

# **FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

## **Anthony C. Beilenson Visitor Center at King Gillette Ranch**

Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area  
May, 2010

### **Introduction**

This Finding of No Significant Impact documents the decision of the National Park Service to adopt Alternative B as presented in the Anthony C. Beilenson Visitor Center at King Gillette Ranch Environmental Assessment and the determination that no significant impacts on the quality of the human environment nor impairment of national park resources or values will ensue. The EA addressed construction and operation of a full-service visitor center at King Gillette Ranch, a park site within Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area (SMMNRA) using the existing Stable building, with Visitor Center Service Area facilities, parking, and infrastructure improvements. On March 30, 2010, the land base associated with the Visitor Center was brought into ownership by the United States government, with all necessary permanent easements for public ingress and egress, and all necessary temporary construction easements. This FONSI, combined with the EA and Errata (including Response to Public Comments) constitute a full and complete record of the conservation planning and environmental impact analysis for this key partnership initiative.

### **Purpose and Need**

The purpose of the proposed Visitor Center at King Gillette Ranch is to provide a centrally located, full-service visitor center to meet the need for visitor orientation to the SMMNRA and environmental education programs for the growing population of the greater Los Angeles metropolitan area.

Currently, there exists no central and easily accessible resource for guiding visitor experiences at the SMMNRA. Although the SMMNRA provides many unique, quality, educational and recreational facilities for visitors, there has been no full-service gateway visitor center to provide park orientation and education programs typical of a national park unit. Throughout the 31-year history of the SMMNRA, the main visitor center has always been located outside the actual legislative boundary of the park. Presently, the majority of visitors must drive to the visitor center at the NPS's headquarters in Thousand Oaks, located at the western end of the Santa Monica—a particularly inefficient path of travel from the Los Angeles region, where the majority of regional visitors live. Absent a readily accessible, physical visitor center, orientation to the SMMNRA tends to occur on an ad hoc basis. Visitors find information at ranger and contact stations at individual park sites with varying hours of operation. The efficiency, extent, and overall quality of the visitor experience are decreased.

## Range of Alternatives

The 2002 SMMNRA General Management Plan (GMP) prescribed a future administrative, environmental, and cultural education center at King Gillette Ranch. A component of the center will be a visitor center to be jointly operated by the NPS, California Department of Parks and Recreation, the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, and Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority. Therefore, the Environmental Assessment examines two alternatives in detail: A) No Action, and B) the Preferred Alternative, which is to construct and operate a full-service visitor center. Several options considered but dismissed from analysis are also addressed.

## Selected Alternative

Alternative B, the Preferred Alternative, was selected for implementation and is the same as described and analyzed in the EA. No modifications are incorporated as a result of public comment. Under the selected alternative, the NPS will construct and operate a full-service Visitor Center at King Gillette Ranch using the Stable building and surrounding area. King Gillette Ranch is the ideally situated gateway location for accessibility from the greater Los Angeles region. The site is in the heart of the SMMNRA, yet quickly accessed from the Los Angeles region from either Highway 101 or Pacific Coast Highway. The Stable building location within the Ranch will provide a visitor center facility of aesthetic value and local culture and historical interest. The approved actions include:

- Modify an existing 6,000 sq. ft. structure, the Stable building, to serve as a full-service Visitor Center. The Stable building is one of the structures from the original King Camp Gillette estate. The building will be rehabilitated in the style of the original Spanish Colonial Revival architecture, and will use "green" technologies for construction and operation to achieve a platinum rating under the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating System™.
- Construct a geo-thermal loop exchange system for heating and cooling in the building.
- Construct facilities for an adjacent, attached, Visitor Center Services Area. The services area includes a 1,000 sq.ft. restroom/storage building and the location for a future 950 sq.ft. multi-purpose visitor services building. These buildings, combined with the Visitor Center in the Stable building, will surround a visitor orientation plaza with a low-volume water feature to establish a Mediterranean ambience in keeping with the Gillette estate's architectural style.
- Demolish an existing 2,400 sq. ft. structure (Print Shop); the structure's foundation will either be removed or retained for use in the adjacent small picnic area.
- Construct an outdoor amphitheatre for up to 100 persons.

- Construct accessible pathways and install bicycle racks and nearby hitching posts.
- Construct parking for 50 vehicles with at least three handicapped spaces and an additional four spaces for busses, RVs, or horse trailers.
- Widen the entrance road off Mulholland Highway to two lanes.
- Establish a storm water runoff control and treatment system designed to maximize groundwater infiltration and to filter runoff prior to its entry into Stokes Creek.
- During operation of the Visitor Center, expand existing public educational and interpretive programs, including day-use education programs, hikes, birdwatching walks, and other outdoor programs.
- Continue permitted special uses, such as weddings, commercial photo shoots, or filming when compatible with general visitors' experience at the Visitor Center and without impacts on park resources.

### **General Construction Schedule**

The proposed construction will be funded under the federal 2009 American Reinvestment and Recovery Act, the NPS Centennial Challenge funding program, and a matching in-kind land donation from the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority. The selected alternative is a "Design-Build" project. Design details will be finalized prior to commencing construction. Resource protection measures will contribute to development of the final design. It is anticipated that the design-build contract will be awarded in summer, 2010. Final design refinements should be completed and construction commenced early in 2011. Visitor Center construction is expected to take approximately one year.

### **Other Alternatives Evaluated**

The No Action Alternative was considered in detail. The No Action Alternative was found to not meet project objectives calling for preservation of the unique aesthetic, historical, and cultural values of King Gillette Ranch; maintenance or improvement of water quality and habitat of Stokes Creek; application of sustainable design; or the creation of visitor center facilities that facilitate interagency operational efficiencies for SMMNRA. The No Action Alternative also would only partially meet other objectives addressing protection and restoration of native plant communities, provision for safe and dependable access and orientation for the visiting public, and development of appropriate recreation and education amenities necessary to promote and support an enjoyable and safe visitor experience. The NPS concluded that the Preferred Alternative met all identified objectives for the project, and is the environmentally preferred alternative. Alternative B surpasses the No Action Alternative in realizing the greater range of beneficial uses without degradation to the human environment.

## **Alternatives Considered but Dismissed**

Analysis of the scoping comments related to the project planning site and design options considered for the Visitor Center led to dismissal of several options that might have been incorporated into other alternatives. These included components that failed to meet the project objectives, included actions that generated unacceptable levels of resource impacts, or were generally unacceptable and could be eliminated as provided in Director's Order 12, Section 4.5(E)(6) (NPS 2001).

### **Alternative Visitor Center Locations**

Construct new building. The option of constructing a new building to serve as a visitor center was considered but eliminated because there was already an aesthetically pleasing vacant building, the former Stable built for King Gillette, on the site. This existing Stable building is ideally situated near the park entrance and is approximately the right size for a visitor center for SMMNRA. Its compelling story would contribute to the visitor experience in a way that a new building would not. In addition, re-use of an existing structure is one recommended approach for green construction projects. Therefore, the new construction option was eliminated because a superior alternative was selected for further study.

