approval with the final Site Plan and Building Plans. No grading permits shall be issued until final building plans have been approved~~a building permit is approved~~. 2. All wastewater shall be treated and managed on-site by the project operators in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations of the County of Los Angeles Health Department. The location of all proposed and abandoned wastewater treatment systems shall be depicted on the final building plans for the City's approval. 3. The projects shall be developed in accordance with all site-specific hydrologic, geologic studies and final recommendations from the City Geologist or City Engineer. 4. Approval of the Proposed Project shall be contingent on approval of a Coastal Development Permit from the City of Malibu, approval of a Zone Text Amendment, and upon effective certification of the Development Agreement by the CCC.	use compatibility or consistency impacts would result from the long-term operation of the Proposed Project.
NOISE		
Construction Impacts Construction of the Proposed Project would result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the project area on an intermittent basis. The new	**Construction Mitigation Measures** The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to address construction noise impacts:	**Construction Impacts** With the use of mufflers and the application of the required mitigation

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
ambient noise level during the construction phase of the Proposed Project (with the use of mufflers) would be at least 17 decibels (a weighted) (dBA) greater than the existing ambient noise level at Receptor 1 and at least 9 dBA greater than existing ambient noise levels at Receptors 2 and 3 (see Figure V.H-1, Noise Monitoring Locations). At Receptor 4, an incremental increase of less than 1 dBA is anticipated during construction. The new ambient noise levels at Receptors 1, 2, and 3 would exceed the significance threshold of a 5 dBA or more increase over the existing ambient noise level, even with the use of mufflers. Thus, a significant impact would occur at Receptors 1, 2, and 3 under Proposed Project conditions, and mitigation measures would be required. **Operational Impacts** The predominant long-term noise source associated with the Proposed Project would be vehicular traffic. The Proposed Project would cause vehicular noise in the area to fall within the range of 60 to 74 dBA Community Noise Equivalency Level (CNEL) during weekdays. At Receptor 1 (see Figure V.H-1, Noise Monitoring Locations), the Proposed Project would incrementally increase ambient noise levels by less than 1 dBA within the "Conditionally Acceptable" category of the Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Environments table (see Table V.H-3). At Receptors 2 and 3, the Proposed Project would incrementally increase ambient noise levels by approximately 1 dBA to the "Normally Unacceptable" category. At Receptor 4, the Proposed Project would incrementally increase ambient noise levels by less than 1 dBA within the "Normally Unacceptable" category. The incremental increase of less than 1 dBA and 1 dBA would not exceed the significance threshold. Thus, less than significant impacts are anticipated during the weekday. During the weekend, the Proposed Project would cause vehicular noise in the area to fall within the range of 59 to 74 dBA (CNEL), as there would be a reduction in retail vehicle trips to and from the Project Site. When compared to "No Project" conditions, the Proposed Project would incrementally increase noise levels by less than 1 dBA at Receptors 1 and 4 and by 1 dBA at Receptors 2 and 3. The incremental increase of less than 1 dBA would not	1. Construction contracts shall specify that all construction equipment shall be equipped with mufflers and other suitable noise attenuation devices. 2. All residential units located within 700 feet of the construction site shall be sent a notice regarding the construction schedule of the Proposed Project. A sign, legible at a distance of 50 feet shall also be posted at the construction site. All notices and the signs shall indicate the dates and duration of construction activities, as well as provide a telephone number where residents can inquire about the construction process and register complaints. 3. The Project Developer shall designate a "noise disturbance coordinator" who shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and would be required to implement reasonable measures such that the complaint is resolved. All notices that are sent to residential units within 700 feet of the construction site and all signs posted at the construction site shall list the telephone number for the disturbance coordinator. 4. Consistent with the City of Malibu Noise Ordinance (Section 4204 G), construction shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays, and prohibited on Sundays and holidays. Special circumstances may arise where construction activities are permitted during prohibited hours by expressed written permission of the City Manager, or if construction is necessary to preserve life or property when such necessity arises (Section 4205 D).	measures identified herein, a decrease of approximately 3 dBA in the new ambient sound level is anticipated at Receptor 1, and a decrease of approximately 2 dBA in the new ambient sound level is anticipated at Receptors 2 and 3. However, a significant and unavoidable temporary noise impact during construction would remain at Receptors 1, 2 and 3. In the event the project is approved despite these significant noise impacts, a statement of overriding considerations will be required to be adopted by the Decision-Makers. **Operational Impacts** A less-than-significant noise impact is anticipated for the operational phase of the Proposed Project.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
exceed the significance threshold of a 3 dBA or more increase to or within the "Normally Unacceptable" category at Receptor 4. At Receptors 1 through 3, the incremental increase of less than 1 dBA and 1 dBA would not exceed the significance threshold of a 5 dBA or more increase within the "Conditionally Acceptable" category. Thus, less than significant impacts are anticipated during the weekend.	**Operational Mitigation Measures** During the operational phase, no mitigation measures are required since operation of the Proposed Project would not exceed the significance criteria.	
