INITIAL STUDY

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
VILLAGE CHRISTIAN SCHOOL PROJECT

Environmental Case Number: ENV-2025-6479-MND

Project Location: 8930 North Village Avenue; 10301 West Vinedale Street; 10158 and 10210 West Penrose Street, Los Angeles, California, 91352

Community Plan Area: Sun Valley – La Tuna Canyon

Council District: 7 - Rodriguez

Project Description: The Project involves the expansion and construction of school facilities within an existing private school campus (K through 12th grade), including:

1) a new 18,826 square-foot gymnasium building with 700 seats; 2) a new 4,023 square-foot annex building; 3) remodel and addition of 5,388 square feet to the existing Administration Building (office, chapel, library); 4) remodel and addition of 5,660 square feet to the existing Building #10 (classrooms); 5) new asphalt parking areas and drive aisles; 6) an extension of the emergency/fire access road; 7) two new retaining walls; and 8) removal of a softball field and associated structures.

No increase in the maximum permitted student enrollment (1,950 students) is proposed.

PREPARED BY:

The City of Los Angeles
Department of City Planning

APPLICANT:
Tom Konjoyan
Village Christian School

October 2026

INITIAL STUDY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1. Introduction 4

2. Executive Summary 6

3. Project Description 11

3.1. Project Summary 11
3.2. Environmental Setting 11
3.3. Description of Project 13
3.4. Requested Permits and Approvals 15
3.5 Responsible and Truestee Public Agencies 16

4. Environmental Impact Analysis 17

I. Aesthetics 17
II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources 21
III. Air Quality 24
IV. Biological Resources 28
V. Cultural Resources 34
VI. Energy 36
VII. Geology and Soils 38
VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions 43
IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials 46
X. Hydrology and Water Quality 52
XI. Land Use and Planning 58
XII. Mineral Resources 61
XIII. Noise 62
XIV. Population and Housing 65
XV. Public Services 66
XVI. Recreation 68
XVII. Transportation/Traffic 70
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources 75
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems 83
XX. Wildfire 87
XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance 91

Appendices

Appendix A: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment Report, October, 2025
Appendix B: Tree Report, October 31, 2025
Appendix C: Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Report, October, 2025
Appendix D: Biologist's Statement of Biological Resources, September 5, 2025
Appendix E: Biologist's Letter, July 1, 2026
Appendix F: Report of Geotechnical Investigation, August 22, 2025
Appendix G: Geologic Report and Response to City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety Soils Report Review Letter, March 31, 2026
Appendix H: Response to Geology and Soils Report Review Letter, May 18, 2026
Appendix I: Geology and Soils Report Approval Letter (Log #138828-02), June 11, 2026
Appendix J: Transportation Study Assessment Referral Form, December 30, 2025
Appendix K: Fire Report, September 23, 2026
Appendix L: AB 52 Letter, December 22, 2025
Appendix M: Los Angeles Fire Department Correspondence, May 5, 2026
Appendix N: Project Plans, September 22, 2026

INITIAL STUDY

1 INTRODUCTION

This Initial Study (IS) document evaluates potential environmental effects resulting from construction and operation of the proposed Village Christian School Project ("Project"). The proposed Project is subject to the guidelines and regulations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Therefore, this document has been prepared in compliance with the relevant provisions of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines as implemented by the City of Los Angeles (City). The City uses Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines as the thresholds of significance unless another threshold of significance is expressly identified in the document. Based on the analysis provided within this Initial Study, the City has concluded that the Project will not result in significant impacts on the environment. This Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration are intended as informational documents, and are ultimately required to be adopted by the decision maker prior to project approval by the City.

1.1 PURPOSE OF AN INITIAL STUDY

The California Environmental Quality Act was enacted in 1970 with several basic purposes: (1) to inform governmental decision makers and the public about the potential significant environmental effects of proposed projects; (2) to identify ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced; (3) to prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures; and (4) to disclose to the public the reasons behind a project's approval even if significant environmental effects are anticipated.

An application for the proposed project has been submitted to the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning for discretionary review. The Department of City Planning, as Lead Agency, has determined that the project is subject to CEQA, and preparation of an Initial Study is required.

An Initial Study is a preliminary analysis conducted by the Lead Agency, in consultation with other agencies (responsible or trustee agencies, as applicable), to determine whether there is substantial evidence that a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the Initial Study concludes that the Project, with mitigation, may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report must be prepared; otherwise the Lead Agency may adopt a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code §21000 et seq.), the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, §15000 et seq.), and the City of Los Angeles CEQA Guidelines (1981, amended 2006).

1.2. ORGANIZATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study is organized into four sections as follows:

1 INTRODUCTION

Describes the purpose and content of the Initial Study, and provides an overview of the CEQA process.

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Provides Project information, identifies key areas of environmental concern, and includes a determination whether the project may have a significant effect on the environment.

3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Provides a description of the environmental setting and the Project, including project characteristics and a list of discretionary actions.

4 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Contains the completed Initial Study Checklist and discussion of the environmental factors that would be potentially affected by the Project.

INITIAL STUDY

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROJECT TITLE	**VILLAGE CHRISTIAN SCHOOL PROJECT**
ENVIRONMENTAL CASE NO.	**ENV-2025-6479-MND**
RELATED CASES	CPC-2025-6478-CU3-SPPC

PROJECT LOCATION	**8930 NORTH VILLAGE AVENUE; 10301 WEST VINEDALE STREET; 10158 AND 10210 WEST PENROSE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 91352**
COMMUNITY PLAN AREA	SUN VALLEY – LA TUNA CANYON
GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION	VERY LOW RESIDENTIAL
ZONING	A2-1-K
COUNCIL DISTRICT	7 – MONICA RODRIGUEZ

LEAD AGENCY	**City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning**
STAFF CONTACT	IRIS WAN
ADDRESS	200 N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 763
PHONE NUMBER	213-978-1397
EMAIL	IRIS.WAN@LACITY.ORG

APPLICANT	**VILLAGE CHRISTIAN SCHOOL**
ADDRESS	8930 NORTH VILLAGE AVENUE LOS ANGELES, CA 91352
PHONE NUMBER	818-767-8382

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this Project. The impacts for each of these environmental factors would be less than significant with mitigation measures included in this MND.

- ☐ Aesthetics
- ☐ Agriculture & Forestry Resources
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☒ Biological Resources
- ☒ Cultural Resources
- ☐ Energy
- ☐ Geology / Soils
- ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- ☒ Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- ☐ Hydrology / Water Quality
- ☒ Land Use / Planning
- ☐ Mineral Resources
- ☐ Noise
- ☐ Population / Housing
- ☐ Public Services
- ☐ Recreation
- ☒ Transportation / Traffic
- ☒ Tribal Cultural Resources
- ☐ Utilities / Service Systems
- ☒ Wildfire
- ☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

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

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

Iris Wan, City Planner	October 30, 2026
PRINTED NAME, TITLE	**DATE**

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

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

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of a mitigation measure has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analysis," as described in (5) below, may be cross referenced).

5) Earlier analysis must be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR, or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

    a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

    b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

    c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

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

the page or pages where the statement is substantiated

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

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

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

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

    b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

INITIAL STUDY

3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 PROJECT SUMMARY

The Project involves the expansion and construction of school facilities within an existing private school campus (K through 12th grade), including: 1) a new 18,826 square-foot gymnasium building with 700 seats; 2) a new 4,023 square-foot annex building; 3) remodel and addition of 5,388 square feet to the existing Administration Building (office, chapel, library); 4) remodel and addition of 5,660 square feet to the existing Building #10 (classrooms); 5) new asphalt parking areas and drive aisles; 6) an extension of the emergency/fire access road; 7) two new retaining walls; and 8) removal of a softball field and associated structures. No increase in the maximum permitted student enrollment (1,950 students) is proposed.

3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.2.1 Project Location

The Project Site is located at 8930 North Village Avenue, 10301 West Vinedale Street, 10158 and 10210 West Penrose Street, in the Sun Valley – La Tuna Canyon Community Plan Area in the City of Los Angeles. The Project Site encompasses approximately 28.02 acres (approximately 1,220,718 square feet) and consists of one parcel, identified by Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 2404-001-019. The Project Site is located near the intersection of Village Avenue and Penrose Street, on the southern side of the La Tuna Canyon Lateral flood control channel, bordered by open space and hills to the south and east, and with residential uses to the west. Single-family residences are located across La Tuna Canyon Lateral to the north. Construction for a new softball field (owned and operated by the Applicant) located across Village Avenue to the west at 10332, 10335, and 10336 West Penrose Street (APN Nos. 2404-002-022 and 2404-002-023) was recently completed in May of 2026. The Applicant also owns one adjacent parcel located southwest of Village Avenue (APN No. 2404-001-007) and said parcel is not a part of the Project. The Project Site is only accessible via Village Avenue and Wildwood Avenue.

For purposes of this Initial Study, the “Project Site” refers to the entire 28-acre campus parcel. Proposed construction would occur within two discrete areas of the campus: (1) the southern development area (gymnasium, annex building, parking areas, retaining walls, and emergency/fire access road, including the new paving within the Village Avenue right-of-way); and (2) the northern development area (Building #10 and the Administration Building).

3.2.2 Existing Conditions

The Project Site is zoned A2-1-K and designated for Very Low Residential land uses. The Project Site is located within the San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan (ZI-2324), as well as an Equine Keeping "K" District (ZI-2438). Under the Specific Plan, the Project Site is not located within a Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area including a Prominent Ridgeline, nor within a Scenic Highway Corridor. The Project Site is located in close proximity to the La Tuna Canyon Lateral flood control channel, which is an Official Equestrian Trail as shown on Specific Plan Map No. 3. The Project Site adjoins Village Avenue, which is a Non-Public Equestrian Trail, as shown on Specific Plan Map No. 4.

The Project Site is located in the Hillside Area, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, High Wind Velocity Areas, Special Grading Area (BOE Basic Grid Map A-13372), Landslide Area, and within the Verdugo Fault Zone. The Project Site is not located within the Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone. The Project Site is not located in a Los Angeles County-designated Significant Ecological Area.

The Project Site is currently developed with Village Christian School grades Kindergarten through 12th. Existing improvements include classroom buildings, an administration building, a gymnasium with 700 seats, a theatre building, an auditorium and café building, an athletic field, a softball field, paved playgrounds, administrative offices, outdoor quad areas, a basketball court, weight room, field house trailer, and surface parking lots. The private school has operated at the site for over 60 years, as building permits were issued for the school in 1963. The school currently provides a total of 359 vehicular parking spaces.

The proposed gymnasium and annex building will be constructed in the southern portion of the campus, in what is presently a softball field. The existing softball field consists of a relatively level playing field that has a dirt infield and grass outfields. There is an existing descending slope, approximately 10 feet in height, located immediately adjacent to the northwest side of the proposed annex building.

3.2.3 Surrounding Land Uses

Properties to the north are zoned OS-1XL-K and improved with the La Tuna Canyon Lateral flood control channel. Single-family residences located in parcels zoned RA-1-K are situated to the north of the channel. Properties to the east and south are zoned A2-1-K, A1-1, and comprise of open space and hills. Properties to the west are zoned RA-1-K and developed with single-family dwellings. A new softball field (owned and operated by the Applicant) located across Village Avenue to the west was recently constructed in May of 2026.

3.3 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

3.3.1 Project Overview

The Project proposes the remodel and expansion of two (2) existing buildings (Building #10 and Administration Building) and the construction of two (2) new buildings (gymnasium building and annex building).

The proposed remodel, expansion, and tenant improvements to the existing Building #10 (classrooms) and Administration Building (office, chapel, library) are located at the northern portion of the campus. The existing Building #10 is one-story and 16 feet in height, with 5,650 square feet in area. The Project proposes the addition of a second story and 5,660 square feet to the existing Building #10, for a new building area of 11,310 square feet. The proposed new building height for Building #10 will be 29 feet 6 inches. The Project proposes to provide approximately 1,296 square feet of rooftop solar zone area for Building #10.

The existing Administration Building is one-story and 19 feet in height, with 8,600 square feet in area. The Project proposes the addition of 5,388 square feet to the existing Administration Building, for a new building area of 13,988 square feet. The proposed new building height for the Administration Building will be 22 feet 2 inches. The Project proposes to provide approximately 2,369 square feet of rooftop solar zone area for the Administration Building.

The proposed gymnasium building and annex building will be constructed in the southern portion of the campus, to the southeast of the existing football field and to the southwest of the existing weight room. The proposed structures will be constructed in what is presently a softball field. In order to facilitate the construction of the new gymnasium building and annex building, the Project proposes the demolition of the following: an existing softball field, a 1,440 square-foot field house trailer, three (3) temporary storage containers, a dugout, batting cages, and bleachers.

The proposed 18,826 square-foot gymnasium building will be one-story inclusive of a mezzanine level, with a maximum building height of 35 feet. The Project proposes to provide approximately 4,219 square feet of rooftop solar zone area for the new gymnasium building. The proposed 4,023 square-foot annex building will be one-story and 19 feet in height. The Project proposes to provide approximately 656 square feet of rooftop solar zone area for the new annex building.

The Project proposes 19,533 square feet of new asphalt parking areas adjacent to the new gymnasium building and annex building. A total of 35 new vehicular parking spaces will be located in the new parking areas. The Project proposes a new emergency/fire access road located to the south of the new gymnasium building, with variable roadway widths of 20 to 28 feet. Approximately 2,213 square feet of new asphalt pavement is

proposed to extend the new emergency/fire access road outside the property line to join existing pavement at the current southern terminus of Village Avenue. The new emergency/fire access road will have egress/ingress from Village Avenue and Wildwood Avenue.

The Project proposes approximately 4,646 cubic yards of cut, 564 cubic yards of fill, and 4,082 cubic yards of soil export. Two new retaining walls are proposed along the eastern and western portion of the new emergency/fire access road. Retaining wall #1 is 126.60 feet in linear length with a maximum height of 10 feet and retaining wall #2 is 108.60 feet in linear length with a maximum height of 10 feet.

The Project proposes the removal of ten (10) on-site non-protected trees and the planting of 75 new trees. The Project is not proposing the removal of any street trees or protected trees. The Project proposes approximately 20,809 square feet of new planting area, and 20,348 square feet of new hardscape area (excluding parking area and new emergency/fire access road).

3.3.2 Access, Circulation, and Parking

The main entrance to the private school campus is located off Village Avenue, located approximately 350 feet to the south of the intersection of Penrose Street and Village Avenue. Parents, students, and visitors enter the campus through the entrance from Village Avenue and exit via Wildwood Avenue. Drop-off and pick-up of students occur along the northern portion of the campus, adjacent to Building #10 and the Administration Building. Several parking lots and parking areas are dispersed throughout the campus. A student and overflow parking lot with approximately 132 parking spaces is located at the northeast quadrant of the site. The school currently provides a total of 359 parking spaces, of which 93 parking spaces are allocated for visitors. The Project proposes the addition of 35 new vehicular parking spaces, for a total of 394 parking spaces.

3.3.3 School Operation and Hours

As proposed, the expansion of the private school campus consists of tenant improvements and addition to existing school buildings, and the construction of two new buildings. The Project will maintain the maximum enrollment of 1,950 students in Kindergarten (K) through Grade 12. The maximum enrollment, however, has not yet been reached as the current enrollment for the private school is 1,270 students. The school's hours of operation for instructional days run from 7:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. A before-school program runs from 6:00 a.m. to 7:30 a.m., and an after-school program runs from 3:30 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. In addition to regular instruction, there are occasional special events and athletic programs for the school which runs from 3:30 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. The school also has summer, fall, winter, and spring break programming outside of the regular school schedule. The school break programming includes play, enrichment, and instructional activities. These programs will typically include 25 percent of the student

enrollment during the summer, 10 percent of the student enrollment during fall and winter, and 15 percent of the student enrollment during spring. The proposed new construction and tenant improvements will not change the school operation, hours, and school capacity.

3.3.4 Project Phasing

The Applicant proposes to build the Project over three phases to upgrade and modernize the existing campus. Phase 1 includes the construction of the new gymnasium building and new annex building. The new gymnasium building will house the athletic training programs and the new annex building will house new classrooms for the performing arts. Phase 2 includes the tenant improvements and addition to the existing Administration Building, which is anticipated to be completed two years after the completion of the gymnasium and annex buildings. Phase 3 includes the tenant improvements and addition to the existing Building #10 classrooms, which is anticipated to be completed in conjunction with the Administration Building or after depending on fundraising for the project.