Locate Visitor Center in one of the other existing buildings on site. Although there are three other existing structures at the Ranch large enough to serve as a visitor center, none of them are located near the site entrance, widely recognized as the best location for a park visitor center. One building, the Dormitory, was considered further and selected to be the temporary visitor orientation site because it has restrooms and is located near the largest parking lot at the Ranch. However, the Dormitory was also recognized as the most suitable location to house school children for overnight environmental education programs, another important component of the vision for this park property. Making improvements to accommodate a public visitor center on the first floor of the building with environmental education participants housed above, was considered but dismissed as incompatible with the use of the same building as an environmental education center. Due to this inherent conflict, its unsuitable location far from the park entrance, and because a superior alternative exists, planners eliminated the Dormitory from further consideration as a location for the visitor center.

Design a reduced-scale visitor center in one of the other existing buildings on site. Although small contact stations operate in several locations throughout the park, the scattered, smaller facilities do not provide efficient visitor orientation or offer the infrastructure for a diversity of interpretive programs. This option also would not meet the identified need for and project goal to have a full-service visitor center for SMMNRA. Therefore, the reduced-scale visitor center alternative was dismissed.

### **Alternative Circulation Options**

During the scoping and design phase, two distinct vehicle circulation options were considered to solve the issue presented by the current single-lane entrance gate and narrow entrance road. These were dismissed in favor of the Preferred Alternative, which is to widen both the gate and the road for two-way traffic.

Preserve existing narrow gate and one-lane entrance road as one-way entrance, and build new one-way exit onto Las Virgenes Road directly across from the entrance to Malibu Creek State Park. A new signal would be required on Las Virgenes Road at the intersection of Ranch exit road and the entrance to Malibu Creek State Park. This option was dismissed due to the cost and environmental impacts of constructing the exit road, signaling the new intersection, and on existing congestion on Las Virgenes Road. Another disadvantage and reason for dismissal of this option was that visitors might become disoriented when they depart the park onto a different road than the one they arrived on. Therefore, because an environmentally superior alternative exists and because this other option would cause major adverse visitor experience impacts and was economically infeasible, this alternative was dismissed from further consideration.

Construct a new one-way exit spur road east of the Gatehouse to intersect with Mulholland Highway. This option would maintain the current entry gate and entrance road width between Mulholland Highway and the Gatehouse. From the Gatehouse to the Visitor Center parking access road, the tree-lined allée would be widened to accommodate two-way traffic. A new exit-only spur road would be constructed beginning southeast of the Gatehouse and running due north to the intersection with Mulholland Highway, east of the entrance road. This option was dismissed due to potential visitor confusion about the location of the designated entrance. This confusion may have become a traffic safety problem if visitors, especially those traveling west on Mulholland, attempted to enter the park through the exit road. Therefore, because it would cause severe operational and visitor experience impacts, this alternative was dismissed from further consideration.

### **Alternative Parking Options**

Construct the parking lot northwest of the Stable in the abandoned agricultural field between the Stable and Mulholland Highway. In this alternative, the parking lot would be readily visible upon entrance to the Ranch. While this parking location would alleviate visitor confusion about where to park, the agencies wanted to retain the aesthetic experience of having visitors drive down the eucalyptus lined allée surrounded by open fields. In addition, the parking lot would have been visible from Mulholland Highway. Therefore, because this alternative would have major adverse cultural, scenic, and visitor experience impacts, and because a superior alternative exists, this option was eliminated from further consideration.

Construct the parking lot and turn around entirely in the current overflow parking area east of the Stable but closer to Stokes Creek. This parking option was superior from a circulation and visitor experience perspective, but conflicted with Coastal Act policies for a 100-ft stream setback from Stokes Creek. The setbacks are required to protect sensitive riparian habitat and water quality. The need for federal consistency with the California Coastal Act and the potential for major adverse environmental consequences warranted the dismissal of this parking alternative in favor of an environmentally superior alternative outside of the 100 foot setback for Stokes Creek.

### ***Alternative Use of Ancillary Structures***

Leave Print Shop intact as maintenance facility or modify as visitor-serving facility. Pre-draft scoping comments and the Vision statement for the Ranch encouraged the agencies to use the existing buildings and footprint for all development at the Ranch. Unfortunately, the function of this building as a maintenance office and shop, a back-of-the-house activity, is not compatible with the visitor-serving facilities of this zone of the Ranch. Also, the aesthetics of the building—a corrugated metal shed—are not compatible with the design of the Stable building. In addition, its condition and location behind a group of oak trees make it difficult to modify as a visitor support facility. Because both options for the Print Shop would have had a severe impact on scenic resources and the visitor experience, they were dismissed in favor of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative calls for removing this building and replacing in its footprint new facilities, including picnicking, closer to the proposed parking area and the Visitor Center.

### ***Alternative to Use Land and Facilities for Equestrian Uses***

During the scoping process many letters and email supported the development of equestrian facilities at the Ranch. One alternative the agencies considered was to restore the Stable building for use as an active stable to showcase the importance of horses in the area or as a living history ranch. Another proposal considered by the agencies in response to public comments was to develop equestrian facilities within the Ranch area that would support horse shows, gymkhanas, horse boarding, and Pony Club events. In addition, the agencies considered requests for an overnight equestrian campground with horse trailer parking and water and electrical hookups. These alternative actions were considered but dismissed for the following reasons.

Restore Stable building as a stable for horses and other ranch animals. In this alternative, the Stable building would be restored to the original design as a stable for livestock and poultry and a bunkhouse for ranch hands. The site would possibly be used as a living history site complete with ranch animals. The agencies considered this alternative, but found it does not implement the decisions of the GMP for the project area. Nor does it satisfy project goals, or resolve park planning needs for a gateway visitor center at this site. The proposed equestrian use would dominate the site and would be in conflict with the goals and objectives of the SMMNRA GMP and Gillette Ranch Vision Statement. The proposed equestrian use would not offer a variety of

individual choices for visitors to the site. This alternative would have a very high cost for limited public benefit when compared with use of the building as a Visitor Center.

Develop the site for equestrian-oriented uses. This alternative would develop portions of the Ranch into active equestrian facilities. While equestrian facility development at the Ranch may serve public demand for recreational equestrian use, the agencies considered this alternative in the context of the limited amount of available space at the Ranch for educational programs and visitor services. There are adequate existing and planned equestrian facilities available in or near SMMNRA. The highest and best visitor-serving use of this site would be for programs serving the diversity of residents in Los Angeles visiting SMMNRA for recreational, interpretive, and education purposes. Additionally, equestrian facility development could potentially cause environmental impacts. New equestrian facilities would require grading and construction in highly visible areas, along with drainage improvements and costly maintenance requirements to protect water quality, control dust, and reduce resource impacts. This alternative would not implement the decisions of the GMP for the project area, would not meet project goals or park planning needs, could potentially cause adverse environmental effects, and would not be economically feasible.