PUBLIC UTILITIES		
Impacts to Electricity Service The Project Site does not currently support any uses that consume electricity resources. Therefore the Proposed Project would result in an increase in the amount of electricity consumed on the Project Site. Upon completion, the Proposed Project is anticipated to consume approximately 4,773 kilowatt hours of electricity per day. The existing electricity infrastructure in the project vicinity is not experiencing any problems or deficiencies and the Proposed Project would not exceed infrastructure design capacities. According to the Southern California Edison Company, the existing infrastructure would be able to handle the electricity demand of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would therefore have a less than significant impact on electricity services. However, temporary disruptions in service may occur during connection of electricity service to the Proposed Project. In the case that service disruption to adjacent properties is needed, a potentially significant impact would be created. Thus, mitigation measures have been included to address this impact. **Impacts to Natural Gas Service** The Proposed Project is anticipated to consume approximately 11,137 cubic feet (cf) of natural gas per day. According to The Gas Company, natural gas service to the Proposed Project can be provided without any significant impact on the environment. Thus, no significant impacts would occur. **Impacts to Water Service**	**Electricity** The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to the greatest extent feasible in keeping with the California Code of Regulations Title 24 for energy efficiency: 1. If connection of electricity services will result in a service disruption to surrounding properties, this connection must be done at a time of day that is the least inconvenient. 2. If a disruption to electricity services must occur, notice shall be provided to all affected properties of the service disruption. 3. High-efficiency air conditioning controlled by a computerized energy-management system shall be installed. 4. Built-in appliances and space-conditioning equipment should exceed the minimum efficiency levels mandated by Title 24. 5. Air shall be cascade ventilated from high-priority areas before being exhausted, thereby decreasing the volume of ventilation air required. 6. Lighting system heat shall be recycled for space heating during cool weather. 7. Low and medium static-pressure terminal units and ductwork shall be installed, and buildings shall be well sealed, to reduce energy consumption by air-	**Electricity Service** Following implementation of the required and recommended mitigation measures, any potentially significant impacts to electricity services would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. **Natural Gas Service** The Proposed Project would not result in any significant natural gas service impacts. **Water Service** Provided the required mitigation measures are implemented, Project impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. **Wastewater Service** With implementation of the mitigation measures, impacts to wastewater utility providers would be less than significant.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
The Proposed Project is expected to generate a demand of approximately 43,370 gallons per day (gpd) of water. While adequate water supply in the project area exists, existing ~~storage and~~ distribution infrastructure cannot serve the Proposed Project. Water mains for the Proposed Project do not exist, and therefore would need to be constructed. Therefore, a potentially significant impact could occur and mitigation measures are required. **Impacts to Wastewater Service** The Proposed Project will be served by a proposed onsite wastewater treatment ~~plant~~system. As such the proposed project will be self-efficient with regard to waterwater treatment and will not result in any impacts upon local public waterwater treatment utility providers. **Impacts to Solid Waste Service** ***Construction Impacts*** Much of the solid waste generated during the construction phase such as wood, metal scrap, and formed construction board (cement and dry wall board) would be recycled and salvaged to the maximum feasible extent. Materials not recycled would be disposed of at local landfills, and possibly a Class III landfill for any hazardous materials. With the recycling of most of the solid waste generated by the construction phase of the Proposed Project, short-term construction impacts to landfills and solid waste service would be less than significant. ***Operational Impacts*** Upon full occupancy of the Proposed Project, daily solid waste associated with the Proposed Project would be approximately 794 pounds of solid waste per day. Solid waste generated on-site would be disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations related to solid waste. Correspondence with the G.I. Rubbish Company has suggested that the Proposed Project would utilize a waste pick up service three times a week, using three trash bins, each three cubic yards in size and a recycling pick up	distribution systems. 8. A performance check of the installed space conditioning system shall be completed prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. 