3.4 REQUESTED PERMITS AND APPROVALS

The list below includes the anticipated requests for approval of the Project. This Initial Study/MND analyzes the impacts associated with the Project and will provide environmental review sufficient for all necessary entitlements and public agency actions associated with the Project. The discretionary entitlements, reviews, permits and approvals required to implement the Project include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

1) Pursuant to LAMC Section 13B.2.3, a Class 3 Conditional Use Permit to allow the expansion and construction of school facilities within an existing private school campus, and waiver of street lighting, street dedication and street improvement requirements along Village Avenue.

2) Pursuant to LAMC Section 11.5.7, a Project Compliance (San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan) for the expansion and construction of school facilities within an existing private school campus.

3) Haul Route review by the Board of Building and Safety Commissioners for the export of 4,082 cubic yards of earth.

4) Pursuant to the LAMC, the Applicant requests applicable ministerial administrative approvals and permits from the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety and other municipal agencies for project construction actions, including but not limited to the following: temporary street closure, haul route, retaining walls, tree removal, demolition, grading, foundation, building, signs, and tenant improvements.

3.5 RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE PUBLIC AGENCIES

A Responsible Agency under CEQA is a public agency with some discretionary authority over a project or a portion of it, but which has not been designated the Lead Agency (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15381). The list below identifies whether any responsible agencies have been identified for the Project: none

A Trustee Agency under CEQA is a state agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project that are held in trust for the people of the State of California (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15386). The California Department of Fish and Wildlife is a Trustee Agency for the fish and wildlife resources in the Project vicinity. In addition, the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy (SMMC) is treated as a CEQA trustee agency by the City of Los Angeles for projects affecting natural resources within its jurisdiction. The Project Site adjoins open space in the Verdugo Mountains, within the SMMC's jurisdiction.

INITIAL STUDY

4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

I. AESTHETICS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099 would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. A scenic vista refers to views of focal points or panoramic views of broader geographic areas that have visual interest. A focal point view would consist of a view of a notable object, building, or setting. An impact on a scenic vista would occur if the bulk or design of a building or development contrasts enough with a visually interesting view, so that the quality of the view is permanently affected. The proposed Project Site is located within the geographic boundary of the San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan, but is not located within a Scenic Highway Corridor or Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area as designated by Specific Plan Map Nos. 1 and 2, respectively. The Specific Plan is intended to preserve, protect, and enhance the unique natural and cultural resources of the Plan area, and

the project is required to comply with the provisions of the Specific Plan including minimum grading and the preservation of natural features, such as prominent knolls or ridge lines. Consistent with these requirements, the Project's proposed grading (approximately 4,646 cubic yards of cut and 564 cubic yards of fill) is generally confined to the already-developed, lower-elevation portion of the campus and does not substantially encroach into the hillside edges of the Project Site. The emergency/fire access road extension and Retaining Walls #1 and #2 (each up to 10 feet in height) would cut into the existing approximately 10-foot descending slope adjacent to the softball field and the toe of the slope along Village Avenue, but would not alter any prominent knoll or ridgeline.

The proposed new gymnasium and annex buildings would be constructed on the site of the existing softball field, an already-developed and disturbed portion of the campus, rather than on any undeveloped hillside or upper-slope area. Consistent with the low-rise character of the existing campus, the new gymnasium building would have a maximum height of 35 feet and the new annex building would be 19 feet in height; the remodeled Administration Building and Building #10 would reach 22 feet 2 inches and 29 feet 6 inches, respectively. As a result, views of the mountain backdrop from Village Avenue, Wildwood Avenue, and other publicly accessible vantage points in the vicinity would remain substantially unobstructed.

No focal point views of a notable object, building, or setting, and no panoramic views of a broader geographic area, have been identified on or immediately adjacent to the Project Site. The Project Site has been continuously developed and operated as a private school campus since 1963, and the proposed expansion would occur within and adjacent to this existing, previously disturbed development footprint rather than introducing new development into an undisturbed scenic setting.

No prominent knolls, ridgelines, or other natural hillside features would be altered by the Project. The proposed project is not located within a Scenic Highway Corridor or Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area, and there are no other identified scenic vistas that would be substantially adversely affected by the proposed low-rise expansion and new construction within the existing private school campus.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural feature within a state scenic highway?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially damage scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway. The City of Los Angeles' General Plan Mobility Element (Citywide General Plan Circulation System Maps) as well as the CalTrans website at https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways indicate that no State-designated scenic highways are located near the Project Site. Therefore, no impacts related to a State Scenic Highway would occur.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project Site is located within the City of Los Angeles, an incorporated city with a population of at least 100,000 persons, and is therefore within an "urbanized area" as defined in PRC Section 21071. Accordingly, the applicable question is whether the Project would conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. The applicable regulations are the A2-1-K zone and Height District No. 1 standards of the LAMC and the San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan. The proposed buildings (maximum 35 feet) would not exceed the maximum building height permitted and the Project's consistency with the Specific Plan is subject to the requested Project Compliance determination, as discussed below and in Section XI, Land Use and Planning.

The proposed Project Site is located within the geographic boundary of the San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan, but is not located within a Scenic Highway Corridor or Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area as designated by Specific Plan Map Nos. 1 and 2, respectively. The Specific Plan is intended to preserve, protect, and enhance the unique natural and cultural resources of the Plan area. Consistent with this intent, the Project would remove only ten non-protected on-site trees while planting 75 new trees, for a net increase in on-site landscaping, and no street trees or protected trees would be removed. All landscaped areas shall be maintained in accordance with a landscape plan, including an automatic irrigation plan, prepared by a licensed landscape architect in accordance with LAMC Sections 12.40 and 12.41. The final landscape plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning during the building permit process. Retaining walls that can be viewed from the adjacent public right(s)-of-way shall incorporate one or more of the following to minimize their visibility: clinging vines, espaliered plants, or other vegetative screening; decorative masonry, or other varied and textured façade; or utilize a combination of methods.

The addition and remodel of Building #10 and the Administration Building involve modest additions to existing structures at the northern portion of the campus and would not introduce new building forms into the site's visual character. The two new buildings, the gymnasium and annex building, would be constructed on the site of the existing softball field, a portion of the campus that is already developed and does not itself contribute scenic or natural visual value. The proposed buildings are consistent in scale with the existing low-rise campus, with heights ranging from 19 to 35 feet, and would be viewed against the backdrop of the existing school campus and surrounding hillside rather than as isolated new features in an undeveloped setting. The Project's grading is consistent with the Specific Plan's minimum grading and natural feature preservation requirements.

The proposed expansion and construction within the existing school campus would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality, and impacts would be less than significant. The proposed remodel, addition, and tenant improvements are for two existing

school buildings. The proposed construction of two new buildings will be located on a site that is currently developed with a softball field.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if light and glare substantially altered the character of off-site areas surrounding the site or interfered with the performance of an off-site activity. Light impacts are typically associated with the use of artificial light during the evening and night-time hours. Glare may be a daytime occurrence caused by the reflection of sunlight or artificial light from highly polished surfaces, such as window glass and reflective cladding materials, and may interfere with the safe operation of a motor vehicle on adjacent streets. Daytime glare is common in urban areas and is typically associated with mid- to high-rise buildings with exterior façades largely or entirely comprised of highly reflective glass or mirrorlike materials. Nighttime glare is primarily associated with bright point-source lighting that contrasts with existing low ambient light conditions. The Project Site is located within an existing private school campus, and a moderate level of ambient nighttime light already exists. Nighttime lighting sources include street lights, vehicle headlights, and interior and exterior building illumination. The proposed project would include nighttime security lighting and pathway lighting for the new gymnasium and annex buildings. However, the security lighting would not substantially change existing ambient nighttime lighting conditions. New exterior lighting would consist of building-mounted and pathway lighting near the new gymnasium and annex buildings, as shown on the site lighting fixture cut sheets and photometric plans included in Appendix N (Sheets A6.10 and A6.11). No athletic field or sports lighting is proposed. Exterior lighting would be required to comply with the Title 24 outdoor lighting standards and LAMC Section 93.0117, which prohibits exterior light sources from causing more than two foot-candles of lighting intensity, or generating direct glare onto exterior glazed windows or glass doors, on any property containing residential units. The nearest residences are located across Village Avenue, approximately 355 to 380 feet from the new gymnasium/annex area. The proposed project does not include any elements or features that would create substantial new sources of glare. Therefore, light and glare impacts would be less than significant.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would convert valued farmland to non-agricultural uses. The Project Site is currently developed with an existing private

school campus. No Farmland, agricultural uses, or related operations are present within the Project Site or surrounding area. According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, the Project Site is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land and is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The subject site is identified on the Zone Information and Map Access System (ZIMAS) as being located within an Urban Agriculture Incentive Zone; however, the Applicant is not proposing any agricultural uses as a part of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not convert any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use, and no impacts would occur.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project conflicted with existing agricultural zoning or agricultural parcels enrolled under the Williamson Act. According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, the Project Site is not under a Williamson Act contract. The Project Site is zoned A2-1-K and designated for Very Low Residential land uses by the Sun Valley – La Tuna Canyon Community Plan. The existing private school campus has operated on the site since the 1960s, and there are no agricultural uses on site. The school is currently operating under a Conditional Use granted by Case No. CPC-1957-8447-CU, which allowed the construction, use, and maintenance of a private elementary, junior high, and high school. The proposed expansion and new construction at the existing private school would not conflict with any zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act contract. As such, no impacts would occur.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project conflicted with existing zoning or caused rezoning of forest land or timberland, or resulted in the loss of forest land or in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The Project Site is zoned A2-1-K and designated for Very Low Residential land uses by the Sun Valley – La Tuna Canyon Community Plan. The existing private school campus has operated on the site since the 1960s, and there are no forest land or timberland on site. The school is currently operating under a Conditional Use granted by Case No. CPC-1957-8447-CU, which allowed the construction, use, and maintenance of a private elementary, junior high, and high school. The project proposes expansion and new construction at the existing private school campus, and would not conflict with forest land or timberland zoning or result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project conflicted with existing zoning or caused rezoning of forest land or timberland, or resulted in the loss of forest land or in the

conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The Project Site is zoned A2-1-K and designated for Very Low Residential land uses by the Sun Valley – La Tuna Canyon Community Plan. The existing private school campus has operated on the site since the 1960s, and there are no forest land on site. The school is currently operating under a Conditional Use granted by Case No. CPC-1957-8447-CU, which allowed the construction, use, and maintenance of a private elementary, junior high, and high school. The project proposes expansion and new construction at the existing private school campus and would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project caused the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The Project Site does not contain farmland, forestland, or timberland. The Project Site is zoned A2-1-K and designated for Very Low Residential land uses by the Sun Valley – La Tuna Canyon Community Plan. The existing private school campus has operated on the site since the 1960s and is currently operating under a Conditional Use granted by Case No. CPC-1957-8447-CU, which allowed the construction, use, and maintenance of a private elementary, junior high, and high school. The project proposes expansion and new construction at the existing private school campus and would not result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the agency primarily responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in the South Coast Air Basin and reducing emissions from area and point stationary, mobile, and indirect sources. SCAQMD prepared the 2022 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) to meet federal and state ambient air quality standards. A significant air quality impact may occur if a project is inconsistent with the AQMP or would in some way represent a substantial hindrance to employing the policies or obtaining the goals of that plan. As discussed in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment Report, prepared for the proposed project by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (see Appendix A), the proposed project is not expected to conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the AQMP and SCAQMD rules. Consistent with the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, consistency with the AQMP is evaluated using two criteria: (1) whether the project would result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of air quality standards, which is evaluated by comparing project emissions to SCAQMD significance thresholds; and (2) whether the project would exceed the growth assumptions in the AQMP. As shown in Appendix A, Tables 2-6 through 2-8, construction and operational emissions would not exceed SCAQMD regional or localized thresholds. Since the Project would not increase student enrollment and does not include housing or new employment-generating uses beyond the existing school, it would not exceed the population, housing, or employment growth projections underlying the AQMP. The proposed

project is also subject to the California Green Building Code (CalGreen) and the City of Los Angeles Green Building Standards Code, which were adopted to reduce the use of natural resources, create healthier living environments, and minimize the negative impacts of development on local, regional and global ecosystems. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the air basin is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. The proposed project will involve grading activities with approximately 4,646 cubic yards of cut, 564 cubic yards of fill, and 4,082 cubic yards of soil export; the demolition of structures; and the addition and construction of new facilities within the school campus. As discussed in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment Report, prepared for the proposed project by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (see Appendix A), during the construction phase the proposed project would not exceed the regional SCAQMD significance thresholds for emissions of Reactive Organic Compounds (ROG), Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x), Carbon Monoxide (CO), Sulfur Oxides (SO_x), and Particulate Matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$). Maximum daily construction emissions are estimated at 5.20 pounds per day (lbs/day) of ROG, 14.30 lbs/day of NO_x, 20.10 lbs/day of CO, 0.03 lbs/day of SO_2, 3.47 lbs/day of PM_{10}, and 1.90 lbs/day of $PM_{2.5}$, compared to the SCAQMD regional construction thresholds of 75, 100, 550, 150, 150, and 55 lbs/day, respectively (Appendix A, Table 2-6). Therefore, regional emission impacts for the proposed project would be less than significant for all construction phases. Implementation of the Project would result in long-term operational emissions of criteria air pollutants such as PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, CO, and SO_2 as well as O_3 precursors such as ROGs and NO_x. Project-generated increase in emissions would be predominantly associated with motor vehicle use from employees. As discussed in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment Report (see Appendix A), maximum daily operational emissions would be approximately 1.83 lbs/day of ROG, 0.76 lbs/day of NO_x, 7.79 lbs/day of CO, 0.01 lbs/day of SO_2, 1.29 lbs/day of PM_{10}, and 0.35 lbs/day of $PM_{2.5}$, which would not exceed the SCAQMD regional operational thresholds of 55, 55, 550, 150, 150, and 55 lbs/day, respectively (Appendix A, Table 2-8). These estimates conservatively assume approximately 173 new daily vehicle trips; as discussed in Section XVII, Transportation, the Project would not increase student enrollment and is not expected to generate new daily trips. The project would also be subject to regulations for construction dust control, equipment emissions, building efficiency standards, vehicle emission standards, and other measures which reduce the impacts of operational and construction regional emissions. As such, impacts to air quality standards are less than significant.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less than Significant Impact. To evaluate whether project-generated construction emissions could result in localized impacts to nearby sensitive receptors, the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment Report, prepared for the proposed project by ECORP Consulting,

Inc. (see Appendix A), applied the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) Localized Significance Threshold (LST) methodology. The LST methodology establishes maximum daily on-site emissions thresholds for oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ based on the size of the project's daily disturbed area, the distance to the nearest off-site sensitive receptor, and the Source Receptor Area (SRA) in which the project is located. The nearest sensitive receptors are the students, faculty, and staff of the Vinedale College Preparatory Academy, located approximately 100 feet north of the Project Site; and the single-family residences located across Village Avenue to the west, approximately 380 feet west from the edge of the new construction footprint. As explained below, Appendix A applied the SCAQMD LSTs for receptors at 25 meters (approximately 82 feet), which are the most stringent LST values and apply to receptors located at that distance or closer.

Appendix A compared maximum daily on-site construction emissions to the SCAQMD LSTs for Source Receptor Area 7 (East San Fernando Valley) for a one-acre site with receptors at 25 meters. These are the most stringent LST values available. The 25-meter values are applied to receptors located 25 meters or closer, and the one-acre values are lower than those for larger daily disturbance areas. Maximum modeled on-site construction emissions of 10.39 lbs/day of NOx, 13.39 lbs/day of CO, 1.84 lbs/day of PM_{10}, and 1.10 lbs/day of $PM_{2.5}$ (Appendix A, Table 2-7) would not exceed the applicable LSTs of 80 NO_2, 498 CO, 4 PM_{10}, and 3 $PM_{2.5}$ pounds per day, respectively. Therefore, project construction would not expose nearby sensitive receptors, including students and staff on the Project Site, to substantial localized pollutant concentrations.