### **Environmentally Preferred Alternative**

Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and §2.7(D) of *Director's Order 12 and Handbook*, the NPS identified the environmentally preferred alternative in the EA. The environmentally preferred alternative is that which promotes the national environmental policy as expressed in the following six criteria (§101(b) of NEPA):

1. Fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations.
2. Ensure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings.
3. Attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences.
4. Preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage and maintain, wherever possible, an environment that supports diversity and variety of individual choice.
5. Enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources.
6. Achieve a balance between population and resource use that will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities.

Alternative B, the Preferred Alternative, was seemed to be the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative provides for and informs the public of a wide variety of visitor-serving experiences and choices in an aesthetically pleasing, sustainably designed, existing facility designed to meet federal and state accessibility guidelines and building codes for fire and seismic hazard protection. This alternative modifies an original building, the Stable building, at King Gillette Ranch designed by a regionally significant architect, thus conveying a sense of the original uses and history of the site and an aspect of the cultural heritage of the Santa Monica Mountains. King Gillette Ranch is the ideally situated gateway location to the park from the greater Los Angeles region. This location quickly orients visitors to all of the cultural, natural, and recreational resources of SMMNRA and will strengthen the agency's goals and objectives for outreach and education efforts. Future visitors' understanding and appreciation of the environment in SMMNRA will be promoted while improving visitor access to orientation and park safety information.

Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, was not found to be environmentally preferred because it would not assure a much-needed centralized visitor center for SMMNRA featuring aesthetically pleasing and safe facilities, would not promote the widest range of beneficial uses associated with visiting the national recreation area, would not achieve a balance between population and resource use owing to inefficiencies in providing visitor orientation and environmental education to the growing population of the region, and would not enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources.

## **Why the Selected Alternative has no Significant Effect on the Environment**

Significance of an impact is determined by examining context and intensity. Context is a measure of geographic extent of potential impacts. Intensity is a measure of how severe impacts may be and includes evaluation of ten criteria listed in 40 CFR 1508.27. The EA established thresholds for gauging intensity levels of potential impacts of the topics analyzed in the EA, ranging from no impact to major impact. No major adverse or beneficial impacts were identified in Alternative B that would require analysis in an EIS. A brief discussion follows, organized by the ten criteria, of why the selected alternative will not have a significant effect on the environment.

1. *Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant effect may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the effect will be beneficial.*

The Visitor Center project will generate long-term, beneficial impacts associated with operation. Major, long-term benefits for visitor use and experience are expected. Other long-term minor to moderate benefits will accrue to accessibility for visitors with disabilities, aesthetics of the Stable building from renovation, air quality and energy conservation from implementing sustainable design



technologies, public safety during wildfire events, and on native vegetation, water resources, and wildlife habitat owing to project design to control non-point source pollution and restore native habitat.

A variety of adverse impacts were identified as well. Negligible to minor adverse impacts were generally short-term in nature and associated with construction. Proposed construction will have short-term minor adverse effects on aesthetics and wildlife from noise, air quality from heavy equipment use, visitor experience from temporary closures or detours, and on water resources from exposed soils during ground disturbance. Ground disturbance during construction will have potentially long-term minor impacts on archaeological and ethnographic resources. Operation-related impacts were mostly negligible or minor and long-term in nature, including impacts on aesthetics from noise and lighting, park operations owing to staffing and maintaining the Visitor Center, and public safety associated with seismic shaking. Moderate impacts were identified for traffic from increased visitation to King Gillette Ranch and on vegetation owing to encroachment into the eucalyptus trees lining the entrance road.

The selected alternative, calling for construction and operation of a full-service visitor center at King Gillette Ranch, using the Stable building and surrounding environs, will provide a major public benefit in terms of visitor use and experience. The selected alternative's beneficial impacts are in balance with other beneficial impacts and adverse effects. The selected alternative will have an overall beneficial effect on the environment that does not reach a level of significance worthy of further analysis in an environmental impact statement.

2. *The degree to which the action affects public health or safety.*

The selected alternative calls for development of a full-service Visitor Center that will be used to convey to visitors the rules, regulations, practices, and values concerning safety in the out-of-doors, ranging from protection of one's self to the protection of others and the environment. The selected alternative's Visitor Center will also provide a forum for the promotion of public health through encouraging the public to take part in outdoor recreational activities that provide tremendous physical and emotional benefits.

The selected alternative also has been designed to place people and facilities away from hazardous fire and flood conditions. Additionally, the original Stable building will be retrofitted to meet seismic safety codes and fire-safe construction standards, thus improving the public's safety while in the building. The proposed other new structures will also be constructed to meet seismic safety codes and fire-safe construction standards. Therefore, the selected alternative will have beneficial impacts on public health or safety.

3. *Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.*

The selected alternative makes use of the original 1927 ranch estate of razor magnate King Camp Gillette that features original structures and landscapes. The Stable building slated for the Visitor Center is one of the estate's original structures, designed in the Spanish Revival architectural style by notable regional architect Wallace Neff. The setting of the Visitor Center is within the context of the original landscape-level views toward the ranch. Both the original estate structures and landscapes, while ineligible for the National Register, have been deemed worthy of protection for their aesthetic ambience and historic interpretive value. The selected alternative plans to protect the original appearance of the Stable building and retain the original views toward the site as seen from the entrance road and from adjacent public roads. In addition to the selected alternative's culturally scenic setting at King Gillette Ranch, the greater setting of the site immediately adjacent to Malibu Creek State Park and among scattered other public lands makes for outstanding visual and recreational resource compatibility.

Through consultation with the USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service, it was determined that, while there are prime or unique farmlands associated with the project planning area—in the vacant fields north and west of the Stable building—the farmland conversion impact rating indicated the proposed use of the site would not require further evaluation. Therefore, prime and unique farmlands were dismissed from further analysis in the EA.

Stokes Creek is designated wetland habitat and environmentally sensitive habitat area (ESHA) per the National Wetland Inventory and the California Coastal Act. The selected alternative is designed to protect vegetation and wildlife associated with Stokes Creek from human uses at the Visitor Center, as well as to restore the native habitat buffer along the creek. Consultation with the California Coastal Commission provided their concurrence that the project would not impact the creek or other Coastal resources.

4. *The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.*

Based on pre-EA public scoping and public comments on the EA, no highly controversial effects on the quality of the human environment were identified for the selected alternative.

5. *The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.*

The selected alternative meets project objectives of improving the efficiency and safety of park operations by reducing maintenance and costs and by providing

visitors and park staff with a safe and healthy environment. The anticipated effects on the human environment, as analyzed in the EA, are not highly uncertain or unique, nor were any unknown risks identified.