9. Exterior walls shall be finished with light-colored materials and high-emissivity characteristics to reduce cooling loads. 10. White reflective roofing material shall be used to meet standards and reflect heat. 11. Thermal installation shall be installed in walls and ceilings which exceeds Title 24 regulations. 12. Window systems shall be designed to reduce thermal gain and loss, and shall be fitted with heat-rejecting window treatments, thus reducing cooling loads during warm weather and heating loads during cool weather. 13. Fluorescent and high-intensity-discharge (HID) lamps shall be installed inside as well as outside. 14. Photo sensitive controls and dimmable electronic ballasts shall be installed to maximize the use of natural daylight and thus reduce the artificial lighting load. 15. Occupant controlled light switches and thermostats shall be installed. 16. Time controlled interior and exterior lighting shall be installed. 17. Passive solar inset of windows or windowless walls shall be incorporated. **Natural Gas** The Proposed Project would not result in any significant natural gas service impacts; no mitigation measures are	**Solid Waste Service** Project impacts to solid waste services or capacity would be less than significant.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
service two times a week, using two trash bins of the same size. This level of service is expected to accommodate the solid waste generated by the Proposed Project, and impacts would thus be less than significant.	required. **Water** The following measures are necessary to address potential impacts to water ~~storage and~~ distribution: ~~1. The Project Applicant shall meet with the City of Malibu, Waterworks District 29, and the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) to determine specific water facility needs such as but not limited to, reservoirs, pumping stations and pressure regulators, off site water mains, and distribution mains. The necessary facilities and land must be acquired and operating before project occupancy.~~ The Applicant shall comply with the requirements of Water District 29 and the LACFD by providing the infrastructure needed to connect to the existing 12-inch water main located in the centerline of Civic Center Way, "T" off from that main and extend new water mains onto and within the project site to serve hydrants throughout the project in accordance with the provisions of the LACFD Code (Title 32) and the specifications listed in the Existing Fire Department Fire Flow/Hydrant Location and Access approvals (see Figure V.J-2 Fire Accessibility Site Plan) and any applicable regulations of the Water District 29. 2. The Project Applicant ~~is also~~ shall be responsible for any fees adopted by the City of Malibu and generally and uniformly imposed by the City of Malibu's Environmental and Building Safety Department for ~~improvements of existing or~~ construction of new water supply and distribution facilities. 3. Automatic sprinkler systems shall be set to irrigate	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	landscaping during early morning hours or during the evening to reduce water loss from evaporation. Care must be taken to reset sprinklers to water less often in cooler months and during the rainfall season to avoid wasting water by excessive landscape irrigation. 4. Selection of native, drought-tolerant, low water consuming plant varieties shall be used to reduce irrigation water consumption to the maximum extent feasible, as reflected in the project's landscape plan; Mitigation Measure A-1, at page V.A-14. 5. Reclaimed irrigation via the OWTS and/or recycled water shall be used where possible for irrigation of landscaping. **Wastewater** To ensure that no significant impacts to wastewater service occur, the following mitigation measures are required: 1. Detailed plans for the OWTS shall be submitted to the City of Malibu Environmental and Building Safety Department for review and approval. 2. The project Applicant shall obtain a Waste Discharge Permit from the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) prior to building permit issuance. 3. The project Applicant shall obtain an Operating Permit from the City of Malibu Environmental and Building Safety Department prior to construction. **4.** Effluent for gray water/re-use irrigation in designated areas on-site shall at all times be a disinfected, high quality, filtered reclaimed water and shall not exceed the effluent quality limits of the RWQCB's Total	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Daily Maximum Load (TDML) requirements for the Malibu Creek Watershed. **Solid Waste** Although solid waste impacts would be less than significant during both the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Project, the following mitigation measures are recommended in order to highlight the Project features that allows for this conclusion: 1. The Proposed Project shall recycle all construction debris in a practical, available, and accessible manner, to the maximum extent feasible, during the demolition and construction phases. 2. Where economically feasible, the Proposed Project shall incorporate the use of recycled materials in building materials, furnishing operations and building maintenance. 3. The design of the Proposed Project shall allocate space for a recycling collection area for use by both on-site employees and visitors.	