Because the proposed project involves temporary construction activity and does not include the establishment of a new stationary source of toxic air contaminants (TACs), a quantitative health risk assessment is not required under SCAQMD or California Air Resources Board (CARB) guidance. Nonetheless, diesel particulate matter generated by off-road construction equipment and haul trucks is a TAC of potential concern given the proximity of off-site sensitive uses. Construction activities would be required to comply with CARB's In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets Regulation (13 CCR §2449), including its five-minute idling limit and fleet emission standards, and CARB's Airborne Toxic Control Measure limiting idling of diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles, including haul trucks, to five minutes (13 CCR §2485). On-site PM_{10} exhaust, which is a surrogate for diesel particulate matter, would be a small fraction of total construction PM_{10} and would not exceed the LSTs, which are set to be protective of sensitive receptors (Appendix A, Section 2.3.3.4). Construction would also be temporary and would occur in discrete phases rather than as a continuous long-term source. Furthermore, the project would be subject to SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) and other applicable regulatory measures, and impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant Impact. Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include equipment exhaust and architectural coatings. Odors from these sources would be localized and generally confined to the immediate area surrounding the Project Site. The proposed project would utilize typical construction techniques, and the odors would be typical of

most construction sites and temporary in nature. As stated in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment Report, prepared for the proposed project by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (see Appendix A), construction of the proposed project presents the potential of objectionable odors in the form of diesel exhaust in the immediate vicinity of the site. However, these emissions are short-term in nature and will rapidly dissipate and be diluted by the atmosphere downwind of the emission sources. It is expected that the odors associated with the project's construction would not be concentrated or stagnant near any of the sensitive receptors, specifically the school surrounding the Project Site. According to the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses and industrial operations that are associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The proposed land uses would not result in activities that create objectionable odors. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to objectionable odors.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. A project would have a significant biological impact through the loss or destruction of individuals of a species or through the degradation of sensitive habitat. As discussed in the Tree Report dated October 31, 2025, prepared by Carlberg Associates (see Appendix B), the Project Site contains 41 on-site trees. Three (3) street trees are located in the public right-of-way along Village Avenue. Two protected coast live oak trees (*Quercus agrifolia*), one Mexican elderberry shrub (*Sambucus mexicana*), and one California sycamore tree (*Platanus racemosa*) occur on- or immediately offsite. None of the protected trees are proposed for removal. No Southern California black walnut (*Juglans californica*) trees, California bay (*Umbellularia californica*) trees or toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*) shrubs occur on- or immediately offsite. Of the proposed on-site removal of ten (10) non-protected trees, there are no palms or other monocots. All ten (10) non-protected trees proposed for removal are planted trees and not naturally occurring. Out of the ten (10) existing trees to be removed, eight (8) trees are located adjacent to the existing Building #10 and Administration Building. Two (2) existing trees to be removed are located at the southern portion of the campus, near the proposed parking areas for the proposed gymnasium building. Of the four (4) protected trees, two (2) coast live oak and one (1) Mexican elderberry are located to the south of the proposed emergency/fire access road. The Tree Report dated October 31, 2025, has been stamped and signed by the City's Urban Forestry Division on November 18, 2025 (see Appendix B).

However, grading, retaining wall construction, and fuel modification would occur near the protected zone of one (coast live oak) of the four protected trees and shrubs. Work within a protected tree's protected zone that damages its root system or canopy could injure the tree. The Tree Report (Appendix B, Conclusion and Recommendations) identifies tree protection practices, including protection fencing, arborist monitoring of work within protected zones, and prohibitions on equipment and material storage within protected zones. These practices are incorporated as MM-BIO-1 below.

Additionally, a Biologist's Statement of Biological Resources dated September 5, 2025, prepared by Sapphos Environmental Inc. (see Appendix D) was provided. The Biologist's Statement states that there are historic California Natural Diversity Database records for western bristly scaleseed (*Atriplex truncata* var. *bracteosa*), white rabbit-tobacco (*Pseudognaphalium leucocephalum*), and Davidson's bushmallow (*Malacothamnus davidsonii*) within the vicinity of the Project Site. However, no individuals or suitable habitat for these species were observed in the areas proposed for work. Therefore, the project will not remove or create a substantial effect on these species.

Furthermore, the Biologist's Letter dated July 1, 2026 (see Appendix E), prepared by Sapphos Environmental Inc., states that the Project Site and proposed scope of work, which is primarily located in previously disturbed portions of the site utilized as hardscape or sports fields areas, will not have impacts on any of the following: Los Angeles County Sensitive Ecological Areas, official equestrian trails, non-public equestrian trails, hiking trails, state and federal wetlands, riparian

habitats, watercourse, and mountain lion habitat. Per ZIMAS, the subject parcel is located within the Verdugo Mountains Criterion 1 Protected Areas for Wildlife (PAWs), identified in the PAWs Report prepared by Environmental Science Associates for the Department of City Planning. Under the Verdugo Mountains PAW, Criterion 1 evaluates whether an area supports endangered and threatened plants and wildlife. The proposed scope of work is located primarily on previously disturbed portions of the site utilized as hardscape or sports fields areas. Therefore, no substantial impacts are anticipated to affect endangered and threatened plants and wildlife.

However, the Project would remove ten non-protected trees and would include vegetation clearance and fuel modification within 100 feet of new structures (Appendix K, Section 7), adjacent to undeveloped chaparral and coastal sage scrub habitat on the hillsides to the south and east. Trees and shrubs on and adjacent to the Project Site could support nesting birds protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code. The Tree Report (Appendix B, Recommendation No. 6) recommends that pruning or removals occur outside the nesting bird season or, if not feasible, that biological monitoring be provided. Construction-period disturbance of active nests would be a potentially significant impact. Implementation of MM-BIO-2 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

MM-BIO-1. Tree Preservation (Grading Activities). The following tree protection measures shall be implemented during any demolition, grading, or construction activities: (a) tree protection fencing (orange mesh or chain link), with clear signage, shall be installed at the outer edge of the protected zone of each protected tree and shrub to remain, and of each non-protected tree with a trunk diameter of 8 inches or greater to remain within 25 feet of construction, before any ground disturbance and maintained until completion of all construction in that area; (b) no equipment, materials, or vehicles stored, parked, or operated within any protected zone; (c) all demolition, digging, excavation, trenching, or retaining wall construction within the protected zone of any protected tree monitored by the Project arborist, with exposed roots kept moist and covered; and (d) any pruning performed only by or under the supervision of an ISA Certified Arborist; and (e) fuel modification and brush clearance within the protected zone of any protected tree or shrub performed by hand or under the direction of the Project arborist. Prior to issuance of any demolition, grading, or building permit for each phase, the Applicant shall submit to the Department of City Planning written verification from the Project arborist that the tree protection fencing has been installed, and shall submit a final arborist compliance letter upon completion of each phase.

MM-BIO-2. Nesting Birds. Project activities that may disturb nesting birds, including tree removal or pruning, vegetation clearance, fuel modification, grading, and demolition, shall occur outside of the bird breeding season (February 1 through August 31), to the extent feasible. If such activities cannot feasibly avoid the breeding season, the Applicant shall retain a Qualified Biologist, as defined in the City's Biologist's Statement of Biological Resources form (CP-3613), who shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey of the work area and all accessible areas within 300 feet (500 feet for raptors) no more than 3 days before the start of those activities, and again whenever activities lapse for 7 or more consecutive days during the breeding season. If an active nest is found, the Qualified Biologist shall establish a no-disturbance buffer (generally 300

feet for passerines and 500 feet for raptors, unless the biologist determines a different buffer is adequate based on species, nest location, topography, and the type of activity), which shall be clearly marked in the field. No construction activity shall occur within the buffer until the Qualified Biologist confirms in writing that the young have fledged or the nest is no longer active. Survey results and any buffer determinations shall be documented in writing and submitted to the Department of City Planning prior to commencement of the affected activity, and retained on site for City inspection.

With implementation of MM-BIO-1 and MM-BIO-2, impacts to special-status species and protected biological resources would be less than significant.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less Than Significant Impact. As stated in the Biologist's Statement of Biological Resources dated September 5, 2025, prepared by Sapphos Environmental Inc. (see Appendix D), there are historic California Natural Diversity Database records for western bristly scaleseed (*Atriplex truncata* var. *bracteosa*), white rabbit-tobacco (*Pseudognaphalium leucocephalum*), and Davidson's bushmallow (*Malacothamnus davidsonii*) within the vicinity of the Project Site. However, no individuals or suitable habitat for these species were observed in the areas proposed for work. Therefore, the project will not remove or create a substantial effect on these species.

Furthermore, as discussed in the Biologist's Letter dated July 1, 2026 (see Appendix E), prepared by Sapphos Environmental Inc., the Project's scope will not remove or possibly create a sustainable effect to biological resources or mountain lions and their habitats. The National Wetlands Inventory map depicts three (3) Riverine (R4SBJ) features on south of the Project Site. Additional notes on these features state that habitats in this area were photo interpreted using 1 meter or less digital, true color imagery from 2006 and a site survey may be needed to confirm extent/location of features. From recent site photographs and Google images, these areas appear to be depressions in topography between hills. While they may convey flow during storm events, the vegetation is dry upland species and does not meet the California Fish and Game Code § 2785 definition of riparian habitat. The La Tuna Canyon Lateral (R4SBCr) is located along the northern boundary of the Project Site within a manmade concrete-lined channel, and will not be impacted by the proposed scope of work. Therefore, as the Project's scope is primarily within previously disturbed areas of the site and does not impact any riparian or other sensitive natural habitats, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in the Biologist's Letter dated July 1, 2026 (see Appendix E), prepared by Sapphos Environmental Inc., the National Wetlands Inventory map depicts three (3) Riverine (R4SBJ) features on south of the Project Site. Additional notes on these

features state that habitats in this area were photo interpreted using 1 meter or less digital, true color imagery from 2006 and a site survey may be needed to confirm extent/location of features. From recent site photographs and Google images, these areas appear to be depressions in topography between hills. While they may convey flow during storm events, the vegetation is dry upland species and does not meet the California Fish and Game Code § 2785 definition of riparian habitat. The La Tuna Canyon Lateral (R4SBCr) is located along the northern boundary of the Project Site within a manmade concrete-lined channel, and will not be impacted by the proposed scope of work. Therefore, impacts to state or federally protected wetlands would be less than significant.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. The Project Site is currently developed with an existing private school campus, which has operated on the site for over 60 years. The proposed project involves the expansion and new construction located at the existing school campus. As discussed in the Biologist's Letter dated July 1, 2026 (see Appendix E), prepared by Sapphos Environmental Inc., the Project Site and proposed scope of work will not have impacts on the following areas: Los Angeles County Sensitive Ecological Areas, official equestrian trails, non-public equestrian trails, hiking trails, state and federal wetlands, riparian habitats, watercourse, and mountain lion habitat. The proposed expansion and tenant improvements will occur primarily on previously disturbed areas of the site utilized as hardscape or sports field. The Project would not install fencing or other barriers across undeveloped hillside areas, and new exterior lighting would be directed toward the developed campus and subject to LAMC Section 93.0117. Potential disturbance of active bird nests (nursery sites) during construction and tree removal would be avoided through MM-BIO-2. With implementation of MM-BIO-2, impacts would be less than significant

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be inconsistent with local regulations pertaining to biological resources. The proposed project would not conflict with any policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Ordinance (Ordinance No. 186,873, LAMC Sections 46.00 et seq.), which regulates the removal of, and damage to, protected trees and shrubs. The project proposes the removal of ten (10) onsite non-protected trees. No street trees or protected trees are proposed to be removed. Of the four (4) protected trees, two (2) coast live oak and one (1) Mexican elderberry are located to the south of the proposed emergency/fire access road. Four protected trees and shrubs occur on or immediately adjacent to the Project Site, none of which are proposed for removal. However, construction would occur near the protected zone of one of the coast live oak. The Tree Report dated October 31, 2025, has been stamped and signed by the City's Urban Forestry Division on November 18, 2025. Therefore, with mitigation as proposed

herein, the project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, and less than significant impacts would occur. **(See MM-BIO-1 above)**

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project Site is not located within the boundaries of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Although not a habitat conservation plan, the Project's consistency with the San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan is discussed below for informational purposes. As previously discussed, the Project Site is located within the geographic area of the San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan (Ordinance No. 175,736). The purpose of the Specific Plan is to preserve, protect, and enhance the unique natural and cultural resources of the area. The Specific Plan regulates prominent ridgelines, biological resources, including oak trees and unique native plant communities, scenic highway corridors, and equine keeping. The Project Site is not located within a Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area including a Prominent Ridgeline, nor within a Scenic Highway Corridor. The Project Site is located in close proximity to the La Tuna Canyon Lateral flood control channel, which is an Official Equestrian Trail as shown on Specific Plan Map No. 3. The Project Site adjoins Village Avenue, which is a Non-Public Equestrian Trail, as shown on Specific Plan Map No. 4. The project does not propose any equine keeping uses or structures and does not propose to remove any existing equine keeping structures. The proposed expansion and tenant improvements to the existing private school campus will occur primarily on previously disturbed areas of the site utilized as hardscape and sports field, and would not conflict with any conservation plan. Therefore, impacts from the proposed scope of work would be less than significant.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially alter the environmental context of, or remove historical resources. The project involves the expansion and construction of an existing private school campus. The proposed remodel, addition, and tenant improvements will add approximately 5,660 square feet to the existing Building #10 and approximately 5,388 square feet to the existing Administration Building, neither of which are designated historical resources. The proposed construction of two new buildings (gymnasium building and annex building) will be located on what is currently a softball field. None of the structures on site have been identified as historic resources by local or state agencies, and the Project Site has not been determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, the Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments Register, and/or any local register. In addition, the site was not found to be a potential historic resource based on SurveyLA, the citywide survey of Los Angeles or the City's HistoricPlacesLA website. As such, the project will have less than significant impact on historical resources.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if a known or unknown archaeological resource would be removed, altered, or destroyed as a result of the proposed development. Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines significant archaeological resources as resources that meet the criteria for historical resources or resources that constitute

unique archaeological resources. A project related significant impact could occur if a project would significantly affect archaeological resources that fall under either of these categories.

The Project Site is currently developed with a private school campus that has operated on the site since the early 1960s. The project involves the remodel, addition, and tenant improvement to two existing school buildings. Construction of two new buildings will be located at what is currently a softball field at the southern end of the campus within the previously disturbed portions of the site. New asphalt parking areas, two retaining walls, and a new emergency/fire access road are proposed near the two new buildings. Proposed project activities are unlikely to have effects to unknown, subsurface archaeological resources. Furthermore, according to a letter received from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), dated March 10, 2026, a search of the NAHC Sacred Lands File was completed and the results were negative. In the unlikely event that archeological resources are encountered, the Project would be subject to the City's standard condition of approval for inadvertent discoveries, which requires work to stop in the vicinity of the find until it is evaluated by a qualified archeologist. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. A significant impact would occur if previously interred human remains would be disturbed during excavation of the project site. Human remains could be encountered during excavation and grading activities associated with the proposed project. While no formal cemeteries, other places of human interment, or burial grounds or sites are known to occur within the project area, there is always a possibility that human remains can be encountered during construction. If human remains are encountered unexpectedly during construction demolition and/or grading activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98. If human remains of Native American origin are discovered during project construction, compliance with state laws, which fall within the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) (Public Resource Code Section 5097), relating to the disposition of Native American burials will be adhered to. As analyzed under Section XVIII, Tribal Cultural Resources, mitigation measures will be implemented should human remains of a Native American origin be discovered during project construction. Therefore, the impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. **(See Section XVIII, Tribal Cultural Resources, MM-TCR-4.)**

VI. ENERGY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Less Than Significant Impact. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b) and Appendix F, this analysis considers the Project's energy use during construction and operation, the effects of the Project on local and regional energy supplies, and the degree to which the Project complies with existing energy standards. Construction. Construction would consume diesel fuel and gasoline for off-road equipment, haul trucks, vendor trucks, and worker vehicles, and a minor amount of electricity. Construction fuel use would be temporary, would occur in phases, and would be subject to CARB's idling limits (13 CCR §§2449 and 2485) and fleet emission standards, which discourage wasteful fuel use. There are no unusual characteristics of the Project's construction that would require more energy than comparable school construction projects.