6. *Degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.*

The selected alternative features a unique, one-time, kind of action for the national recreation area. Only one full-service visitor center is planned for construction within SMMNRA. The selected alternative was designed to avoid impacts to natural, cultural, scenic, and recreational resources. No exceptions from federal, state, and local rules and regulations were requested for the project that would lead to a precedent for future exceptions or affect future decisions in principle.

7. *Whether an action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance exists if it is reasonable to anticipate a cumulatively significant impact on the environment. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it into small component parts.*

The EA identified cumulative adverse impacts, ranging from negligible to moderate, for all analyzed topics. The finding reflects the Visitor Center's adjacency to ongoing urban and suburban development in the nearby cities as well as the greater Los Angeles metropolitan area. The proposed Visitor Center contributes negligibly to the cumulative impact in all topics except transportation, when a moderate contribution was identified. No major cumulative impacts were identified that rise to a level of significance worthy of additional impact analysis.

8. *Degree to which action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.*

The original estate structures and landscapes were deemed ineligible for the National Register in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer. However, the project area includes archaeological and ethnographic resources that have been assumed to be eligible for the National Register and which may be impacted by implementation of the selected alternative. Phase II archaeological testing will be performed prior to finalizing the design and construction plans for the Visitor Center, and additional resource protection measures will be implemented to avoid or minimize disturbance of archaeological resources.

9. *Degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.*

The area of potential effect is within U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service-designated critical habitat for two fish species, and contains habitat suitable for one listed bird

species, one bat species of federal and state concern, and four reptile species of federal and/or state concern. The EA concluded that Alternative A would not adversely affect designated critical habitat. The project is not likely to adversely affect any state or federally listed endangered or threatened species, which was corroborated by U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and California Dept of Fish and Game.

10. *Whether the action threatens a violation of federal, state, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.*

SMMNRA is within the jurisdictional setting of several federal, state, and local agencies. The Congressional establishing legislation for the park envisioned a federal/state/local and private/public cooperative effort to protect park values. Therefore, the selected alternative was designed for consistency with all federal, state, and local resource protection rules, regulations, and policies, including protection of oak trees, native vegetation and the habitat it provides for wildlife, water resources and required streambank setbacks, cultural resources including archaeological site monitoring, and promotion of public recreational access. Additional federal, state, and local permits will be obtained as necessary prior to construction. The NPS will not violate any federal, state, or local laws or requirements imposed for protection of the environment.

As summarized above, the potential effects of the selected alternative, Alternative B, have been considered and determined to be less than significant when evaluated against the ten criteria listed in 40 CFR 1508.27.

## **Resource Protection Measures**

Resource protection measures were identified in the EA as part of the impact analysis and are also incorporated into the approved project. In the Table which follows this section, resource protection measures noted as "Design" or "Construction" under the "Timing" column will be funded as part of Visitor Center construction. Park staff, as part of their routine work responsibilities, will be responsible for implementing measures identified as "Operation" under the "Timing" column; no additional funding will be necessary specific to implementation of these measures, except for the measure directing the park to seek additional base funding for staff to fully cover operation and maintenance of the Visitor Center.

Resource Protection Measures			
Resource Topic / Resource Protection Measure		Timing	Responsible Party/Monitoring
<b>General Considerations</b>			
GEN-1	The NPS and/or MRCA project manager will ensure that the project remains confined within the parameters established in the compliance documents and that mitigation measures will be properly implemented.	All Phases	NPS Project Manager MRCA Project Manager
GEN-2	All necessary federal, state, and local permits, project plan checks, consultations, and any other pre-construction regulatory jurisdictional approvals shall be obtained prior to construction.	Design	NPS Project Manager NPS and MRCA Staff
GEN-3	A hazardous spill plan will be in place, stating what actions will be taken in the case of a spill and the preventive measures to be implemented, such as placement of refueling facilities, storage, and handling hazardous materials, etc.	Construction	Construction Contractor
GEN-4	Construction zones will be identified and flagged before beginning construction, and all disturbance will be confined to the flagged areas. All project personnel will be instructed that their activities must be confined to locations within flagged areas, and all equipment, materials, and stockpiled soils must remain within these areas. Disturbance beyond the construction zones will be prohibited. The only exception would be to set up and maintain necessary temporary structures, such as silt control barriers, that may be outside designated construction zones. Construction fencing installed for archaeological resource protection, riparian corridor protection (100-foot setback from Stokes Creek), tree protection, migratory bird protection, erosion control, or for any other resource protection purpose, will be inspected by NPS staff prior to construction.	Construction	NPS Project Manager Construction Contractor NPS Staff
GEN-5	Flagging, fencing, and other barricades shall be located to protect visitor safety and to guide public access during construction. An adequate safety zone shall be established to protect visitors from falling or flying debris, from contact with construction equipment and building materials, and as much as feasible, from noise generated by construction. Alternative access routes for the public and park staff shall be identified and posted as necessary to guide staff away from the construction zone.	Construction	NPS Project Manager NPS Safety Officer Construction Contractor

Resource Protection Measures			
Resource Topic / Resource Protection Measure		Timing	Responsible Party/Monitoring
GEN-6	All trucks hauling demolition debris and other loose materials that could spill onto paved surfaces will be covered or will maintain adequate freeboard.		Construction Contractor
GEN-7	Staging for construction vehicles and equipment will be located in previously disturbed areas approved by NPS, outside of high visitor use areas, and will be clearly identified in advance.	Construction	NPS Project Manager Construction Contractor
GEN-8	All equipment on the project site will be maintained in accordance with regulatory and manufacturers' standards and kept in a clean and well-functioning state to avoid or minimize contamination from automotive fluids, exhaust emissions, and unnecessary noise.	Construction	Construction Contractor
GEN-9	Construction vehicle engine idling will be limited to reduce construction equipment emissions.	Construction	Construction Contractor
GEN-10	Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be used to reduce spills from refueling, during overnight parking, and any other activities that may release petroleum products into the environment.	Construction	Construction Contractor
GEN-11	All fuel, transmission, or brake fluid leaks, or other hazardous waste leaks, spill, or releases will be reported immediately to the designated NPS and/or MRCA safety officer. The construction contractor shall be responsible for spill material removal and disposal to an approved off-site landfill and, if necessary, will notify the appropriate federal agency. The NPS Safety Officer is responsible for overseeing the clean-up effort.	Construction	Construction Contractor NPS and/or MRCA Safety Officer
GEN-12	All tools, equipment, barricades, signs, surplus materials, and rubbish will be removed from the project work limits upon project completion. Any asphalt or concrete surfaces damaged due to work on the project will be repaired to original condition. All demolition debris will be removed from the project site.	Construction	Construction Contractor
<b>Aesthetics and Visual Resources</b>			