PUBLIC SERVICES		
Impacts to Fire Protection Services ***Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) Services*** The Proposed Project would increase the level of human occupancy and activity on the Project Site, and this level of activity could result in a likely increase in the percentage of emergency calls to the Project Site. According to the LACFD, additional service provisions, including staff, equipment, and stations are already needed. Therefore, development of the Proposed Project could create a potentially significant environmental impact by exacerbating already insufficient service ratios and standards. Mitigation measures are required. The Site Plan identifies two access roadways. Both access driveways will be developed in accordance with all applicable fire access codes and standards	**Fire Protection Mitigation Measures** In order to establish that all appropriate fire protection measures have been incorporated into the Proposed Project design, the following mitigation measures are required in accordance with the requirements of the LACFD: 1. The Project shall comply with all applicable code and ordinance requirements for construction, emergency access, water main fire flows and fire hydrants. ~~This includes those mitigation measures listed in Section V.I.3, Public Utilities, Water, regarding the water facility needs such as but not~~	**Impacts to Fire Protection Services** ***LACFD Services*** Following implementation of the required mitigation measures, impacts on fire protection services provided by the LACFD would be less than significant. ***Water Supply and Infrastructure*** Water-related impacts to fire service would be reduced to a less-than-

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
and the proposed development plans will be required to be submitted to and approved by the LACFD prior to construction. Thus, impacts associated with fire access would be less than significant. ***Water Supply and Infrastructure*** The Project Site is not currently served by water infrastructure such as water mains or fire hydrants. This lack of water services for fire protection on the Project Site would have a significant impact on fire protection services, necessitating the inclusion of mitigation measures to specifically address this impact. ***Grading, Slope, and Associated Wildfire Risks*** While most of the Proposed Project is located on land that has a less than ten percent grade, the north boundary is characterized by steeper slopes, which, without mitigation could pose a fire risk to developments located upslope. The development pads will be graded to comply with the LACFD requirements. A Fuel Modification Plan ~~will need to be~~ has been developed and ~~submitted to~~ approved by the LACFD ~~for approval~~ to mitigate potential grading, slope and associated wildfire impacts within the northern areas of the project site. ***Emergency Fire Access*** The proposed site plan identifies two access roadways including one primary driveway providing access to Parcels A, B, and C and a secondary extended driveway along the project site's western property line, providing additional access to Parcel C. Both access driveways will be developed in accordance with all applicable fire access codes and standards and the proposed development plans will be required to be submitted to and approved by the LACFD prior to construction. Thus, impacts associated with fire services and apparatus accessibility would be less than significant. **Impacts to Police Protection Services** ***Construction Impacts***	~~limited to, reservoirs, pumping stations and pressure regulators, off site water mains, and distribution mains.~~ 2. The Applicant shall pay a uniformly applied ~~participate in an appropriate financing mechanism such as a~~ developer fee or an in-kind consideration in lieu of developer fees, to provide funds for fire protection facilities, which are required by new commercial, industrial or residential development in an amount proportionate to the demand created by the Proposed Project. Currently, the developer fee is a set amount per square foot of building space, adjusted annually, and is due and payable at the time a building permit is issued. ~~In the event that the developer fee is no longer in effect at the time of building permit issuance, alternative and comparable mitigation measures shall be required.~~ 3. ~~Upon project approval and prior to the issuance of building permits, the Applicant shall submit to the LACFD for review a fuel modification zone plan which includes all required zones, including:~~ ~~a) Zone A – A setback zone of at least 20 feet must be established between structures and the following zone. Zone A may include selected and limited vegetation.~~ ~~b) Zone B – An irrigation zone consisting of thinned native or existing vegetation as well as irrigated vegetation that is fire resistant and drought tolerant may occupy this area.~~ ~~c) Zone C – The fuel load in this area shall be reduced by the removal, thinning and maintenance of existing vegetation. Vegetation may become more highly concentrated as the zone moves away from the built environment.