During operation, the Project would consume electricity for lighting, heating, ventilation and air conditioning, and equipment in the new and expanded buildings. New buildings would be required to comply with the 2025 Title 24, Part 6 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, the Los Angeles Green Building Code, and CALGreen. The Project also provides solar-ready zones totaling approximately 8,540 square feet on the four buildings. Since the Project would not increase enrollment, it is not expected to increase transportation fuel use. LADWP's planned supply is sufficient to serve the Project's incremental demand. For these reasons, the Project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Less Than Significant Impact. The State of California Energy Commission and the City's Departments of Water and Power and Public Works offer programs to encourage energy efficiency. The proposed expansion and new construction at an existing private school campus

would comply with the Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, CALGreen, and the Los Angeles Green Building Code, which implement the State's energy efficiency policies, and would provide solar-ready roof zones that would not preclude future on-site renewable generation consistent with the City's Green New Deal (L.A.'s Green New Deal: Sustainable City pLAn 2019) and LADWP's renewable energy goals under SB 100. Accordingly, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct either state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv. Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Be located on a geologic unit that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would cause personal injury or death or result in property damage as a result of a fault rupture occurring on the Project Site and if the Project Site is located within a State-designated Alquist Priolo Zone or other designated fault zone. According to ZIMAS, the Project Site is located within the Verdugo Fault Zone but not within the Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone. The Geologic Report and Response to City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety Soils Report Review Letter dated March 31, 2026 (see Appendix G), prepared by R.T. Frankian & Associates, states that no active or potential active faults are known to project into or through the Project Site. The nearest mapped fault, the Verdugo Fault, is located approximately 0.9 mile from the Project Site and is not considered active under the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (Appendix G). The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act is intended to mitigate the hazard of surface fault rupture on structures for human occupancy. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would cause personal injury or death or resulted in property damage as a result of seismic ground shaking. The entire Southern California region is susceptible to strong ground shaking from severe earthquakes. Consequently, development of the proposed project could expose people and structures to strong seismic ground shaking. However, the proposed project would be designed and constructed in accordance with State and local Building Codes to reduce the potential for exposure of people or structures to seismic risks to the maximum extent possible. The proposed project would be required to comply with the seismic design requirements of the California Building Code, as adopted and amended by the City in the 2026 Los Angeles Building Code (LABC), including the site-specific seismic design parameters required by the LADBS Geology and Soils Report Approval Letter (Appendix I, Condition No. 14), and with California Geological Survey guidance for the evaluation and mitigation of seismic hazards. Compliance with such requirements would reduce seismic ground shaking impacts to the maximum extent practicable with current engineering practices. Therefore, impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a proposed project is located within a liquefaction zone. Liquefaction is the loss of soil strength or stiffness due to a buildup of pore-water pressure during severe ground shaking. According to ZIMAS, the subject site is not located within a Liquefaction Zone. Furthermore, the Report of Geotechnical Investigation dated August 22, 2025 (see Appendix F), prepared by R.T. Frankian & Associates, states that

the site is not located in a special Liquefaction Zone, as determined by the State of California, Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey. Finally, the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety Grading Division issued a Geology and Soils Report Approval Letter (Log #138828-02) dated June 11, 2026 (see Appendix I) for the proposed project. Therefore, impacts related to seismic ground failure, including liquefaction, would be less than significant.

iv) Landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be implemented on a site that would be located in a hillside area with unstable geological conditions or soil types that would be susceptible to failure when saturated. According to ZIMAS, the Project Site is located in a landslide area. As stated in the Geology and Soils Report Approval Letter (Log #138828-02) dated June 11, 2026 (see Appendix I), hillside portions at the edges of the school campus are located within a seismically inducted landslide hazard zone established by the State of California. The proposed construction does not encroach into this zone and a slope stability evaluation addressing this hazard is not required. Furthermore, the Project is required to comply with conditions attached to the Geology and Soils Report Approval Letter (Log #138828-02) dated June 11, 2026. As such, impacts due to landslide would be less than significant.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if construction activities or future uses would result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Construction of the proposed project would result in ground surface disturbance which could create the potential for soil erosion to occur. Construction activities would be performed in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles Building Code and the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board through the City's Stormwater Management Division. In addition, the proposed project would be required to develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. The Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan would require implementation of an erosion control plan to reduce the potential for wind or waterborne erosion during the construction process. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur with respect to erosion or loss of topsoil.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if any unstable geological conditions would result in any type of geological failure, including lateral spreading, offsite landslides, liquefaction, or collapse. Development of the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to expose people and structures to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslide. Subsidence and ground collapse generally occur in areas with active groundwater withdrawal or petroleum production. The extraction of groundwater or petroleum from sedimentary source rocks can cause the permanent collapse of the pore space previously occupied by the removed fluid. According to ZIMAS, the Project Site is not identified as being

located in an oil field or within an oil drilling area. The proposed project would be required to implement standard construction practices that would ensure that the integrity of the Project Site and the proposed structures is maintained. The applicant is proposing 4,646 cubic yards of cut, 564 cubic yards of fill, and 4,082 cubic yards of soil export. Construction will be required by the Department of Building and Safety to comply with the Los Angeles Building Code (LABC) which is designed to assure safe construction and includes building foundation requirements appropriate to site conditions. With the implementation of the Building Code requirements and conditions contained in the Department of Building and Safety's Geology and Soils Report Approval Letter (Log #138828-02) dated June 11, 2026, the potential for landslide lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse would be less than significant.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18 1 B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be built on expansive soils without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for project buildings, thus, posing a hazard to life and property. Expansive soils have relatively high clay mineral and expand with the addition of water and shrink when dried, which can cause damage to overlying structures. As discussed in the Geologic Report and Response to City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety Soils Report Review Letter dated March 31, 2026 (see Appendix G), prepared by R.T. Frankian & Associates, tests performed on two separate samples obtained at the site indicated Expansion Indexes that were in the Very Low to Low range. It is expected that the soils encountered during the course of grading operations will have Expansion Indexes ranging from Very Low to Low. Since the soils at final grade are expected to have a Very Low to Low expansion potential, no special treatment of the soil, relative to expansive soil conditions, is anticipated to be required. However, the proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements of the LABC, LAMC, and other applicable building codes. Compliance with such requirements would reduce impacts related to expansive soils, and impacts would be less than significant.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

Less Than Significant Impact. A project would cause a significant impact if adequate wastewater disposal is not available. The Project Site is located in an area where wastewater infrastructure is currently in place. The proposed project would connect to existing sewer lines that serve the project site and would not use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if excavation or construction activities associated with the proposed project would disturb paleontological or unique geological

features. As described in Appendices F and G, the Project Site is underlain by artificial fill, Quaternary alluvium, and granitic (quartz diorite) bedrock. Fill and igneous rock such as quartz diorite do not contain fossils, and the alluvial deposits encountered are relatively young and have low potential to contain significant fossils at the depths of proposed excavation (borings extended to 16–31 feet; Appendix F). No unique geologic features are present on the Project Site. Accordingly, the potential for the Project to destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature is low. In the unlikely event that paleontological resources are encountered, the Project would be subject to the City's standard condition of approval for inadvertent paleontological discoveries, which requires work to stop in the vicinity of the find until it is evaluated by a qualified paleontologist. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact. Neither SCAQMD nor the City of Los Angeles has adopted a numeric threshold of significance for GHG emissions from land use development projects. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.4, significance is instead evaluated based on (1) the extent the project would increase or reduce GHG emissions compared to existing conditions, (2) whether the project exceeds an applicable threshold, and (3) the extent to which the project complies with regulations adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local GHG reduction plan.

As discussed in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment Report (see Appendix A), project construction would generate approximately 172 MT CO_2e, and operation approximately 412 MT CO_2e annually, amortized consistent with SCAQMD guidance. These emissions would result from the same sources (worker and student trips, natural gas and electricity use) already generated by the existing school; the project does not increase student enrollment, and only two of four project components are new buildings on an already-developed portion of the campus. These estimates are also conservative because they assume approximately 173 new daily vehicle trips, although the Project would not increase student enrollment (see Section XVII). For context, the Project's estimated emissions are well below the 3,000 MT CO_2e per year screening level discussed by the SCAQMD GHG CEQA Significance Threshold Working Group for non-industrial projects. That screening level has not been adopted by SCAQMD or the City and is provided for informational purposes only; the City's significance determination is based on the Project's consistency with applicable GHG reduction plans, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(b)(3) discussed in response (b) below, the project would comply with the applicable requirements of the CARB 2022 Scoping Plan, SCAG's 2024–2050 RTP/SCS, and CALGreen/the City's Green Building Code, and would generate fewer GHG emissions than it would in the absence of these plans and regulations. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project's consistency with adopted GHG reduction plans was evaluated at the state, regional, and local level:

- *State — CARB 2022 Scoping Plan*: The project does not conflict with the Scoping Plan's strategies for the built environment, which rely primarily on building electrification and energy-efficiency codes rather than direct project-level mandates; the project's compliance with Title 24 and CALGreen (below) implements these strategies. As discussed in Appendix A, local jurisdictions without a CEQA-qualified Climate Action Plan are encouraged to focus on three priority areas – transportation electrification, VMT reduction, and building decarbonization – to align with the State's climate goals. These areas address the largest sources of GHG emissions at the local level.

  Transportation Electrification

  As the Project proposes the expansion of an existing school's facilities, the Project would not directly affect transportation electrification. The State has adopted AB 1236 and AB 970, which requires cities to adopt streamline permitting procedures for electric vehicle (EV) charging stations. Section IX of the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code requires most new construction to designate 30 percent of new parking spaces as capable of supporting future electric vehicle supply equipment. Per the Project's Site Plan (see Appendix N, Project Plans), the Project proposes to add 35 new vehicular parking spaces, of which 12 are EV capable spaces. As such, the Project would include enough EV charging stations.

  VMT Reduction

  As the Project proposes the expansion of an existing school's facilities, the Project would not have the potential to directly affect VMT reduction in the region. The expansion serves an existing student population and does not include new regional travel demand or shift land use patterns in a way that would increase VMT. Therefore, the Project is not in conflict with the VMT reduction goals, as it maintains current travel behaviors without generating additional VMT.

  Building Decarbonization

  As discussed in Appendix A, the Project will be required to comply with CalGreen which includes energy and water saving measures that reduce GHG emissions below Title 24 requirements.

  The Project would comply and assist with the improvement of all three priority areas defined in the CARB 2022 Scoping Plan. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the 2022 Scoping Plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

- *Regional — SCAG 2024–2050 RTP/SCS*: The project involves expansion of an existing school with no increase in enrollment or daily trips (see Transportation, Appendix J), consistent with the RTP/SCS's VMT-reduction goals.

- *Local — L.A.'s Green New Deal and City Green Building Code*: The project is subject to Title 24 and the Los Angeles Green Building Code (as discussed in Energy, above), and provides dedicated solar-ready zones on all four buildings (1,296 sf for Building #10, 2,369 sf for the Administration Building, 4,219 sf for the gymnasium, and 656 sf for the annex building), consistent with the City's renewable-energy and building-efficiency objectives.

Since the project would comply with the applicable requirements of each of these plans, it would generate fewer GHG emissions than it would absent such plans, would not conflict with or obstruct their implementation, and impacts would be less than significant.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☒	☐	☐
g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☒	☐	☐

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Construction of the proposed project would involve the temporary use of potentially hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. Operation of the project would involve the limited use and storage of common hazardous substances typical of those used in school campuses, including lubricants, paints, solvents, custodial products (e.g., cleaning supplies), pesticides and other landscaping supplies, and vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. No uses or activities are proposed that would result in the use or discharge of unregulated hazardous materials and/or substances, or create a public hazard through transport, use, or disposal. The proposed expansion and new construction at an existing school campus would not involve large quantities of hazardous materials that would require routine transport, use, or disposal. With compliance to applicable standards and regulations and adherence to manufacturer's instructions related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project created a significant hazard to the public or environment due to a reasonably foreseeable release of hazardous materials. City records show that existing school buildings exist on the subject site and were constructed as early as 1962. Therefore, it is likely that the existing structures on the subject site may contain asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paint (LBP). Demolition or conversion of these buildings would have the potential to release asbestos fibers into the atmosphere if such materials exist and they are not properly stabilized or removed prior to demolition activities. The project proposes the remodel, expansion, and tenant improvements to two existing school buildings on site. The removal of asbestos is regulated by SCAQMD Rule 1403; therefore, prior to renovation or demolition of the Administration Building and Building #10, a survey for asbestos-containing materials by a Cal/OSHA Certified Asbestos Consultant would be required, and any asbestos found on-site would be required to be removed in accordance with applicable regulations prior to demolition. Similarly, it is likely that lead-based paint is present in buildings constructed prior to 1979. Compliance with existing State laws regarding removal would be required, including the Cal/OSHA Lead in Construction Standard (8 CCR §1532.1) and California Department of Public Health lead-related construction requirements (17 CCR Division 1, Chapter 8). Because the work would occur on an operating K–12 campus, these requirements, including containment, worker protection, and proper disposal, would apply during school operations, resulting in a less-than-significant impact.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activities have the potential to result in the release, emission, handling, and disposal of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing school. A private school (Village Christian School) is currently existing on the subject site. The Vinedale College Preparatory Academy (10150 West La Tuna Canyon Road) is located approximately 100 feet north of the Project Site. The types of hazardous materials that would be used during construction of the project would be typical of those hazardous materials necessary for construction (e.g., paints, solvents, fuel for construction equipment, building materials, etc.), which could emit hazardous emissions. However, the use of these materials would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations. While the project would be operational during school hours as it is also a school, to the extent that the Project would require the use of hazardous materials, such use would be in accordance with existing local, state, and federal regulations. Therefore, the project would not pose a significant risk involving the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials or the accidental release of hazardous materials, and impacts associated with the emission of hazardous materials near an existing or proposed school would be less than significant.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Project Site is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) maintains a database (EnviroStor) that provides access to detailed information on hazardous waste permitted sites and corrective action facilities, as well as existing site cleanup information. EnviroStor also provides information on investigation, cleanup, permitting, and/or corrective actions that are planned, being conducted, or have been completed under DTSC's oversight. In addition, the State Water Board's GeoTracker database identifies leaking underground storage tanks. A review of both did not identify any records of hazardous materials on the Project Site. Therefore, the proposed project would not be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites or create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, and no impact would occur.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area. The Project Site is located approximately 1.35 miles north of the Hollywood Burbank Airport. As discussed in the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Report, prepared for the proposed project by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (see Appendix C), the proposed project is located outside of the 60 dBA CNEL noise-level contour boundary of the Hollywood Burbank Airport. Therefore, the proposed project would not

expose those visiting or working on the Project Site to safety hazard or excessive noise. As such, no impacts would occur.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. A significant impact may occur if a project were to interfere with roadway operations used in conjunction with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan or would generate traffic congestion that would interfere with the execution of such a plan.

The City's Emergency Management Department maintains the City of Los Angeles Emergency Operations Plan (EOP), last updated in November 2018. The EOP describes the overall Citywide response functions and capabilities for small to large scale emergency situations. In addition, the Evacuation Functional Support Annex (EFSA), last updated in October 2020, was developed in support of the EOP to facilitate City and other responsible agency response during evacuations.

While the EOP and EFSA do not identify specific emergency response or evacuation routes, they establish that primary evacuation routes consist of the major interstates, highways, and primary arterials within the City and County of Los Angeles, and state that the City will work with the Operational Area, Los Angeles County Sheriff, Law Enforcement agencies from surrounding jurisdictions, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), California Highway Patrol (CHP), City and/or County Public Works, and other applicable agencies or departments to identify evacuation pick up points and transportation routes. Consistent with this approach, the City's 2021 Safety Element Update acknowledges that "jurisdictional infrastructures, such as roads and emergency services, have become increasingly interrelated," and refers to the Los Angeles County Safety Element for critical systems and evacuation routes for the entire County. La Tuna Canyon Road, located approximately 0.13-miles north of the Project Site, is identified as a disaster route by the Los Angeles County Safety Element as shown on Figure 12.6: Disaster Routes Map of the County's Safety Element. In addition, the Los Angeles County Safety Element identifies La Tuna Canyon Road as an evacuation route, as shown on Figure 12.9: Evacuation Routes Map of the County's Safety Element.

Although construction may require staging of equipment and/or worker vehicles along Village Avenue, the Project applicant would be required to submit formal construction staging and traffic control plans for review and approval by LADOT prior to the issuance of any construction permits. Construction Traffic Management Plan will be developed for use during the entire construction period. The Construction will identify all traffic control measures, signs, delineators, and work instructions to be implemented by the construction contractor through the duration of grading and construction activity. The Construction Traffic Management Plan would minimize the potential for conflicts with or impairment of an emergency response or evacuation during construction.