Resource Protection Measures			
Resource Topic / Resource Protection Measure		Timing	Responsible Party/Monitoring
AES-1	The character of the existing Stable building shall be retained to the maximum extent feasible during modification and/or rehabilitation. Final plans for modification of the Stable building and new attached trellis and structures, widening of the entry gate, walls and entrance road, and all exterior renovation/rehabilitation to structures dating from 1926-1952 Gillette-Brown era shall be reviewed by NPS Pacific West Region cultural resource professionals.	Design	NPS Project Manager Design/Architectural Contractor NPS PWR Cultural Resource Professionals
AES-2	Building materials and colors for the proposed new restroom/storage structure and the future multi-purpose structure shall be compatible with the character of the Stable building. Glare shall be reduced to the extent feasible by using non-reflective paint.	Design	NPS Project Manager Design/Architectural Contractor
AES-3	The project landscaping shall consist of drought-tolerant native and/or Mediterranean-type species which adequately screen the project site from surrounding land uses while also maintaining compatibility with the character of the Gillette-Brown era landscape features and the architectural style of the Stable building.	Design	NPS Project Manager Design/Architectural Contractor MRCA Project Manager
AES-4	<p>Visitor Center Services Area and parking lot exterior night lighting shall be of low intensity, low glare, and low height design, and shielded to direct light downward and prevent spillover into the night sky or onto adjacent properties. NPS Night Sky Policies shall be followed (<a href="http://www.nature.nps.gov/air/lightscapes/lighting.cfm">http://www.nature.nps.gov/air/lightscapes/lighting.cfm</a>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use outdoor lights only where they are needed.</li> <li>• Direct all light downward by using shielded lights and aiming them down.</li> <li>• Use motion sensors and timers to insure lights are on only when needed.</li> <li>• Use the right amount of light, not too much, not too little.</li> <li>• In darker areas, use less light to prevent disrupting night vision.</li> </ul>	Design	NPS Project Manager Design/Architectural Contractor MRCA Project Manager

Resource Protection Measures			
Resource Topic / Resource Protection Measure		Timing	Responsible Party/Monitoring
AES-5	Lighting for permitted special events shall be contained within the Visitor Center Services Area and the Stable building courtyard. Lighting requests beyond typical "ambiance" string lighting or similar low-wattage lighting shall be evaluated by partner agencies for potential assignment of special permit conditions on location, intensity, and duration of the requested lighting. For wildlife protection, artificial lighting shall not be used within 100 feet of Stokes Creek, and shall always be shielded and directed away from the creek.	Operation	NPS and MRCA Staff
AES-6	Lighting for permitted filming within the Visitor Center project planning area shall be reviewed by partner agencies for assignment of special permit conditions on location, intensity, and duration of the requested lighting.	Operation	NPS and MRCA Staff
AES-7	Interior lighting of Visitor Center Services Area structures shall be turned off, or dimmed as much as possible for security purposes, and blinds or other window treatments closed to reduce light spillover through windows.	Operation	NPS and MRCA Staff
AES-8	Construction hours shall be restricted to 7:00 am to 5:00 pm, with no work occurring on Saturdays, Sundays, and federal or state holidays. If deemed necessary, work may occur after hours or on prohibited days with prior written approval from NPS. Noisy construction, i.e. above 76 A-weighted decibels (dBA), such as operation of jackhammers and other heavy equipment, will remain limited to daylight hours.	Construction	NPS Project Manager Construction Contractor
AES-9	Programs and permitted special events that will require public address systems or amplified sound systems shall occur only between 9:00 am and 8:00 pm. The systems shall be directed away from neighboring sensitive receptors to minimize the level of noise at the nearest residences and at Malibu Creek State Park. For events continuing after 8:00 p.m., sound systems may be allowed if noise levels are not perceptible at distances greater than 750 feet from the Visitor Center and will not inhibit wildlife's ability to hear each others' calls, to nest without noise harassment, or to hear approaching predators.	Operation	NPS Staff MRCA Staff
<b>Air Quality</b>			
AQ-1	Fugitive Dust. Consistent with SCAQMD Rule 403, it is recommended that fugitive dust generated by grading and construction activities be kept to a minimum with a goal of retaining dust on the site, by following the dust control measures listed below:	Construction	NPS Project Manager Construction Contractor



Resource Protection Measures		
Resource Topic / Resource Protection Measure	Timing	Responsible Party/Monitoring
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. During clearing, grading, earth moving, excavation, or transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to prevent dust from leaving the site and to create a crust after each day's activities cease.</li> <li>b. During construction, water truck or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this will include wetting down such areas later in the morning and after work is completed for the day and whenever winds exceed 15 miles per hour.</li> </ul> <p><i>(Condition continues on next page.)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. Soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.</li> <li>d. Reduce speeds on unpaved roads to less than 15 miles per hours.</li> <li>e. Halt all grading and excavation operations when wind speeds exceed 25 miles per hour.</li> <li>f. Dirt and debris spilled onto paved surfaces at the project site and on the adjacent roadways shall be swept, vacuumed, and/ or washed at the end of each workday.</li> <li>g. Should minor import/ export of soil materials be required, all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose material to and from the construction site shall be tarped and maintain a minimum two feet of freeboard.</li> <li>h. At a minimum, at each vehicle egress from the project site to a paved public road, install a pad consisting of washed gravel (minimum-size: one inch) maintained in a clean condition to a depth of at least six inches and extending at least 30 feet wide and at least 50 feet long (or as otherwise directed by SCAQMD).</li> <li>i. Review and comply with any additional requirements of SCAQMD Rule 403.</li> </ul>		

Resource Protection Measures			
Resource Topic / Resource Protection Measure		Timing	Responsible Party/Monitoring
AQ-2	<p>Exhaust Emissions. The following shall be adhered to during project grading and construction to reduce VOC, NOx, and CO from construction equipment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Heavy-duty diesel-powered construction equipment manufactured after 1996 (with federally mandated "clean" diesel engines) shall be utilized wherever feasible as determined by the City Inspector.</li><li>b. The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.</li><li>c. The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any on time.</li><li>d. Construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer's specifications.</li><li>e. Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible as determined by the City Inspector.</li><li>f. Diesel particulate filters shall be installed, if available.</li><li>g. Diesel-powered equipment shall be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible.</li></ul>	Construction	Construction Contractor
<b>Cultural Resources</b>			
CR-1	<p>Prior to finalizing the project design, Phase II archaeological testing shall be carried out to determine the boundaries for CA-LAN-229 and CA-LAN-44 within the project planning area. Depending on Phase II findings, Phase III data recovery may be required. Archaeological testing shall be performed by a qualified archaeologist that meets the U.S. Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines for professional qualifications. (See <a href="http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_9.htm">http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_9.htm</a>).</p>	Design	NPS Project Manager NPS SMMNRA Cultural Anthropologist Qualified Archaeologist
CR-2	<p>The final design of the proposed stormwater drainage swale located in the field north of the Stable building shall avoid any focused release of collected water to avoid down-flow erosional incising and exposure of archaeological artifacts that could then wash away. The final design of the swale will incorporate input from a qualified archaeologist and Native Americans to avoid potential impact to adjacent archaeological sites.</p>	Design	NPS Project Manager Construction Contractor