~~	significant level by the implementation of the required fire protection mitigation measures, as well as the mitigation measures listed in Section V.I.3, Public Utilities, Water, which designate the provision of water infrastructure to serve the Project Site. ***Grading, Slope, and Associated Wildfire Risks*** Potential impacts associated with grading, slope and associated fire risks will be mitigated to an acceptable level of safety upon LACFD's approval of a Fuel Modification Plan. ***Emergency Fire Access*** After implementation of the required mitigation measures, emergency fire access impacts would be less than significant. **Impacts to Police Protection Services** ***Construction Impacts*** With implementation of the required mitigation measure, impacts to sheriff services during construction of the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Los Angeles County Sheriff Department (LACSD) service requirements would increase over the existing demands during the construction phase of the Proposed Project. The potential for vandalism and theft would increase due to the presence of construction equipment and building materials, increasing Sheriff's service demands for property protection. Therefore, potentially significant impacts would occur, and mitigation measures are required. ***Operational Impacts*** The Proposed Project consists of 132,058 square feet of commercial, retail, and City Hall space that would add incrementally to the existing demands on the LACSD in the City of Malibu. According to the LACSD, existing staff levels are adequate to meet the needs of the Proposed Project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.	~~d) Zone D – The interface thinning zone consists of native vegetation maintained to be less hazardous by the thinning but not removal of flora.~~ [This measure has been complied with.] 4. Development may require fire flows up to ~~5,000~~ 2,625 gallons per minute at 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure for up to a ~~five~~ two-hour duration, and as specified by the Los Angeles County Fire Department. Final fire flows will be based on the size of the buildings, their relationships to other structures, property lines, and types of construction used. 5. Fire hydrant spacing shall be 300 feet and shall meet the following requirements: a) No portion of lot frontage shall be more than 200 feet via vehicular access from a public fire hydrant. b) No portion of a building shall exceed 400 feet via vehicular access from a properly spaced public fire hydrant. Additional hydrants will be required if hydrant spacing exceeds specified distances. 6. Turning radii shall not be less than 32 feet. This measurement shall be determined at the centerline of the road. A Fire Department approved turning area shall be provided for all driveways exceeding 150 feet in length and at the end of all cul-de-sacs. The on-site driveway is to be within 150 feet of all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of any building. All on site driveways shall provide a minimum unobstructed width of 26 feet, clear-to-sky. The 26 foot width will be increased to: a) 34 feet in width when parallel parking is allowed on one side of the access	***Operational Impacts*** Impacts to sheriff services during operation of the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	roadway/driveway. Preference is that such parking is not adjacent to the structure. b) 42 feet in width when parallel parking is allowed on each side of the access roadway/driveway. 7. "Fire Lanes" are any ingress/egress, roadway/driveway with paving less than 34 feet in width, and will be clear-to-sky. All "Fire Lanes" will be depicted on the final map. 8. For streets and driveways with parking restrictions: The entrance to the street/driveway and intermittent spacing distances of 150 feet shall be posted with Fire Department approved signs stating "NO PARKING – FIRE LANE" in three-inch high letters. Driveway labeling is necessary to ensure Fire Department access. 9. All proposals for traffic calming measures (speed humps/bumps, traffic circles, roundabouts, etc.) shall be submitted to the Fire Department for review prior to implementation. 10. As required by Section 1117.2.1 of the County Fire Code, a Fuel Modification Plan, a landscape plan and an irrigation plan shall be submitted to the LACFD prior to construction. Said plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Forestry Division of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department for reasonable fire safety. **Police Protection Mitigation Measures** ***Construction Mitigation Measures*** In order to mitigate potential security risks during the construction phase of the Proposed Project, the following mitigation measure is required, in accordance with LASD	

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	recommendations: 1. During construction, the Proposed Project shall: (1) implement a security system; (2) hire private security personnel; and (3) erect perimeter fencing. ***Operational Mitigation Measures*** Operation of the Proposed Project would yield a less-than-significant impact on police protection services provided by the LASD. Thus, no mitigation measures are required. Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measure based on comments received during DEIR circulation: 1. A 6-foot high wrought iron fence shall be constructed along the northern perimeter of the property sufficient to prevent or discourage pedestrians from accessing the Malibu Knolls neighborhood on foot via the hillside.	
TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION		
Trip Generation Summary The Proposed Project would generate a net traffic increase of ~~2,863~~2,850 weekday daily trips, 151 weekday morning peak hour trips, and 248 weekday afternoon peak hour trips. On Saturdays, the Proposed Project would generate a total of ~~2,241~~2,250 new daily trips and 197 mid-day peak hour trips. **Intersection Impacts** Under the future with Project conditions, which considers cumulative impacts in conjunction with the Proposed Project, significant impacts would occur at five of the nine study intersections analyzed herein. The level of project impacts were determined for the Weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hour periods and during the Saturday midday period. The five impacted intersections, all of which are located in the City of Malibu, include the following: • Malibu Canyon Road & Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) (both	**Traffic Mitigation Measures** The following feasible mitigation measures were identified as effective improvements for mitigating project-related traffic impacts. 1. Webb Way & PCH - Mitigating project impacts at the intersection of Webb Way & PCH would entail re-striping/widening Webb Way between PCH and Civic Center Way to provide a six-lane cross-section with three lanes in each direction. The northbound departure currently provides two travel lanes and widening along the east side of Webb Way north of PCH would be necessary to accommodate the additional northbound lane. The widening of Webb Way to provide a six-lane cross-section would increase the storage capacity on Webb Way in an effort to minimize the potential for overflow	Implementation of the mitigation improvements would be effective in mitigating project impacts at three of the five intersection locations identified in the analysis for the weekday cumulative plus project conditions. However, significant and unavoidable traffic impacts would still remain at two intersection locations, namely: the intersection of Malibu Canyon Road & PCH during the weekday a.m. and p.m. periods, and the intersection of Cross Creek Road and Civic Center Way during the weekday p.m. period.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
weekday peak hours) • Webb Way & PCH (weekday afternoon peak hour and Saturday peak hour) • Cross Creek Road & PCH (both weekday peak hours and Saturday peak hour) • Webb Way & Civic Center Way (weekday afternoon peak hour only) • Cross Creek Road & Civic Center Way (weekday afternoon peak hour only)	conditions. The addition of dual left turn lanes to the eastbound approach on PCH is also recommended; this would entail narrowing the raised center median. The existing travel lanes on PCH at this intersection are substandard (i.e., less than 12 feet wide). This mitigation can fit within the existing traveled way with substandard lane widths (less than 12 feet); the resulting lane configuration would consist of a raised median, an 11- and 10-foot left turn lane, one 11-foot through lane, two 10-foot through lanes, and one 11-foot right-turn lane. Shifting the east and west legs of the intersection (approach and departure) several feet to the north would allow the standard width lanes with this mitigation. Additionally, a guide sign shall be posted facing the eastbound dual left turns from PCH onto Webb Way, so that motorists who wish to make a subsequent right turn onto east bound Civic Center Way would be directed to the "Number 2" left turn lane. The sign may have to be mounted overhead. 2. Cross Creek Road & PCH - The impact of project traffic on the intersection of Cross Creek Road & PCH could be mitigated by the addition of a right-turn lane westbound on PCH. This mitigation would improve the traffic movement along westbound PCH. If Caltrans does not approve of non-standard narrower lane widths, then roadway widening on the south side of PCH on the approach and departure legs would allow the standard width lanes for this mitigation measure. 3. Webb Way & Civic Center Way – Mitigating the project impact would entail installing a new traffic signal and widening Webb Way to a six-lane cross	No feasible mitigation measures are available for the roadway segment of Malibu Canyon Road between the Hughes Research Lab and Piuma Road. Therefore, the impacts to this roadway segment would remain significant and unavoidable. In the event the project is approved despite the significant and unavoidable traffic impacts identified above, a statement of overriding considerations will be required to be adopted by the Decision-Makers.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	section south of the intersection of Civic Center Way. The northbound approach and the eastbound approach would each be re-striped to include one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane. The southbound approach would be widened to provide one left-turn lane and one shared through/right lane. Widening the east side of Webb Way between PCH and Civic Center Way would be necessary for the proposed six-lane cross section. Results of this signal warrant are provided in the project traffic study (see Appendix G).	**Roadway Segment Impacts** No feasible mitigation measures are available for the roadway segment of Malibu Canyon Road between the Hughes Research Lab and Piuma Road. Therefore, the impacts to this roadway segment would remain significant and unavoidable.
Roadway Segment Impacts The Proposed Project would result in a significant impact on the roadway segment on Malibu Canyon Road between the Hughes Research Lab and Piuma Road during both weekday peak hours.	**Roadway Segment Impacts** No feasible mitigation measures were available.	
Congestion Management Program (CMP) Impacts The Proposed Project would not have a significant impact at any of the CMP arterial intersections analyzed.	**CMP Mitigation Measures** The Proposed Project would not have a significant impact at any of the CMP arterial intersections analyzed; therefore, mitigation measures are not required.	**CMP Impacts** The Proposed Project would not have a significant impact at any of the CMP arterial intersections analyzed.