During operation, all driveways and access points proposed for the Project Site would comply with Fire and Building Codes subject to review and approval of LADBS and LAFD as part of the building permit process. The proposed project would not require the closure of any public or

private streets and would not impede emergency vehicle access to the Project Site or surrounding area. Additionally, emergency access to and from the Project Site would be provided in accordance with requirements of the LAFD. The Project would not increase student enrollment or the number of employees on campus, and therefore would not increase the number of people who would need to evacuate during a normal school day. The Project would improve emergency access by constructing a new emergency/fire access road connecting Village Avenue and Wildwood Avenue at the southern portion of the campus, providing a second means of emergency vehicle ingress and egress (Appendices K and M). Any temporary lane or sidewalk closures during construction would be subject to Bureau of Engineering and LADOT permits and to the Construction Traffic Management Plan required by MM-TSP-1, which requires that emergency access be maintained at all times. With implementation of MM-TSP-1, impacts would be less than significant. **(See Section XVII. Transportation/Traffic, MM-TSP-1.)**

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. A significant impact may occur if a project is located in proximity to wildland areas and poses a potential fire hazard, which could expose persons or structures, either directly or indirectly, in the area in the event of a fire. According to ZIMAS, the Project Site is located within a High Wind Velocity Area and Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. This designation includes lands designated by the City of Los Angeles Fire Department pursuant to Government Code 51178 that were identified and recommended to local agencies by the Director of Forestry and Fire Protection based on criteria that includes fuel loading, slope, fire weather, and other relevant factors. Areas designated within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone are required to be designed and constructed in accordance with the Los Angeles Fire Code and would be required to incorporate fire-resistant measures, including but not limited the following:

- Ignition-resistant roofing and other building materials
- Fire-Retardant-Treated Wood or noncombustible materials
- Roof coverings, valleys, and gutters
- Attic ventilation
- Eave or cornice vents
- Sprinkler systems
- Landscaping with fire-retardant plants
- Vegetation clearance

Additionally, prior to issuance of an Occupancy Permit, the Project Applicant would be required to coordinate with Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) to ensure that the Project incorporates all appropriate fire-prevention measures. As documented in the Wildfire Mitigation and Fire Code Analysis Report prepared by Simpson Gumpertz & Heger Inc. (Appendix K), the new and expanded buildings would be required to comply with the 2025 California Wildland-Urban Interface Code as amended by the City, including ignition-resistant exterior construction (Class A roofs, noncombustible exterior materials, tempered glazing, and ember-resistant vents),

defensible space within 100 feet of structures or to the property line pursuant to Government Code Section 51182, and LAFD fire apparatus access, hydrant, and fire flow requirements. The LAFD Hydrant and Access Unit has conditionally approved the Project's access and hydrant proposal (Appendix M). These requirements are mandatory and are enforced by LADBS and LAFD at building permit plan check. In addition, MM-WF-1 requires a Campus Wildfire Preparedness and Evacuation Plan. With implementation of MM-WF-1, the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, and impacts would be less than significant. **(See Section XX, Wildfire, MM-WF-1.)**

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project discharges water which does not meet the quality standards of agencies that regulate surface water quality and water discharge into stormwater drainage systems. Significant impacts would also occur if a project does not comply with all applicable regulations with regard to surface water quality as governed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). During construction of the project, particularly during the grading and excavation phases, stormwater runoff from precipitation events could cause exposed and stockpiled soils to be subject to erosion and convey sediments into municipal storm drain systems. In addition, on-site watering activities to reduce airborne dust could contribute to pollutant loading in runoff. Pollutant discharges relating to the storage, handling, use and disposal of chemicals, adhesives, coatings, lubricants, and fuel could also occur. Thus, a significant impact could occur if a project discharges water that does not meet the quality standards of agencies that regulate surface water quality and water discharge into storm water drainage systems or would not comply with all applicable regulations as governed by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB).

The project would be required to comply with the NPDES General Construction Permit, which satisfies the LARWQCB water quality standards, including the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and implementation of best management practices (BMPs), required to minimize soil erosion and sedimentation from entering the storm drains during the construction period. In addition, the project would be subject to the City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control regulations (Ordinance No. 172,176 and No. 173,494) to ensure pollutant loads from the Project Site would be minimized for downstream receiving waters. Compliance with the NPDES and implementation of the SWPPP and BMPs, as well as the City's discharge requirements, would ensure that the project complies with the LARWQCB standards and therefore that construction stormwater runoff would not violate water quality and/or discharge requirements.

Stormwater runoff generated during operation of the project has the potential to introduce small amounts of pollutants (e.g., typical commercial cleaning products, landscaping pesticides, and vehicle petroleum products) into the stormwater system. Stormwater runoff from precipitation events could carry urban pollutants into municipal storm drains. However, during operation, the project would be required to comply with the City's Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance. The LID Ordinance applies to all development and redevelopment projects in the City that require a building permit. LID plans are required to include a site design approach and BMPs that address runoff and pollution at the source. Further, to comply with LID Ordinance, the project would be required to capture and treat the first 3/4-inch of rainfall in accordance with established stormwater treatment protocols. Regulatory compliance with the LID Ordinance would reduce the amount of surface water runoff leaving the Project Site as compared to the current conditions. Regulatory compliance with the LID Plan and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), including the implementation of BMPs, would ensure that operation of the project would not violate water quality standard and discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water

quality. Compliance with these regulations would ensure construction and operational activities of the project would not violate water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality, and project impacts related to water quality would be less than significant.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project includes deep excavations resulting in the potential to interfere with groundwater movement or includes withdrawal of groundwater or paving of existing permeable surfaces important to groundwater recharge. During a storm event, stormwater runoff flows to the adjacent roadways where it is directed into the City's storm drain system. The existing softball field in the southern development area is a pervious surface that allows some infiltration; the Project would convert a portion of it to buildings, parking, and paving. However, the Project Site is not identified as a groundwater recharge area, and the incremental increase in impervious area (on the order of 1 to 2 acres of the 28-acre campus) would be small relative to the San Fernando Valley Groundwater Basin. In addition, the LID Ordinance requires on-site retention or infiltration of the design storm runoff where feasible. Therefore, the Project would not substantially interfere with groundwater recharge.

According to the Report of Geotechnical Investigation dated August 22, 2025 (see Appendix F), prepared by R.T. Frankian & Associates, groundwater was not encountered in any of the test borings that were drilled for the investigation. The test borings extended to depths of up to 31 feet below the present grade. Therefore, it is not likely that any temporary dewatering would be required during construction. Finally, all water consumption associated with the project would be supplied by LADWP and not from any groundwater beneath the Project Site. Thus, project impacts with respect to groundwater would be less than significant.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project results in a substantial alteration of drainage patterns that would result in a substantial increase in erosion or siltation. The Project Site is currently improved with an existing private school campus, and there are no natural watercourses on the Project Site. The project proposes the remodel, addition, and tenant improvements to two existing school buildings located at the northern portion of the campus. The project would increase the amount of impervious surface due to the new construction of two buildings, associated asphalt parking areas, two retaining walls, and emergency/fire access road, located at the southern end of the campus near the hillside. Current stormwater runoff flows to the local storm drain system. Under the post-project condition, the Project Site would contain more

impervious surface, based on the changes to the southern campus site. The applicant is required to prepare a SWPPP and implement BMPs to reduce runoff and preserve water quality during construction of the project. While grading and construction activities may temporarily alter the existing drainage patterns of the Project Site, BMPs would be implemented to minimize soil erosion impacts during project grading and construction activities. In addition, the project applicant is required to implement a LID Plan (during operation), which would reduce the amount of surface water runoff leaving the Project Site after a storm event. Specifically, the LID Plan would require the implementation of stormwater BMPs to retain or treat the runoff from a storm event producing 3/4-inch of rainfall in a 24-hour period. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, impacts would be less than significant.

ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project results in increased runoff volumes during construction or operation of the project that would result in flooding conditions affecting the Project Site or nearby properties. Grading and construction activities on the Project Site may temporarily alter the existing drainage patterns and change off-site flows. However, construction and operation of the project would not result in a significant increase in site runoff or any changes in the local drainage patterns that would result in flooding on- or offsite. The Project Site is currently improved with an existing private school campus. The project would increase the amount of impervious surface due to the new construction of two buildings, associated asphalt parking areas, two retaining walls, and emergency/fire access road, located at the southern end of the campus near the hillside. The project applicant would be required to prepare a SWPPP and implement BMPs to reduce runoff and preserve water quality during construction of the project. Regulatory compliance with the LID Ordinance would also reduce the amount of surface water runoff leaving the Project Site as compared to the current conditions. Project impacts would therefore be less than significant.

iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff;

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project would increase the volume of stormwater runoff to a level that exceeds the capacity of the storm drain system serving the Project Site, or if a project would substantially increase the probability that polluted runoff would reach storm drains. Runoff from the Project Site flows to the adjacent roadways where it is directed into the City's storm drain system. Three general sources of potential short-term construction-related stormwater pollution associated with the Project are: 1) the handling, storage, and disposal of construction materials containing pollutants; 2) the maintenance and operation of construction equipment; and 3) earth moving activities which, when not controlled, may generate soil erosion and transportation, via storm runoff or mechanical equipment. Pursuant to City policy, stormwater retention would be required as part of the LID/SUSMP implementation features. Any contaminants

gathered during routine cleaning of construction equipment would be disposed of in compliance with applicable stormwater pollution prevention permits. During construction, the Applicant will be required to demonstrate compliance with NPDES permitting, and will implement all applicable and mandatory BMPs in accordance with the approved LID Plan and the SWPPP. These "good-housekeeping" practices would ensure that short-term construction-related activities would not result in polluted stormwater leaving the site.

Pollutants resulting from project operation, including petroleum products associated with the project's parking and circulation areas, would be subject to the requirements and water quality standards and wastewater discharge BMPs set forth by the City, the SWRCB, and the project's approved LID Plan. Further, the project would be required to comply with the NPDES and applicable LID Ordinance requirements. Accordingly, the project would be required to demonstrate compliance with LID Ordinance standards and retain or treat the first three-quarters inch of rainfall in a 24-hour period. Thus, the project would not create or contribute surface runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, project impacts related to storm drain capacity and water quality would be less than significant.

iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

Less Than Significant Impact. The La Tuna Canyon Lateral, a concrete-lined flood control channel, runs along the northern boundary of the Project Site. No work is proposed within or adjacent to the channel, and the Project Site is not located within a FEMA-mapped Special Flood Hazard Area (see response (d)). On-site drainage would be conveyed to the street in a non-erosive manner as required by the LADBS Geology and Soils Report Approval Letter (Appendix I) and the LID Ordinance. Thus, the Project would not impede or redirect flood flows, and impacts would be less than significant.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

No Impact. A seiche is an oscillation of a body of water in an enclosed or semi-enclosed basin, such as a reservoir, harbor, lake, or storage tank. A tsunami is a great sea wave, commonly referred to as a tidal wave, produced by a significant disturbance undersea, such as a tectonic displacement of sea floor associated with large, shallow earthquakes. Mudflows occur as a result of downslope movement of soil and/or rock under the influence of gravity. The Project Site is not located within a flood zone, as mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA, Flood Insurance Rate Map number 06037C1330F). Furthermore, the City of Los Angeles 2018 Local Hazard Mitigation Plan does not map the Project Site as being located within an area potentially affected by a tsunami. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, and no impacts would occur.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project is within the jurisdiction of the LARWQCB, and grading, excavation, and other construction activities associated with the implementation of the project could impact water quality due to erosion resulting from exposed soils that may be transported from the Project Site in stormwater runoff. Compliance with the NPDES program would ensure that stormwater pollutants would not substantially degrade water quality. Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with the City's SUSMP requirements. Compliance with these regulations would ensure that project impacts with respect to a water quality control plan or groundwater management plan would be less than significant.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☒	☐	☐

a) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be sufficiently large or configured in such a way so as to create a physical barrier within an established community. A physical division of an established community is caused by an impediment to through travel or a physical barrier, such as a new freeway with limited access between neighborhoods on either side of the freeway, or major street closures. The project proposes the expansion and new construction of facilities within an existing private school campus that has operated at this location since 1963; all proposed development would occur within the boundaries of the existing Project Site and would not include the permanent closure of any surrounding travel routes or the introduction of a physical barrier between adjacent uses. The proposed scope of work will not physically divide an established community, and no impacts would occur.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. A significant impact would occur if the project would conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Consistent with Government Code §65000 et seq. and applicable state General Plan Guidelines, a project need not be in perfect conformity with every policy of an applicable plan to be found consistent, it must be in general agreement or harmony with the plan and must not obstruct its primary goals. Consistency with each applicable plan is evaluated below.

Regional Plan Consistency. The project involves the expansion of an existing school with no increase in the maximum permitted student enrollment and no net increase in daily trips (see Transportation, Appendix J). Accordingly, the project would not obstruct the land use and VMT-reduction strategies of SCAG's 2024–2050 RTP/SCS.

Local General Plan and Community Plan Consistency. The Project Site is zoned A2-1-K and designated for Very Low Residential land uses by the Sun Valley – La Tuna Canyon Community Plan. The existing private school campus has operated on the site since the 1960s and is currently

operating under a Conditional Use granted by Case No. CPC-1957-8447-CU, which allowed the construction, use, and maintenance of a private elementary, junior high, and high school. The proposed expansion and new construction would continue that established, approved use rather than introduce a new or conflicting land use.

Specific Plan Consistency. The Project Site is located within the San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan (ZI-2324), as well as the Equine Keeping "K" District (ZI-2438). The purpose of the San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan (ZI-2324, Ordinance No. 175,736 effective February 8, 2004) is to preserve, protect, and enhance the unique natural and cultural resources of the area. The Plan established regulations in four areas as follows:

1. Prominent Ridgeline Protection measures that protect from grading and/or development on designated Prominent Ridgelines that are visible from the right-of-way of Scenic Highways and depicted on Specific Plan Map No 2.
2. Biological Resource Protection measures to protect oak trees and unique native plan communities.
3. Scenic Highway Corridors Viewshed Protection measures that establish standards for site design, landscaping, and signage for scenic highway corridors as designated on Specific Plan Map No 1.
4. Equine-keeping District Standards, Equestrian Trails, and Domestic Livestock measures to provide for the designation and development of existing and future equestrian trails within "K" Equine-keeping Districts, re-establish the right of property owners to keep domestic livestock in conjunction with RE40 Zoned uses, and protect non-conforming equine uses in "K" Districts.

The Project Site is not located within a Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area including a Prominent Ridgeline, nor within a Scenic Highway Corridor. The Project Site is located in close proximity to the La Tuna Canyon Lateral flood control channel, which is an Official Equestrian Trail as shown on Specific Plan Map No. 3. The Project Site adjoins Village Avenue, which is a Non-Public Equestrian Trail, as shown on Specific Plan Map No. 4. The project does not propose any equine keeping uses or structures and does not propose to remove any existing equine keeping structures.

As discussed in the Tree Report dated October 31, 2025, prepared by Carlberg Associates (See Appendix B), the project proposes to remove ten (10) on-site non-protected trees. All ten (10) non-protected trees proposed for removal are planted trees and not naturally occurring. There are four (4) protected trees located on the Project Site. Of the four (4) protected trees, two (2) coast live oak and one (1) Mexican elderberry are located to the south of the proposed emergency/fire access road. The Tree Report dated October 31, 2025, has been stamped and signed by the City's Urban Forestry Division on November 18, 2025.

The San Gabriel Verdugo Mountains Specific Plan's Biological Resource Protection provisions protect oak trees and unique native plant communities. Because construction would occur near the protected zones of one coast live oak, MM-BIO-1 (Tree Protection) has been incorporated to ensure consistency with these provisions, and MM-BIO-2 (Nesting Birds) addresses potential disturbance of nesting birds in the adjacent habitat buffer area. **(See Section IV, Biological Resources, MM-BIO-1 and MM-BIO-2.)**

Additionally, a Biologist's Statement of Biological Resources dated September 5, 2025, prepared by Sapphos Environmental Inc. (see Appendix D) was provided. The Biologist's Statement states that there are historic California Natural Diversity Database records for western bristly scaleseed (*Atriplex truncata* var. *bracteosa*), white rabbit-tobacco (*Pseudognaphalium leucocephalum*), and Davidson's bushmallow (*Malacothamnus davidsonii*) within the vicinity of the Project Site. However, no individuals or suitable habitat for these species were observed in the areas proposed for work. Therefore, the project will not remove or create a substantial effect on these species.