Resource Protection Measures			
Resource Topic / Resource Protection Measure		Timing	Responsible Party/Monitoring
CR-3	<p>All ground disturbance shall be monitored by a qualified archaeologist that meets the U.S. Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines for professional qualifications (See <a href="http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_9.htm">http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_9.htm</a>).</p> <p>Ground disturbing actions include the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visitor Center Services Area facilities construction</li> <li>• Foundation excavation and seismic stabilization in and around the Stable building</li> <li>• Print Shop demolition</li> <li>• Entry road widening</li> <li>• Parking lot and turnaround loop construction</li> <li>• Stormwater runoff control and treatment construction</li> <li>• Geo-thermal heating and cooling system construction</li> <li>• Interpretive programs amphitheatre</li> <li>• Landscaping installation</li> </ul> <p>A pre-construction meeting will be held with the NPS Cultural Anthropologist and the responsible parties to discuss the area's historic resources, clarify construction schedules, and establish a plan for archaeological monitoring of ground disturbing site work.</p>	Construction	NPS Project Manager Construction Contractor Qualified Archaeologist
CR-4	<p>If archaeological resources are discovered during construction-related ground disturbance, work shall be halted immediately in the vicinity of the find until National Park Service staff have been contacted and an appropriate mitigation strategy developed. Work may resume only after actions have been completed to address the findings. Any artifacts found will be curated by the National Park Service.</p> <p>If human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony are encountered, excavation and ground disturbing work on or adjacent to the project site (or area of discovery) shall be stopped immediately in the vicinity. Provisions outlined in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (25 USC 3001) will be followed.</p>	Construction	NPS Project Manager NPS SMMNRA Cultural Anthropologist Qualified Archaeologist

Resource Protection Measures			
Resource Topic / Resource Protection Measure		Timing	Responsible Party/Monitoring
CR-5	Archaeological sites present at King Gillette Ranch shall be assessed every five years by a qualified archaeologist, and the conditions for the sites shall then be updated in the NPS Archaeological Site Management Information System.	Operation	NPS SMMNRA Cultural Anthropologist Qualified Archaeologist
CR-6	<p>The following actions will be taken to reduce unauthorized collecting of historic and archaeological artifacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction personnel will be educated about the need to protect any cultural resources encountered.</li> <li>• In advance of ground disturbing activities, instructions will be given regarding respectful treatment of human remains, and notification of the appropriate personnel in the event such remains are discovered.</li> <li>• Work crews will be instructed of the illegality of collecting artifacts on federal lands (Archaeological Resources Protection Act).</li> <li>• Partner agencies' staff will continue to educate visitors about the cultural significance of Native American archaeological sites and the respect with which such sites should be treated, including why it is illegal to collect artifacts.</li> </ul>	Construction Operation	NPS Project Manager NPS SMMNRA Cultural Anthropologist Qualified Archaeologist NPS and MRCA staff
<b>Park Operations</b>			
PO-1	NPS base funding and FTE increases shall be requested for maintenance and interpretive staff to cover added park operational needs at the new Visitor Center.	Operation	NPS SMMNRA Superintendent
<b>Public Safety – Natural Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>			
PS-1	The Stable building will be retrofitted with seismic stability features that meet current federal, state, and local building codes for seismic safety.	Design	NPS Project Manager Design/Architectural Contractor

Resource Protection Measures			
Resource Topic / Resource Protection Measure		Timing	Responsible Party/Monitoring
PS-2	<p>The final grading plan shall prescribe grading strategies to protect structures from potential damage from liquifaction during earthquakes and soil settlement associated with expansive/compressible soils. The final design geotechnical report upon which the final grading plan will be based shall incorporate the recommendations stated in the preliminary geotechnical evaluation prepared for the Visitor Center (N&amp;M 2009), summarized as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Earthwork shall be performed in general accordance with local and state agency grading ordinances and sound construction practices.</li> <li>• A liquefaction analysis may be needed, and appropriate mitigation will be based on site-specific subsurface evaluation.</li> <li>• On-site soils may need to be further evaluated to determine the extent of potential issues with expansive soils, soil settlement, and corrosive soils. Appropriate mitigation may involve removal of the problem soils and replacement with compacted fill, or deepening of building footings to extend to competent material.</li> </ul>	Design	NPS Project Manager Design/Architectural Contractor
PS-3	The final design of the stormwater control system shall reduce the potential for flooding of the Stable building. The final design shall also protect the Stable building and new structures from soil settlement resulting from moisture infiltration into subsurface soils and/or expansive soil movement due to moisture fluctuation of the surficial/subsurface soil.	Design	NPS Project Manager Design/Architectural Contractor
PS-4	Implementation of the proposed on-site, green technology, wastewater treatment system will take place only if the system complies with federal, state, and local building codes for health and sanitation systems.	Design	NPS Project Manager Design/Architectural Contractor
PS-5	Upon excavation of the existing concrete foundation in the north wing of the Stable building, the construction contractor shall observe the underlying soil for signs of petroleum product contamination, including soil appearance and odor. If signs of contamination are present, the construction contractor shall immediately notify the NPS Project Manager. NPS will then develop and appropriate mitigation strategy for treating the contaminated soils.	Construction	NPS Project Manager Construction Contractor

<b>Resource Protection Measures</b>			
<b>Resource Topic / Resource Protection Measure</b>		<b>Timing</b>	<b>Responsible Party/Monitoring</b>
PS-6	All demolition and renovation work associated with removing asbestos-containing materials will be guided by an asbestos investigation and removal plan. This plan will be compliant with all federal, state, and local requirements and in accordance with Occupational Safety and Health standards pertaining to employee or worker exposure covered under 29 CFR 1910.1001. Additional work practices will comply with the Construction Standard for the Asbestos Industry (40 CFR 1926.1101 or CFR Title 8 Section 1529).	Construction	Construction Contractor
PS-7	Where appropriate, activities conducted in interior rooms and spaces will be guided by a lead abatement investigation and removal plan. This plan will be compliant with all federal, state, and local requirements in accordance with Title 15, Chapter 53, subchapter IV Section 2688 – Control of Lead-based Paint Hazards at Federal Facilities and the Occupational Safety & Health Administration standard for construction (29 CFR 1926.62).	Construction	Construction Contractor
PS-8	A wildfire evacuation plan shall be developed and partner agency staff trained in its implementation prior to commencement of Visitor Center operation.	Operation	NPS Fire Management Officer and Safety Officer Partner Agency Staff
<b>Utilities and Public Services</b>			
UTL-1	To address construction & demolition (C&D) solid waste impacts, a C&D Waste Recycling and Reuse Plan (RRP) shall be prepared to ensure that C&D materials (e.g., asphalt, concrete, and green waste) are recycled and/or reused to the maximum extent feasible, in order to divert a minimum of 50% of the C&D debris from disposal at the local landfill.	Design	NPS Project Manager Construction Contractor
UTL-2	To address operational solid waste impacts, NPS shall develop and implement a Trash & Recycling Program for the Visitor Center. The trash/recycling program shall identify the location and type of each non-recyclable and recyclable container, the frequency and method of trash/recycling pick-up, and include signage to encourage park visitors to dispose of their trash properly.	Operation	NPS and MRCA management.