Parking Impacts The Proposed Project would include approximately 609 parking spaces, which includes 346 spaces within Parcel A, 197 spaces on Parcel B, and 66 spaces on Parcel C. The number of parking spaces proposed is consistent with the minimum number of parking spaces required by the zoning code. Therefore, the Proposed Project would satisfy the zoning code and parking impacts would be less than significant.	**Parking Impacts** No parking mitigation measures are required.	**Parking Impacts** The Proposed Project would satisfy the zoning code and parking impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARDS/RISK OF UPSET		
Construction Impacts Public record research of the Project Site indicated that no potential environmental hazards which could be upset during construction activities are present on the Project Site. The site is not listed on any federal, State, or local databases compiled in accordance with Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, impacts with respect to this issue are considered less than significant. ***Groundwater Impacts*** An analysis of groundwater samples at the Project Site indicated that total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) was not detected (ND). Concentrations of benzene and ethylbenzene ranged from ND to microgram per liter (1 µg/l). Concentrations of toluene were detected at 1 µg/l and concentrations of xylenes ranged from ND to 4 µg/l. All of these concentrations are below the State drinking water standards and, therefore, are not considered to be significant. However, pumped groundwater could potentially draw higher concentrations of contaminants onto the Project site, constituting a potentially significant impact and necessitating incorporation of mitigation measures that address the risk of accidental groundwater contamination during construction. ***Asbestos Impacts*** The structures on the Project Site may have been built prior to the federal banning of asbestos containing materials (ACMs). Therefore, the existing structures may have been constructed with building materials containing lead-based paint and/or ACMs. The potential release of ACMs is considered to be a significant impact. Mitigation measures are required. ***Radon Impacts*** Based on the location of the Project Site, elevated levels of radon are not	**Construction Mitigation Measures** The following mitigation measures shall be implemented during the construction phase in order to address identified potentially significant impacts in the applicable impact areas: ***Groundwater Mitigation Measures*** 1. The Project Developer shall obtain all necessary permits from the RWQCB prior to the installation of any temporary and/or permanent dewatering systems. Procurement of all applicable RWQCB permits will ensure the water quality of groundwater discharge into the storm drain infrastructure. ***Asbestos Mitigation Measures*** 2. A demolition-level asbestos survey by a licensed contractor shall be conducted for the existing on-site structures. If the survey reveals that these structures contain ACMs, the structures shall be stabilized, removed, and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations, including but not limited to, SCAQMD Rule 1403 and Cal/OSHA requirements. ***Radon Mitigation Measures*** No radon-related impacts would occur; therefore,	**Construction Impacts** The following summarizes the level of impact after mitigation for construction impacts as it relates to each of the environmental hazards listed below. ***Groundwater Impacts*** With implementation of the required mitigation measure, impacts involving groundwater contamination during the construction phase of the Proposed Project would be less than significant. ***Asbestos Impacts*** With implementation of the required mitigation measure, impacts involving the release of ACMs during the construction phase of the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
expected to be of concern, and no impact would occur. ***Lead Impacts*** It is possible that the existing structures on the Project Site contain lead-based materials which could be released into the environment during demolition activities. Therefore, a potentially significant impact exists and mitigation measures are required. ***Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) Impacts*** Within the existing on-site structures, fluorescent light ballasts manufactured prior to 1978 may contain small quantities of PCBs. It is possible that PCBs could be released into the environment during demolition activities. Therefore, a potentially significant impact exists and mitigation measures are required. **Operational Impacts** The Proposed Project does not involve any materials or activities that would entail the use of hazardous materials that could potentially pose a threat to individuals on-site or on immediately adjacent properties. Based on the Proposed Project's required compliance with applicable regulations, the risk of upset and accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment is considered to be less than significant.	mitigation measures are not required. ***Lead Mitigation Measures*** 3. During the demolition of existing structures, building materials shall be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, ~~State~~state, and local regulations regarding lead-containing materials. ***PCB Mitigation Measures*** 4. Fluorescent light ballasts not specifically labeled as not to contain PCBs shall be presumed to contain them and shall be disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations, including but not limited to, Cal/OSHA requirements. **Operational Mitigation Measures** Operational impacts would be less than significant with respect to the risk of upset and accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Thus, mitigation measures are not required.	***Radon Impacts*** No radon impacts would occur. ***Lead Impacts*** After mitigation, impacts involving lead contamination during the construction phase of the Proposed Project would be less than significant. ***PCB Impacts*** With implementation of the required mitigation measure, impacts involving PCB contamination during the construction phase of the Proposed Project would be less than significant. **Operational Impacts** Operational impacts would be less than significant with respect to the risk of upset and accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.