Furthermore, the Biologist's Letter dated July 1, 2026 (see Appendix E), prepared by Sapphos Environmental Inc., states that the Project Site and proposed scope of work will not have impacts on the following resources: Los Angeles County Sensitive Ecological Areas, official equestrian trails, non-public equestrian trails, hiking trails, state and federal wetlands, riparian habitats, watercourse, mountain lion habitat, and criterion 1 protected areas for wildlife. Based on the above, the project would be in agreement and harmony with, and would not obstruct the primary goals of, the applicable regional, local, and specific plans, and would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. With implementation of MM-BIO-1 and MM-BIO-2, impacts would be less than significant.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources of regional value or locally-important mineral resource recovery site. The Project Site is not classified by the City as containing significant mineral deposits nor is it designated for mineral extraction land use. The Project Site is an existing private school campus and has operated on the site since the 1960s. In addition, the Project Site is not identified by the City as being located in an oil field or within an oil drilling area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any known, regionally- or locally-valuable mineral resource, and no impact would occur.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources of regional value or locally-important mineral resource recovery site. The Project Site is not classified by the City as containing significant mineral deposits nor is it designated for mineral extraction land use. The Project Site is an existing private school campus and has operated on the site since the 1960s. In addition, the Project Site is not identified by the City as being located in an oil field or within an oil drilling area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any known, regionally- or locally-valuable mineral resource, and no impact would occur.

XIII. NOISE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning has established significance thresholds for construction noise that distinguish daytime and nighttime activity. For daytime construction activity (7:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M. Monday through Friday, and 8:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. on Saturdays), there is no significance threshold based on the increase over ambient noise levels; however, construction noise may not exceed an absolute threshold of 80 dBA L_{eq} (8-hour) at the property line of adjacent sensitive uses (or at the exterior of the building for outdoor uses, including outdoor public recreational areas). For nighttime construction activity (7:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M. Monday through Friday, 6:00 P.M. to 8:00 A.M. on Saturdays, and anytime on Sundays or national holidays, with certain mat pour activities exempt), construction noise may not increase the ambient noise level by more than 5 dBA at sensitive uses, and is further subject to an absolute threshold ranging from 55 dBA L_{eq} (sensitive uses within older buildings with operable windows) to 65 dBA L_{eq} (non-operable, single-glazed windows) to 70 dBA L_{eq} (newer construction designed to achieve an interior 45 dBA with double-paned windows), depending on the age and window configuration of the nearest sensitive receptor.

Construction activity would result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the project area on an intermittent basis. Noise levels would fluctuate depending on the construction phase, equipment type and duration of use, distance between the noise source and receptor, and presence or absence of noise attenuation barriers.

The proposed project's construction and demolition activities would occur between 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturday, entirely within the City's daytime period defined above. No nighttime construction, including mat pour activities, is proposed. Accordingly, only the daytime 80 dBA L_{eq} (8-hour) absolute threshold applies to the proposed project; the nighttime increase-over-ambient and absolute thresholds do not apply. As discussed in the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Report, prepared for the proposed project by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (see Appendix C), the maximum predicted construction noise level at the nearest sensitive receptor, the single-family residences across Village Avenue, approximately 380 feet from the edge of the gymnasium/annex construction footprint and approximately 430 feet from the acoustical center of construction activity, would experience 65.9 dBA L_{eq} for site preparation, 66.5 dBA L_{eq} for grading, and 66.9 dBA L_{eq} for building, construction, paving, and painting, which does not exceed the 80 dBA L_{eq} daytime absolute threshold. Construction noise would additionally be subject to LAMC Sections 112.05 (Maximum Noise Level of Powered Equipment or Powered Hand Tools) and 41.40 (Noise Due to Construction, Excavation Work – When Prohibited), and the project shall comply with LAMC regulations related to noise.

New stationary sources of noise, such as mechanical HVAC equipment, would be installed on the proposed development. The design of the equipment will be required to comply with LAMC Section 112.02, which prohibits noise from air conditioning, refrigeration, heating, pumping, and filtering equipment from exceeding the ambient noise level on the premises of other occupied properties by more than five dBA. Appendix C estimates that HVAC equipment noise would attenuate to approximately 20 dBA L_{eq}, and noise from the 35 new parking spaces to approximately 31 dBA L_{eq}, at the nearest residences, which would be imperceptible against the existing daytime ambient level of 58.0 dBA L_{eq}. Even under Appendix C's conservative assumption of 113 new daily trips, off-site traffic noise would increase by approximately 0.2 dBA. These levels are well below the 5 dBA increase threshold in LAMC Section 111.02 and the L.A. CEQA Thresholds (Appendix C, Section 5.5.2). Indoor activities in the new gymnasium would occur within an enclosed building.

Therefore, the noise exposure impact due to temporary construction activity would be less than significant and any permanent increase in ambient noise would be less than significant.

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction-related groundborne vibration is evaluated against the City's human annoyance and building damage thresholds. For daytime construction activity, the City has not established a numerical threshold for human annoyance from groundborne vibration; for nighttime construction activity, groundborne vibration may not exceed 80 VdB at the exterior of a sensitive use building. Independent of time of day, construction vibration is also

subject to building damage thresholds that vary by structure type: 0.1 peak particle velocity (PPV, in/sec) for fragile buildings, 0.25 PPV for historic buildings, 0.3 PPV for older residential structures, and 0.5 PPV for new residential and modern industrial/commercial buildings.

The proposed project's construction activities would be restricted to daytime hours as described above; therefore, the 80 VdB nighttime human-annoyance threshold would not apply. The nearest off-site sensitive receptors to construction activity are the single-family residences located across Village Avenue to the west of the Project Site, approximately 380 feet from the nearest construction activity, which are characterized as older residential structures and are subject to a building damage threshold of 0.3 PPV. Typical heavy construction equipment (e.g., large bulldozers, loaded trucks, and vibratory compaction equipment) generates reference vibration levels ranging from approximately 0.076 to 0.210 PPV at a reference distance of 25 feet, per the Federal Transit Administration Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018). Applying the standard vibration propagation formula and as confirmed in the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Report, prepared for the proposed project by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (see Appendix C), the maximum predicted vibration level at the nearest residential structure would not exceed the applicable building damage threshold, and vibration impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from a public airport or public use airport or a private airstrip. The Project Site is located approximately 1.35 miles north of the Hollywood Burbank Airport. As discussed in the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Report, prepared for the proposed project by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (see Appendix C), the proposed project is located outside of the 60 dBA CNEL noise-level contour boundary of the Hollywood Burbank Airport. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose those visiting or working on the Project Site to excessive airport noise. As such, no impacts would occur.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

No Impact. A potentially significant impact would occur if the proposed project would induce substantial population growth that would not have otherwise occurred as rapidly or in as great a magnitude. The proposed project involves the expansion and new construction at an existing private school campus. No increase in student enrollment is proposed. Operation of the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in the project area, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. A potentially significant impact would occur if the proposed project would displace a substantial quantity of existing residences or a substantial number of people. The proposed project involves the expansion and new construction at an existing private school campus. No increase in student enrollment is proposed. The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, or necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e. Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) could not adequately serve the proposed project, necessitating a new or physically altered station, the construction or operation of which would cause a significant environmental impact. The Project Site and the surrounding area are currently served by Fire Station 77 located at 9224 Sunland Boulevard, approximately one mile northwest of the subject site. The project proposes the expansion and new construction at an existing private school campus. No increase in student enrollment is proposed which would not increase the number of emergency calls and demand for LAFD fire and emergency services. Given that there are existing fire stations in close proximity to the Project Site, it is not anticipated that there would be a need to build a new or expand an existing fire station to serve the proposed Project and maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection. By analyzing data from previous years and continuously monitoring current data regarding response times, types of incidents, and call frequencies, LAFD can shift resources to meet local demands for fire protection and emergency services. The proposed project would neither create capacity or service level problems nor result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection.

The proposed project is located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and High Wind Velocity Areas. The Project would be required to comply with the LAFD recommendations including fire lane, hydrant, fire flow, Knox box, and aerial access requirements, which LAFD's Hydrant and Access Unit has conditionally approved. Compliance with these code requirements ensures that the Project can be adequately served by existing LAFD facilities; these are building-

design requirements, not new or expanded fire facilities. Wildfire risk is addressed in Sections IX.g and XX. Therefore, impacts on fire protection services would be less than significant.

b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) could not adequately serve the proposed project, necessitating a new or physically altered station, the construction or operation of which would cause a significant environmental impact. The proposed project involves the expansion and new construction at an existing private school campus. No increase in student enrollment is proposed and would not increase demand for police services. The Project Site and surrounding areas are currently served by LAPD's Foothill Station, located at 12760 Osborne Street, approximately 4.5 miles northwest of the subject site. Given that there is a police station in close proximity to the Project Site, it is not anticipated that there would be a need to build a new or expand an existing police station to serve the proposed project and maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Schools?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) could not adequately serve the proposed project, necessitating a new or physically altered school, the construction or operation of which would cause a significant environmental impact. The Project Site contains a private school and the site is located approximately 100 feet south of Vinedale College Preparatory Academy (10150 West La Tuna Canyon Road). No increases to school demand will occur as a result of this project and would result in no impacts.

d) Parks?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would exceed the capacity or capability of the local park system to serve the proposed project. The City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) is responsible for the provision, maintenance, and operation of public recreational and park facilities and services in the City. The proposed project involves the expansion and new construction at an existing private school campus. No increase in student enrollment is proposed. Therefore, the project would not create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial physical impacts associated with the provision of new or altered parks facilities, and project impacts would be less than significant.

e) Other public facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project involves expansion and new construction at an existing private school campus. No increase in student enrollment is proposed. No increased demand for library services and resources of the Los Angeles Public Library System is anticipated. The proposed project would not create substantial capacity or service level problems that would require the provision of new or expanded public facilities in order to maintain an acceptable level of service for libraries and other public facilities. Therefore, impacts to other public facilities would be less than significant.

XVI. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Would the project Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would exceed the capacity or capability of the local park system to serve the proposed project. The City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) is responsible for the provision, maintenance, and operation of public recreational and park facilities and services in the City. The proposed project involves expansion and new construction at an existing private school campus. No increase in student enrollment is proposed and the project would not result in increased demand for parks and recreation facilities. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project includes a new 18,826-square-foot gymnasium and training facility, which is a recreational facility serving the school's existing students. The physical effects of constructing and operating the gymnasium, including air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology, noise, and transportation effects, are evaluated throughout this Initial Study and would be less than significant or reduced to less than significant with the mitigation measures identified herein.

The Project proposes the tenant improvements and addition to two existing school buildings, and the construction of two new buildings. No increase in student enrollment is proposed. The proposed construction of a new gymnasium building and annex building within an existing school campus would not result in significant impacts to existing recreational facilities. The Project would not require the construction or expansion of any off-site recreational facilities. The Project Site is located in close proximity to the La Tuna Canyon Lateral, which is an Official Equestrian Trail as

shown on Specific Plan Map No. 3. The Project Site adjoins Village Avenue, which is a Non-Public Equestrian Trail, as shown on Specific Plan Map No. 4. The project would have no impact on those existing trails. The Biologist's Letter (Appendix E) states that the Project's improvements at the end of Village Avenue would provide a flush transition to the Mt. La Tuna trail and would not impact the trail, which continues outside the Project Site. Therefore, any impacts to recreational facilities, including hiking and equestrian trails, will be less than significant.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☒	☐	☐

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if a project conflicts with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Consistent with Government Code §65000 et seq., a project need not be in perfect conformity with every policy of an applicable circulation plan to be found consistent with it, it must be in general agreement or harmony with the plan and must not preclude attainment of its primary goals. The project involves the expansion and new construction of school facilities at an existing private school campus. Remodel, addition, and tenant improvements are proposed for two existing school buildings, located in the northern portion of the school campus. New construction of two school buildings (gymnasium building and annex building) and associated asphalt parking areas are proposed at what is currently developed with a softball field, located near the end of Village Avenue.

Village Avenue is an improved street and public right-of-way adjacent to the school campus and the southern portion of the school's football field, at which point it transitions into an unimproved condition and then curves southeast while increasing in elevation around a small hill to the west (also owned by the Village Christian School). This public right-of-way then terminates at an adjacent parcel to the south, associated with APN 2404005002 and under separate ownership. There is a 20-foot wide slope easement adjoining this section of Village Avenue to the east within the school campus property. Portions of the proposed new road construction (Retaining wall #1, new emergency/fire access road, and a gate) would be located within the 20-foot slope easement area, as well as on the southwest corner of Village Avenue. The existing Village Avenue public right-of-way is 29 feet in width, comprised of a variable width approximately 20-foot paved

roadway and an adjacent 9-foot wide landscaped slope with no sidewalk to the east. The Project proposes to extend the same street configuration from the improved section of the street to a portion of the southern section, in order to create a continuous 20-foot wide roadway on Village Avenue from Penrose Avenue into a new emergency vehicle access ingress and egress entrance at the southern end of the school campus.

The project's extension of Village Avenue into an emergency/fire access road would conform to required roadway dimensions for emergency access, and would be an improvement to the existing roadway circulation system. The existing configuration of Village Avenue along the Project Site's frontage, as a 20-foot roadway width with no sidewalk, would be maintained. This segment of Village Avenue is not identified on the City's Vision Zero High Injury Network (Executive Directive No. 10, Vision Zero Los Angeles), terminates at an adjacent parcel to the south with no through connection, and its east side is currently improved with an existing slope, fencing, and no sidewalk. Consistent with the recent construction of the adjacent softball field on the west side of Village Avenue in May 2026, which similarly did not include dedication or sidewalk improvements along this segment, the project would not alter the existing street condition. Pedestrian and equestrian trail access along Village Avenue, as shown on Specific Plan Map No. 4 of the San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan, would be retained in its existing, unimproved condition.

With respect to bicycle and pedestrian facilities, the project proposes two new long-term and 48 new short-term bicycle parking spaces, consistent with the bicycle parking requirements of LAMC Section 12.21 A.16 and furthering the City's Mobility Plan 2035 goal of expanding bicycle infrastructure at institutional uses. The project does not propose the removal or alteration of any existing transit stops, bicycle lanes, or pedestrian facilities. Accordingly, the project would not conflict with the circulation-system goals of the Mobility Plan 2035 with respect to transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities.

An emergency access gate would be located on the Project Site, outside the public right-of-way, and would not restrict public use of Village Avenue or pedestrian and equestrian access to the Mt. La Tuna trailhead. Any improvements within the public right-of-way would require Bureau of Engineering permits and approval. Accordingly, the Project would not conflict with the Mobility Plan 2035, Vision Zero Los Angeles, the Bicycle Parking Ordinance, or any other applicable program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

No Impact. The proposed project involves the expansion and new construction at an existing private school campus. However, no increase in student enrollment is proposed. Under the City's VMT screening criteria (Los Angeles Department of Transportation Assessment Guidelines), a project that does not increase vehicle trips as compared to existing conditions is screened out from further VMT analysis. Consistent with this criterion, the Transportation Study Assessment Referral Form dated December 30, 2025 (see Appendix J), reviewed and signed by the Los

Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), confirms that no Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) analysis is required. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. A significant impact may occur if a project were to include a new roadway design, introduce a new land use or project features into an area with specific transportation requirements and characteristics that have not been previously experienced in that area, or if project access or other features were designed in such a way as to create hazardous conditions. The Project is requesting Haul Route Approval, which is subject to independent review and approval by the Board of Building and Safety Commissioners (Board). As a condition of that approval, the Board imposes route-specific requirements addressing hours of hauling, truck spacing and staging, dust control, flag persons and traffic control, signage, and other safety and circulation measures appropriate to the specific route and site conditions. As such, the specific conditions applicable to the approved route, and the traffic-related impacts associated with the haul route would be addressed through this existing regulatory process rather than through project-specific mitigation imposed herein.