Resource Protection Measures			
Resource Topic / Resource Protection Measure		Timing	Responsible Party/Monitoring
UTL-3	NPS shall implement a green waste recycling program for the Visitor Center. The Green Waste Recycling Program shall require that green waste be recycled as mulch, and applied on-site, whenever feasible.	Operation	NPS and MRCA management.
<b>Vegetation</b>			
VEG-1	Construction fencing shall be installed to delineate the 100-foot setback from the top of the Stokes Creek streambank or from the edge of the riparian canopy adjacent to the stream, whichever distance is greater. NPS staff shall verify that the fencing has been correctly located.	Construction	NPS Project Manager Construction Contractor NPS Staff
VEG-2	Staging areas and soil stockpiling locations shall be located within the existing barren areas in the project planning area and that are outside the 100-foot setback from Stokes Creek.	Construction	NPS Project Manager Construction Contractor NPS Staff
VEG-3	<p>To avoid injury or damage to native oaks and sycamores that could potentially be impacted by construction, construction fencing will be placed at least five feet outside the edge of the canopy of trees, or 15 feet from the trunk, whichever distance is greater. Equipment use, parking, and materials storage shall be prohibited within the fenced areas. Construction fencing around trees will include, but not be limited to, the following areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sycamores surrounding the Stable building courtyard (northern and eastern sides of the trees)</li> <li>• Oak trees north and west of the Print Shop</li> <li>• Oak trees within or near the development footprint of the proposed parking lot and turnaround area</li> <li>• Valley oaks on the east side of the entrance road</li> </ul> <p>Prior to commencing construction, NPS staff shall confirm that all trees have been adequately fenced.</p>	Construction	Construction Contractor NPS SMMNRA Plant Ecologist/Arborist

Resource Protection Measures			
Resource Topic / Resource Protection Measure		Timing	Responsible Party/Monitoring
VEG-4	<p>The two oak trees adjacent to the visitor orientation plaza within the Visitor Center Services Area and those that border the area on the western side shall also be fenced, with the understanding that fencing will have to be removed during construction tasks that will encroach into the protected root zone. Encroaching activities around any oak trees within the project planning areas shall be performed using techniques and equipment that minimize removal of roots or crushing of the root system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trenching for utilities shall require digging with hand tools, wrapping temporarily exposed roots, and threading of conduit through roots to the maximum extent feasible.</li> <li>• Excavation for the concrete walkway slab around the restroom/storage building and future multi-purpose structure shall be to the minimal depth needed for the sidewalk.</li> <li>• Excavation for constructing the visitor orientation plaza and fountain shall be minimized, and performed with hand tools, with minimal cutting of the root system. Base material for the plaza shall be clean and non-toxic, and shall be backfilled in around roots and minimally compacted as balanced with making sure the plaza surface will remain stable, with minimal settling.</li> </ul>	Construction	Construction Contractor NPS SMMNRA Plant Ecologist/Arborist MRCA Biologist
VEG-5	<p>To mitigate the encroachment into four oak trees, a minimum of two trees for each tree that has an encroachment, per requirements of the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Protection Ordinance. Eight replacement oak trees shall be planted for the four encroached-upon trees. The trees shall be planted within the two defined restoration areas on the northern side of Stokes Creek. If possible, oak tree stock should be grown from acorns from trees within the King Gillette Ranch area or adjacent Malibu Creek State Park. The health of the trees shall be monitored for at least five years, with replacement trees planted for any trees that do not survive within the five-year timeframe.</p>	Operation	NPS SMMNRA Restoration Ecologist MRCA Biologist
VEG -6	<p>The stormwater catchment facility on the east side of the eucalyptus allée shall be constructed at least 26 feet from the nearby eucalyptus tree(s) to avoid impact to the tree root systems.</p>	Construction	NPS Project Manager Construction Contractor



Resource Protection Measures			
Resource Topic / Resource Protection Measure		Timing	Responsible Party/Monitoring
VEG-7	The area around the proposed stormwater catchment swale in the field north of the Stable building shall be monitored for post-disturbance germination of noxious non-native plant species. Monitoring and, if necessary, weed eradication efforts shall take place for three years after construction. Monitoring for post-construction presence of new non-native weed species in all areas where ground has been disturbed shall occur for three years, and eradication efforts made in the case of finding new weed occurrences.	Operation	NPS SMMNRA Plant Ecologist
VEG-8	Two barren areas adjacent to Stokes Creek, comprising approximately two acres, shall be restored as riparian habitat to widen the vegetated corridor along Stokes Creek in the project planning area north of the southern boundary (Figure 13). The restoration will mitigate construction-related impacts to native trees and project operational impacts to wildlife from light and noise. The restoration may also incorporate a footpath for use in interpretive and educational programs offered at the Ranch. NPS will prescribe a plant palette consistent with natural, undisturbed habitat along Stokes Creek in Malibu Creek State Park and determine restoration performance standards for assuring restoration success.	Operation	NPS Restoration Ecologist NPS and MRCA Staff
<b>Water Resources – Hydrology and Water Quality</b>			
WR-1	A Stormwater Pollution Protection Plan (SWPPP) that meets U.S. Environmental Protection Agency requirements for reducing impacts to water quality shall be prepared, and implementing water quality-protective Best Management Practices (BMPs) for construction sites. Any pertinent Best Management Practices (BMPs) consistent with Los Angeles County's Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) will be incorporated into the SWPPP.	Construction	NPS Project Manager Construction Contractor
WR-2	Erosion control devices, including temporary siltation basins, shall be installed around all construction areas to insure that sedimentation is trapped and properly removed. Stored topsoil will be surrounded by silt fencing and overtopped by semi-permeable matting anchored together to prevent siltation from heavy runoff during rainstorms. Erosion control devices shall be inspected periodically throughout the construction project and during rain storms.	Construction	Construction Contractor