The Project's permanent design features would not create geometric hazards. The new emergency/fire access road would be designed to LAFD standards, including an approximately 20-foot width (28 feet where required for aerial apparatus or hydrants), a maximum 10 percent grade, approved turnaround and dead-end lengths, and 14-foot vertical clearance (Appendix K). The road would be primarily used for emergency access rather than serve general school traffic. The Project would not change the existing school entrance and exit configuration on Village Avenue and Wildwood Avenue. During construction, haul trucks, construction vehicles, and temporary work zones would operate on Village Avenue and adjacent streets, which are narrow hillside residential streets that also serve school drop-off and pick-up for Village Christian School and are near Vinedale College Preparatory Academy. Without coordination, construction traffic could create temporary conflicts with students, pedestrians, equestrians, and school traffic. MM-TSP-1 requires a Construction Traffic Management Plan to address these conditions. With implementation of MM-TSP-1, impacts would be less than significant.

MM-TSP-1. Construction Traffic Management Plan. Prior to issuance of the first demolition, grading, or building permit for each construction phase, the Applicant shall submit a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) to LADOT for review and approval, with a copy to the Department of City Planning. The CTMP shall apply in addition to and be consistent with any haul route conditions imposed by the Board of Building and Safety Commissioners, and shall remain in effect throughout all demolition, grading, and construction activities for that phase. At a minimum, the CTMP shall:

> (a) Maintain emergency vehicle access to the Project Site and to adjacent properties at all times, and prohibit construction parking or staging on Village Avenue or Wildwood Avenue on LAFD-declared Red Flag days;

(b) Prohibit staging, queuing, or idling of haul trucks and construction vehicles on Village Avenue, Penrose Street, and other streets adjacent to the campus and to Vinedale College Preparatory Academy, and prohibit haul truck trips during the morning drop-off and afternoon pick-up periods for both schools

(c) Require that all construction materials and equipment be stored on-site and not within the public right-of-way;

(d) Maintain safe pedestrian and equestrian passage along Village Avenue and access to the Mt. La Tuna trailhead, with physical separation from work areas (e.g., K-rail or barricades)

(e) Require flag persons and temporary signage at the construction entrance and at any temporary lane closure;

(f) Designate a construction liaison and provide written notice to the administration of Vinedale College Preparatory Academy and to residents within 500 feet at least 10 days before each phase begins, including the anticipated schedule, haul route, and a contact for complaints; and

(g) Require the construction liaison to keep a log of complaints and responses, available to the City upon request.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. A significant impact may occur if a project design does not provide emergency access meeting the requirements of the Fire Department or in any other way threatens the ability of emergency vehicles to access and serve the project site or adjacent uses.

Construction may require staging of equipment and/or worker vehicles along Village Avenue, the Project applicant would be required to submit formal construction staging and traffic control plans for review and approval by LADOT prior to the issuance of any construction permits. A Construction Traffic Management Plan will be developed for use during the entire construction period. The Construction Traffic Management Plan will identify all traffic control measures, signs, delineators, and work instructions to be implemented by the construction contractor through the duration of grading and construction activity. The Construction Traffic Management Plan would minimize the potential for conflicts with or impairment of an emergency response or evacuation during construction.

The Project would not permanently close any public or private street. Temporary lane or sidewalk closures during construction, if needed, would require BOE/LADOT permits and would be subject to MM-TSP-1, which requires that emergency access be maintained at all times. Additionally, emergency access to and from the Project Site would be provided in accordance with requirements of the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD). However, the proposed scope of work,

particularly at the southern portion of the site, is located in an area near hillside terrain where the circulation system is not fully built out.

The Applicant is proposing improvements to the currently unimproved portion of Village Avenue to extend the roadway and to build a new emergency/fire access road and connect Wildwood Avenue to Village Avenue at the southern portion of the campus. On May 5, 2026, the LAFD Hydrant and Access Unit confirmed in writing that the Applicant has tentatively addressed all fire code items cited in LAFD's recommendations and conditionally approved the access and hydrant proposal, subject to final review at building permit plan check. The Fire Report (Appendix K) documents that the proposed fire lanes, dead-end lengths, and access reach have been dimensioned on the plans, and that final LAFD confirmation of aerial apparatus access for the gymnasium occurs at plan check. Compliance with the LAFD requirements, including the requirement to submit a parking and driveway plan to LAFD, BOE, and LADOT for approval, is mandatory and enforced through the building permit process. The new emergency/fire access road would provide a second emergency access route between Village Avenue and Wildwood Avenue, improving emergency access compared to existing conditions. With implementation of MM-TSP-1 during construction, impacts related to emergency access would be less than significant.

XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	☐	☒	☐	☐
b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☒	☐	☐

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k)?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. A significant impact would occur if the project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, which is Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k).

Approved by Governor Brown on September 25, 2014, Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) establishes a formal consultation process for California Native American Tribes to identify potential significant impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs), as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074, as part of CEQA. PRC Section 21084.2 establishes that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. To help determine whether a project may have such an effect, PRC Section 21080.3.1 requires a lead agency to consult with any California Native American tribe that requests consultation and is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project. That consultation must take place prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report for a project. As a result of AB 52, the following must take place: 1) prescribed notification and response timelines; 2) consultation on alternatives, resource identification, significance determinations, impact evaluation, and mitigation measures; and 3) documentation of all consultation efforts to support CEQA findings for the administrative record.

Under AB 52, if a lead agency determines that a project may cause a substantial adverse change to a TCR, the lead agency must consider measures to mitigate that impact. PRC Section 21074 provides a definition of a TCR. In brief, in order to be considered a TCR, a resource must be either: 1) listed or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or included in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k); or 2) a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to the criteria set forth in PRC Section 5024.1(c). In the latter instance, the lead agency must determine that the resource meets the criteria for listing in the State register of historic resources or City Designated Cultural Resource. In applying those criteria, a lead agency shall consider the value of the resource to the tribe.

As specified in AB 52, lead agencies must provide notice to tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project if the tribe has submitted a written request to be notified. The tribe must respond to the lead agency within 30 days of receipt of the notification if it wishes to engage in consultation on the project, and the lead agency must begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving the request for consultation. An informational letter (see Appendix L) was mailed to a total of 10 Tribes known to have resources in the area, on December 22, 2025, describing the project and requesting any information regarding resources that may exist on or near the Project Site. Two Tribes responded to the informational letter, and the consultations are summarized below.

Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians

On December 22, 2025, a tribal response was received from Sarah Brunzell, on behalf of the Cultural Resources Management (CRM) Division of the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (FTBMI), and requested for the Applicant to complete a Project Intake Form in order for the tribe to determine whether consultation is required. On January 7, 2026, the Applicant submitted the Project Intake Form to the FTBMI. On January 9, 2026, staff received an email from the Tribal representative, requesting on the availability of the geotechnical report. On January 13,

2026, staff provided the Report of Geotechnical Investigation dated August 22, 2025 (see Appendix F) via email. On January 14, 2026, the Tribal representative emailed staff and stated that the proposed project has been categorized as Low Sensitivity and directed the Applicant to complete a new Consultation Form. The Tribal representative also stated that the consultation will be conducted via email once the Consultation Form is received. On January 19, 2026, the Tribal representative provided an email with proposed mitigation measures related to Tribal Cultural Resources Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training, inadvertent discovery, disposition and treatment of inadvertent discoveries, and inadvertent discovery of human remains. On May 14, 2026, staff emailed the Tribal representative and provided a list of proposed mitigation measures related to WEAP training, tribal monitor, disposition and treatment of inadvertent discoveries, and inadvertent discovery of human remains and associated funerary or ceremonial objects. On May 14, 2026, staff and the Tribal representative discussed the proposed mitigation measures via a telephone call. On May 21, 2026, staff provided a revised list of proposed mitigation measures to the Tribal representative. On May 26, 2026, the Tribal representative emailed staff and stated that FTBMI is in agreement with the proposed mitigation measures, and that the email communication concludes FTBMI's input on the project, and no additional consultation pursuant to CEQA is required unless there is an unanticipated discovery of cultural resources during project implementation.

Gabrieleño Band Of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation

On December 22, 2025, a tribal response was received from Andrew Salas, on behalf of the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation, requesting for consultation for the proposed project. On December 23, 2025, staff emailed the Tribal representative, initiating the consultation process and inquired on the Tribe's availability for a phone consultation. The Tribe responded and stated that there were no availability for the month of December, and that the next available time for a phone consultation would be January 29, 2026 at 11:00 a.m. Staff confirm the availability of a consultation for January 29, 2026 and provided a meeting invitation link to the Tribal representative. On January 22, 2026, staff emailed the Tribal representative to confirm the attendance for the virtual consultation, and the Tribal representative confirmed his attendance. On January 28, 2026, an email correspondence was received from the Tribe and stated that the Tribal representative needed to reschedule but that consultation may proceed via email. Staff responded for the consultation to proceed via email. On February 4, 2026, the Tribal representative emailed staff documents and proposed mitigation measures related to tribal monitor, unanticipated discovery of tribal cultural resources, and unanticipated discovery of human remains and associated funerary or ceremonial objects. On June 4, 2026, staff provided a list of proposed mitigation measures to the Tribal representative and inquired on the availability for a meeting to discuss the proposed mitigation measures. Subsequent emails were sent to the Tribal representative on June 12, June 15, and June 17, 2026. The Tribal representative did not respond to these four emails. On July 8, 2026, a closure letter for tribal consultation was issued to the Tribe, and stated that the City, after acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, has concluded that mutual agreement has been reached for the purpose of tribal consultation. The closure letter included a list of mitigation measures incorporated herein. With implementation of

MM-TCR-1 through MM-TCR-4, impacts with respect to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant.

MM-TCR-1. WEAP Training. Prior to the start of Ground Disturbance Activities, the archaeological monitor and a Qualified representative, procured by the Tribe(s) and retained by the Project Applicant, shall conduct a Tribal Cultural Resources Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training for construction personnel regarding the aspects of Tribal Cultural Resources and the procedures for notifying the Tribe(s) should Tribal Cultural Resources be discovered by construction staff.

a. Training can be done in conjunction with Cultural Resources WEAP training, if such training is requested by the proposed project's archaeologist.

b. Workers will be shown examples of the types of resources that would require notification of the archaeological monitor and tribal monitor(s). The project applicant shall maintain on the project site, for potential City inspection, documentation establishing that the WEAP training was completed for all members of the construction crew involved in Ground Disturbance Activities.

MM-TCR-2. Tribal Monitor(s).

a. The project applicant, or its successor shall retain a qualified Native American Tribal Monitor(s) from or approved by the Tribe(s) and a qualified archaeological monitor. The tribal monitor(s) shall be retained prior to the commencement of any "ground-disturbing activity" for the subject project at all project locations (i.e. both on-site and any off-site locations that are included in the project description/definition and/or required in connection with the project, such as public improvement work). "Ground-disturbing activity" shall include, but is not limited to, demolition, digging, plowing, tunneling, quarrying, leveling, removing peat, clearing, driving posts, backfilling, blasting, stripping topsoil, pavement removal, potholing, augering, grubbing, tree removal, boring, grading, excavation, drilling, trenching, or a similar activity at the project site. A qualified archaeological monitor shall be identified as principal personnel who must meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation, have a minimum of 10 years of experience as a principal investigator working with Native American archaeological sites in Southern California, and shall ensure that all other personnel associated with and hired for the archaeological monitoring are appropriately trained and qualified.

b. A copy of the executed monitoring agreement between the Applicant, or its successor, the archaeological monitor, and the tribal monitor(s) shall be submitted to the lead agency prior to the earlier of the commencement of any ground-disturbing activity, or the issuance of any permit necessary to commence a ground-disturbing activity.

c. The archaeological and tribal monitor(s) shall observe all Ground Disturbance Activities on the project site at all times any Ground Disturbance Activities are taking place. If

Ground Disturbance Activities are simultaneously occurring at multiple locations on the project site, an archaeological monitor and a tribal monitor(s) shall be assigned to each location where the Ground Disturbance Activities are occurring. The tribal monitor(s) will complete daily monitoring logs that will provide descriptions of the relevant ground-disturbing activities, the type of construction activities performed, locations of ground-disturbing activities, soil types, cultural-related materials, and any other facts, conditions, materials, or discoveries of significance to the Tribe. Monitor logs will identify and describe any discovered tribal cultural resources as defined in California Public Resources Code Section 21074, including but not limited to, Native American cultural and historical artifacts, remains, places of significance, etc., (collectively, tribal cultural resources, or "TCR"), as well as any discovered Native American (ancestral) human remains and burial goods. Copies of monitor logs will be provided to the project applicant/lead agency upon written request to the Tribe. If any project scheduled activities require the tribal monitor(s) to leave the project site for a period of time and return, confirmation shall be submitted to the Tribe(s) by the Project Applicant, in writing, upon completion of each set of scheduled activities and five (5) days' notice (if possible) shall be submitted to the Tribe(s) by the Project Applicant, in writing, prior to the start of each set of scheduled activities.

d. On-site tribal monitoring shall conclude upon the latter of the following (1) written confirmation to the Tribe(s) from a designated point of contact for the project applicant that all ground-disturbing activities and phases that may involve ground-disturbing activities on the project site or in connection with the project are complete; or (2) a determination and written notification by the Tribe(s) to the project applicant/lead agency that no future, planned construction activity and/or development/construction phase at the project site possesses the potential to impact the tribal cultural resources.

MM-TCR-3. Disposition and Treatment of Inadvertent Discoveries.

a. Upon discovery of any potential tribal cultural resource(s), as determined by the tribal monitor(s) and archaeological monitor, all construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall cease (within a 60-foot buffer) and shall not resume until the discovered tribal cultural resource has been fully assessed by the Native American Tribal monitor(s) and a qualified archaeologist. The Tribe(s) will recover and retain all discovered tribal cultural resource(s) in the form and/or manner the Tribe(s) deems appropriate, in the Tribe's sole discretion, and for any purpose the Tribe deems appropriate, including for educational, cultural and/or historic purposes.

b. A qualified archaeological monitor shall be identified as principal personnel who must meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation, have a minimum of 10 years of experience as a principal investigator working with Native American archaeological sites in Southern California, and shall ensure that all other personnel associated with and hired for the archaeological monitoring are appropriately trained and qualified.

c. If the archaeological monitor and tribal monitor(s) determine the resources are Native American in origin, the Tribe(s) will recommend steps for treatment of all discovered tribal cultural resources in the form and/or manner the Tribe deems appropriate, in the Tribe's reasonable discretion, and for any purpose the Tribe deems appropriate, including for educational, cultural and/or historic purposes.

d. The Project Applicant, or its successor, shall implement the Tribe's recommendations if the archaeological monitor, in consultation with the tribal monitor(s), conclude that the Tribe's recommendations are reasonable and feasible.

e. In addition to any recommendations from the Tribe(s), the archaeological monitor shall develop a list of actions that shall be taken to avoid or minimize impacts to the identified tribal cultural resources substantially consistent with best practices identified by the Native American Heritage Commission and in compliance with any applicable federal, state or local law, rule or regulation.

f. The Applicant, or its successor, may recommence Ground Disturbance Activities outside of the specified radius of the discovery site, so long as this radius has been reviewed by both the archaeological monitor and tribal monitor(s) and determined to be reasonable and appropriate, and so long as the Applicant has complied with all of the recommendations developed and approved pursuant to the process set forth in Paragraphs (b) through (e) above.

g. Copies of any subsequent prehistoric archaeological study, tribal cultural resources study or report, detailing the nature of any significant tribal cultural resources, remedial actions taken, and disposition of any significant tribal cultural resources shall be submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center.

h. Notwithstanding Paragraph g above, any information that Los Angeles Department of City Planning, in consultation with the Los Angeles City Attorney's Office, determines to be confidential in nature shall be excluded from submission to the SCCIC or provided to the public under the applicable provisions of the California Public Records Act, California Public Resources Code (PRC), Section 6254(r), and handled in compliance with the City's AB 52 Confidentiality Protocols.

i. Archaeological and Native American monitoring and excavation during construction projects will be consistent with current professional standards. All feasible care to avoid any unnecessary disturbance, physical modification, or separation of human remains and associated funerary objects shall be taken. Copies of any reports described in Paragraph (g), subject to Paragraph (h), shall also be submitted to the Native American Heritage Commission for inclusion in its Sacred Lands File.

MM-TCR-4. Inadvertent Discovery (Human Remains and Associated Funerary or Ceremonial Objects).

a. Native American human remains are defined in PRC 5097.98 (d)(1) as an inhumation or cremation, and in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness. Funerary objects, called associated grave goods in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, are also to be treated according to this statute.

b. If Native American human remains and/or grave goods are discovered or recognized on the project site, then Public Resource Code 5097.98 as well as Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 shall be followed.

c. Human remains and grave/burial goods shall be treated alike per California Public Resources Code section 5097.98(d)(1) and (2).

d. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment for discovered human remains and/or burial goods.

e. Any discovery of human remains/burial goods shall be kept confidential to prevent further disturbance.

f. In the event that human skeletal remains are encountered at the project site during construction or the course of any ground disturbance activities, all such activities shall halt immediately, pursuant to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 which requires that no further ground disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to the origin and disposition pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. In the event human skeletal remains are discovered during construction or during any ground disturbance activities, the following procedures shall be followed:

g. Stop immediately and contact the County Coroner:

   1104 N. Mission Road Los Angeles, CA 90033
   323-343-0512 (8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday) or
   323-343-0714 (After Hours, Saturday, Sunday, and Holidays)

h. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the Coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC).

i. The NAHC will immediately notify the person it believes to be the most likely descendent of the deceased Native American.

j. The most likely descendent has 48 hours to make recommendations to the Applicant, for the treatment or disposition, with proper dignity, of the human remains and grave goods.

k. If the Applicant does not accept the descendant's recommendations, the owner or the descendent may request mediation by the NAHC.

b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. Under PRC Section 21074(a)(2), the City, as Lead Agency, may determine in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence that a resource is a tribal cultural resource by applying the criteria in PRC Section 5024.1(c), considering the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. No such resource has been identified on or near the Project Site. A search of the Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File returned negative results (letter dated March 10, 2026). On December 22, 2025, the City sent AB 52 notification letters to 10 tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Project area (Appendix L). Two tribes responded, and neither identified a specific tribal cultural resource within the Project Site. The Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians categorized the Project as low sensitivity. On May 26, 2026, it confirmed its agreement with the proposed mitigation measures and that no further consultation was required. The Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation provided proposed mitigation measures but did not respond to the City's four follow-up requests. The City concluded consultation with the Kizh Nation on July 8, 2026, pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.2(b)(2). The Project Site has been developed and operated as a school campus since the early 1960s, and much of the proposed construction would occur in previously disturbed areas. However, the Project would involve approximately 4,646 cubic yards of cut, including excavation into native soils in the southern development area. As a result, the possibility of encountering previously unknown subsurface tribal cultural resources cannot be entirely ruled out. MM-TCR-1 through MM-TCR-4, which reflect the measures developed through AB 52 consultation, address that possibility through four requirements:

- Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training for construction crews.
- Tribal and archaeological monitoring of all ground-disturbing activities.
- A halt to work within 60 feet of any discovery until it is assessed, with treatment and disposition in consultation with the tribe(s).
- Compliance with PRC Section 5097.98 and Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 if human remains are found.

With implementation of MM-TCR-1 through MM-TCR-4, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource determined by the Lead Agency to be significant under PRC Section 5024.1(c), and impacts would be less than significant.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would increase water consumption, wastewater generation, gas, electricity, or other utilities to such a degree that the capacity of facilities currently serving the Project Site would be exceeded, resulting in the relocation or construction of utilities. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) conducts water planning based on forecast population growth. The project proposes expansion and new construction at an existing private school campus. No increase in student enrollment is proposed. Therefore, the project demand for water is not anticipated to

require new water supply entitlements and/or require the expansion of existing or construction of new water treatment facilities beyond those already considered in the LADWP 2025 Urban Water Management Plan. Prior to any construction activities, the project applicant would be required to coordinate with the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation (BOS) to determine the exact wastewater conveyance requirements of the proposed project, and any upgrades to the wastewater lines in the vicinity of the Project Site that are needed to adequately serve the proposed project would be undertaken as part of the project.

The LADWP would supply the Project from the existing electrical system. Electricity demand during construction would vary throughout the construction period based on the construction activities being performed, and would cease upon completion of construction. When not in use, electric equipment would be powered off so as to avoid unnecessary energy consumption. Accordingly, it is not expected that the temporary demand for electricity during construction would require new electric power facilities.

SoCalGas would supply the Project from the existing natural gas facilities. Construction activities typically do not involve the consumption of natural gas. Accordingly, construction of the Project would not require the installation of natural gas facilities. The Project would connect to existing natural gas facilities in coordination with and under the supervision of SoCalGas.

Construction-related activities, including grading and excavation, could encroach on telecommunication facilities. However, before construction begins, the Project Applicant would be required to coordinate with applicable regulatory agencies and telecommunication providers to locate and avoid or implement the orderly relocation of telecommunication facilities that need to be removed or relocated.

New utility facilities, such as fire hydrants required by LAFD and sewer lateral extensions, as well as electrical, gas, or telecommunication facilities, would be installed within existing paved right-of-way areas or developed areas of the campus, with the construction effects covered by the analysis in this Initial Study. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to water or wastewater, energy, natural gas, and/or telecommunications infrastructure.

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would increase water consumption to such a degree that the capacity of facilities currently serving the Project Site would be exceeded. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) conducts water planning based on forecast population growth. The project proposes expansion and new construction at an existing private school campus. No increase in student enrollment is proposed. As such, the project demand for water is not anticipated to require new water supply entitlements and/or require the expansion of existing or construction of new water treatment facilities beyond those already considered in the LADWP 2025 Urban Water Management Plan.

Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to water supplies during normal, dry, and multiple dry years.

c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would increase wastewater generation to such a degree that the capacity of facilities currently serving the Project Site would be exceeded. Prior to any construction activities, the project applicant would be required to coordinate with the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation (BOS) to determine the exact wastewater conveyance requirements of the proposed project, and any upgrades to the wastewater lines in the vicinity of the Project Site that are needed to adequately serve the proposed project would be undertaken as part of the project. The project proposes expansion and new construction at an existing private school campus for athletic facilities. No increase in student enrollment is proposed, and therefore there would be no increase in operation wastewater amounts. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to wastewater infrastructure.

d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project's solid waste generation exceeded the capacity of permitted landfills or generated solid waste in excess of State or local standards. The Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation (BOS) and private waste management companies are responsible for the collection, disposal, and recycling of solid waste within the City, including the project site. Solid waste during the operation of the proposed project is anticipated to be collected by the BOS and private waste haulers, respectively. As the City's own landfills have all been closed and are non-operational, the destinations are private landfills. In compliance with Assembly Bill (AB) 939, the project applicant would be required to implement a Solid Waste Diversion Program and divert at least 50 percent of the solid waste generated by the project from the applicable landfill site. The proposed project would also comply with all federal, State, and local regulations related to solid waste. No increase in student enrollment is proposed, and therefore there would be no increase in solid waste generation amounts. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to solid waste.

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project's solid waste generation exceeded the capacity of permitted landfills or generated solid waste in excess of State or local standards. The Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation (BOS) and private waste management companies are responsible for the collection, disposal, and recycling of solid waste within the City, including the project site. Solid waste during the operation of the proposed project is anticipated to be collected by the BOS and private waste haulers, respectively. As the City's own landfills have all been closed and are non-operational, the destinations are private landfills.

In compliance with Assembly Bill (AB) 939, the project applicant would be required to implement a Solid Waste Diversion Program and divert at least 50 percent of the solid waste generated by the project from the applicable landfill site. The proposed project would also comply with all federal, State, and local regulations related to solid waste. No increase in student enrollment is proposed, and therefore there would be no increase in solid waste generation amounts. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to solid waste.

XX. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. The Project Site is located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) in a Local Responsibility Area, at the northwestern base of the Verdugo Mountains, where brush-covered slopes abut the southern and eastern edges of the campus (Appendix K, Sections 5 and 6). The applicable emergency response and evacuation framework includes the City's Emergency Operations Plan and the General Plan Safety Element. La Tuna Canyon Road, located approximately 0.13-miles north of the Project Site, is identified as a disaster route by the Los Angeles County Safety Element as shown on Figure 12.6: Disaster Routes Map of the County's Safety Element. In addition, the Los Angeles County Safety Element identifies La Tuna Canyon Road as an evacuation route, as shown on Figure 12.9: Evacuation Routes Map of the County's Safety Element. The Project would not alter La Tuna Canyon Road or any other designated route, and would not increase student enrollment or employment on the campus, so it would not increase the number of people who would need to evacuate on a typical school day. The Project would construct a new emergency/fire access road connecting Village

Avenue and Wildwood Avenue at the southern end of the campus, providing a secondary emergency access route that does not exist today. During construction, MM-TSP-1 requires emergency access to be maintained at all times and prohibits construction parking and staging on Village Avenue and Wildwood Avenue on Red Flag days. Since the new gymnasium would add assembly space that could be used for events, and the Fire Report (Appendix K, Recommendation R10) recommends that operational readiness, Red Flag procedures, and evacuation/shelter-in-place coordination with LAFD be established before occupancy, MM-WF-1 requires a Campus Wildfire Preparedness and Evacuation Plan. With implementation of MM-TSP-1 and MM-WF-1, the Project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

MM-WF-1. Campus Wildfire Preparedness and Evacuation Plan.

Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the gymnasium, the Applicant shall prepare and submit to LAFD for review and approval, with a copy to the Department of City Planning, a Campus Wildfire Preparedness and Evacuation Plan. The plan shall be updated whenever campus facilities, access, or operations change materially, and the Applicant shall implement the plan for the life of the Project. The plan shall include, at a minimum:

(a) Evacuation and shelter-in-place procedures for students, staff, and event attendees, including evacuation routes, assembly areas, and parent reunification procedures, coordinated with LAFD and the Los Angeles Emergency Management Department;

(b) Red Flag Warning day procedures, including postponement or cancellation of non-essential evening and spectator events in either gymnasium, verification that emergency access gates and Knox devices are operable, and removal of combustible materials from within 5 feet of buildings;

(c) An annual pre-fire-season inspection of defensible space, gutters, vents, fire access gates, and hydrants, with records retained for City inspection;

(d) Annual staff training and at least one wildfire evacuation drill per school year; and

(e) Procedures to maintain required defensible space and fire access around completed buildings during later construction phases.

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. The Fire Report (Appendix K) identifies the principal wildfire vulnerabilities of the site as the rear brush interface, sloped terrain, Santa Ana wind exposure and ember transport, and interim conditions during multi-year phased construction. The Project would locate new development within the already-developed campus, rather than extending development into the adjacent undeveloped hillside. The new and expanded buildings

would be required to comply with the 2025 California Wildland-Urban Interface Code as amended by the City, including ignition-resistant exterior construction (noncombustible exterior materials, Class A roof assemblies, tempered glazing, and ember-resistant vents), automatic fire sprinklers, and defensible space within 100 feet of structures or to the property line pursuant to Government Code Section 51182. The 30-foot fuel modification zone for each new or expanded building lies entirely within the property (Appendix K, Figure B-1). The landscape plan (Appendix N, Sheets L-1 and L-2) includes a managed, irrigated 100-foot buffer and a fire-resistant plant palette.

These are mandatory requirements, enforced by LADBS and LAFD at building permit plan check, and they would reduce the potential for ignition of the new structures and for structure-to-wildland fire spread compared to existing conditions. Wildfire smoke could affect campus occupants during a regional fire event, as it could for any existing development in the area; the Project would not increase the number of occupants exposed. MM-WF-1 further requires Red Flag day procedures, including postponement of non-essential spectator events and defensible space inspections. With implementation of MM-WF-1, the Project would not exacerbate wildfire risks or expose occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or to the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire, and impacts would be less than significant.

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. The Project would require the installation and maintenance of wildfire-related infrastructure, including the new emergency/fire access road and retaining walls, one or more additional fire hydrants as may be required by LAFD, and fuel modification and defensible space within 100 feet of new structures. The emergency access road, retaining walls, and any new hydrants would be located within the southern development area and existing paved areas, and their construction impacts are included in the analysis of air quality, noise, geology, and hydrology in this Initial Study. No new overhead power lines are proposed. The access road and hydrants would reduce, rather than exacerbate, fire risk by improving fire apparatus access and water supply. Fuel modification would involve thinning and clearing vegetation on campus slopes adjacent to the new buildings, which could affect protected trees and nesting birds. MM-BIO-1 requires fuel modification to be carried out consistent with the Tree Protection Plan, and MM-BIO-2 requires nesting bird surveys and buffers for vegetation clearance during the breeding season. With implementation of MM-BIO-1 and MM-BIO-2, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Less Than Significant Impact. As stated in the LADBS Geology and Soils Report Approval Letter (Appendix I), the proposed construction does not encroach into the seismically induced landslide hazard zone at the hillside edges of the campus. LADBS conditions of approval require that all retaining walls include backdrains and subdrains, and that all roof, pad, and site drainage

be conveyed to the street in a non-erosive manner. Graded slopes would be planted and irrigated (Appendix K, Section 5.3). The Project would also be required to implement a SWPPP during construction and LID best management practices during operation. The Project would not alter natural drainage courses on the hillsides, and new impervious surfaces would drain to the street system rather than onto adjacent slopes. Therefore, the Project would not expose people or structures to significant risks from downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes, and impacts would be less than significant.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. The Project Site is within the Verdugo Mountains Criterion 1 Protected Areas for Wildlife, and construction and fuel modification would occur near protected trees and potential nesting habitat. With implementation of MM-BIO-1 (Tree Protection) and MM-BIO-2 (Nesting Birds), the Project would not substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species or threaten a plant or animal community. With implementation of MM-TCR-1 through MM-TCR-4, the Project would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation. **(See Sections IV, V, and XVIII.)**

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the proposed project, in conjunction with related projects, would result in impacts that are less than significant when viewed separately but significant when viewed together. Although projects may be constructed in the project vicinity, the cumulative impacts to which the proposed project would contribute would be less than significant. The immediate adjacent properties include residential, institutional, and open space uses. There are no known current or future projects in the immediate vicinity that, in conjunction with the proposed expansion and new construction at the existing private school campus, would result in cumulatively significant environmental impacts. The Applicant's recently constructed softball field across Village Avenue (completed May 2026) is part of the existing baseline. The Project's air quality and GHG emissions are evaluated against SCAQMD thresholds and GHG reduction plans that are designed to address cumulative impacts; because the Project would not exceed those thresholds or conflict with those plans, its contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. Construction noise and traffic effects are localized and temporary, and would be managed through MM-TSP-1. The Project would not increase enrollment, so it would not contribute to cumulative demand for public services, utilities, or transportation. Biological, cultural, and tribal cultural resource effects are site-specific and would be mitigated by MM-BIO-1, MM-BIO-2, and MM-TCR-1 through MM-TCR-4. Therefore, the Project's impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact. Effects on human beings are addressed in the air quality, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, transportation, and wildfire sections of this Initial Study. As discussed in those sections, construction and operational emissions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds; geologic hazards would be addressed through compliance with LADBS requirements; asbestos and lead-based paint would be abated in accordance with applicable regulations; construction noise and vibration would not exceed City thresholds; and construction traffic and wildfire preparedness would be addressed through MM-TSP-1 and MM-WF-1. With implementation of the mitigation measures identified herein, the Project would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, and impacts would be less than significant.

PREPARERS AND PERSONS CONSULTED

Carlberg Associates

ECORP Consulting, Inc.

Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, Environmental Planning and Sustainability

Native American Heritage Commission

R.T. Frankian & Associates

Sapphos Environmental Inc.

5 REFERENCES, ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AB – Assembly Bill

ACM - asbestos-containing materials

AQMP – Air Quality Management Plan

BMP – Best Management Practices

BOS – City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation

CARB – California Air Resources Board

CDFW – California Department of Fish and Wildlife

CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act

CFGC – California Fish and Game Code

CMP – Congestion Management Program

DTSC – California Department of Toxic Substances Control

GHG – greenhouse gasses

LADOT – Los Angeles Department of Transportation

LADWP – Los Angeles Department of Water and Power

LAFD – Los Angeles Fire Department

LAMC – Los Angeles Municipal Code

LAPD – Los Angeles Police Department

LBP – lead-based paint

LID – low impact development

LST – localized significance thresholds

MBTA – Migratory Bird Treaty Act

Metro – Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

MND – Mitigated Negative Declaration

NAHC – Native American Heritage Commission

PRC – California Public Resources Code

RAP – Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks

REC – Recognized Environmental Condition

RTP – Regional Transportation Plan

SCAG – Southern California Association of Governments

SCAQMD – South Coast Air Quality Management District

SCCIC - Central Coastal Information Center

SCS – Sustainable Communities Strategy

SEA – Significant Ecological Area

SUSMP - Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan

SWPPP – Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

UBC – Uniform Building Code

USFWS – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services