Resource Protection Measures			
Resource Topic / Resource Protection Measure		Timing	Responsible Party/Monitoring
WR-3	Installation of native and other landscaping shall take place as soon as work in each area has been completed, i.e. around the Visitor Center Services Area, the parking lot, and around the new picnicking area that will replace the Print Shop. All plantings shall be in place within one year after completion of construction in that area. Any fertilizer, herbicides, or pesticides used on the landscaping will be subject to approval through the NPS Integrated Pest Management System prior to application.	Construction	Construction Landscape Contractor NPS Staff
WR-4	All debris, litter, leaks or spills shall be removed promptly and in an approved manner.	Construction	Construction Contractor
WR-5	To prevent pesticides and herbicides from mixing with stormwater or presenting hazardous exposures, the agencies shall establish a landscape maintenance and management plan that includes approval through the NPS Integrated Pest Management System.	Operation	NPS and MRCA Staff
WR-6	Stormwater collection systems shall be routinely inspected in conformance with any regulatory agency permit conditions to ensure that filtering technologies are properly functioning and to ensure that no erosion is occurring at the outfall point in the system.	Operation	NPS and MRCA Staff
<b>Wildlife</b>			
WLD-1	During construction, trash cans and recycling bins shall be made available for construction workers. All food and containers shall be removed from the site and properly disposed of daily. During the construction close-out final walk-through to confirm that all trash bins have been removed.	Construction	NPS Project Manager Construction Contractor
WLD-2	Trash cans and recycling bins will be conveniently placed to encourage prompt disposal of wastes and to discourage littering. Trash cans and recycling bins shall be frequently emptied. Signs shall be installed directing visitors to not feed animals.	Operation	NPS and MRCA Staff
WLD-3	Light and noise shall be controlled to avoid disturbance to wildlife using the riparian habitat and the individual oak trees throughout the site. See conditions under Aesthetics for lighting and noise mitigation measures.	Operation	NPS and MRCA Staff

Resource Protection Measures		
Resource Topic / Resource Protection Measure	Timing	Responsible Party/Monitoring
<p>WLD-4 To assure compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), areas either directly or indirectly affected by construction activities shall be surveyed for nesting birds. The surveys shall be conducted in accordance with California Department of Fish and Game regulations designed to uphold the MBTA, prescribed as follows (CDFG, South Coast Region 5, 2007).</p> <p>"Proposed project activities (including disturbances to native and non-native vegetation and man-made nesting substrates) shall take place outside of the breeding bird season which generally runs from March 1- August 31 (as early as February 1 for raptors) to avoid take (including disturbances which would cause abandonment of active nests containing eggs and/or young). Take means to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture of kill (Fish and Game Code Section 86).</p> <p>"If project activities cannot feasibly avoid the breeding bird season, the Department recommends that beginning thirty days prior to the disturbance of suitable nesting habitat the project proponent shall arrange for weekly bird surveys to detect any protected native birds in the habitat to be removed and any other such habitat within 200 feet of the construction work</p> <p><i>(Condition continues on next page.)</i></p> <p>area (within 500 feet for raptors) as access to adjacent areas allows. The surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist with experience in conducting breeding bird surveys. The surveys shall continue on a weekly basis with the last survey being conducted no more than 3 days prior to the initiation of clearance/construction work. If a protected native bird is found, the project proponent shall delay all clearance/construction disturbance activities in suitable nesting habitat or within 200 feet of nesting habitat (within 500 feet for raptor nesting habitat) until August 31 or continue the surveys in order to locate any nests. If an active nest is located, clearing and construction within 200 feet of the nest (within 500 feet for raptor nests) shall be postponed until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged and when there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. Limits of construction to avoid a nest shall be</p>	Construction	NPS Staff Construction Contractor Qualified Bird Specialist

Resource Protection Measures			
Resource Topic / Resource Protection Measure		Timing	Responsible Party/Monitoring
<p>established in the field with flagging and stakes or construction fencing. Construction personnel shall be instructed on the sensitivity of the area. The project proponent shall record the results of the recommended protective measures described above to document compliance with applicable State and Federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds."</p> <p>NPS staff shall identify the appropriate person to perform bird surveys. Areas to be surveyed will include the oaks and sycamores surrounding the Stable building and Print Shop, the eucalyptus allée, the open fields to the north and east of the Stable and Print Shop, and along Stokes Creek.</p>			
WLD-5	<p>If agency staff or contractors come into contact with the Stokes Creek stream channel, whether wet or dry, the following measures shall be taken to protect against the spread of the invasive non-native New Zealand mudsnail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine that shoes, waders, pants, or other articles of clothing are free from mudsnails from other infested waters prior to entering the stream channel.</li> <li>After coming into contact with water or the sandy substrate in Stokes Creek, freeze shoes, socks, waders, and other articles of clothing for no less than 36 hours. A freezer will be available for NPS staff and Visitor Center contractors at the Diamond X Ranch. NPS staff will advise on the freezer's location.</li> </ul>	Construction and Operation	Construction Contractor NPS and MRCA Staff

## **Public Involvement**

### **Internal Scoping**

Internal scoping included appropriate staff from NPS and from associated partner agencies, including California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) and the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA). Throughout the design process, an interagency steering committee of the Visitor Center agency partners met on a monthly basis to review potential issues and to formulate next steps in the Visitor Center design process. Agency staff were consulted about the Visitor Center design, including facilities and appearance, parking layout and circulation, sustainable design features, and concepts for interpretive programs and visitor experience. NPS staff provided comments and necessary edits during drafting of the EA.

### **External Scoping**

The 1982 SMMNRA GMP was the first publicly reviewed document envisioning a jointly operated administration, environmental and cultural education center at King Gillette Ranch (then referred to as "Claretville"). Extensive public involvement re-occurred beginning in 1997, when scoping for the GMP update began, resulting in the current 2002 SMMNRA GMP/EIS. The 2002 planning effort maintained the 1982 GMP's vision for a joint facility at King Gillette Ranch and provided a programmatic environmental impact analysis.

In late 2008, NPS, CDPR, and MRCA, initiated a public scoping process for the proposed King Gillette Ranch Design Concept Plan (DCP). The proposed DCP will provide a vision for formalizing public access and recreational use of the full 588-acre Ranch and will implement site-specific improvements for the joint agency administrative, environmental, and cultural education center envisioned in the 2002 SMMNRA GMP. Public scoping for the DCP included receiving input on the construction and operation of a proposed visitor center. The public was informed of the opportunity to provide early input through mailing a hardcopy notification by the MRCA; posting the public scoping meeting schedule on websites for NPS and MRCA; and publishing the meeting notice at the NPS Planning, Environmental, and Public Comment (PEPC) website. The initial scoping meetings included an informal site visit on November 8, 2008, and a formal public scoping meeting on November 18, 2008, to present the DCP and potential environmental issues being considered for the planning process and to gather public comments. The agencies received more than 200 comment letters and emails through the close of the scoping period on January 10th, 2009.

On September 24, 2009, and September 26, 2009, the agencies hosted two additional public workshops specifically about visitor-serving facilities. [Public notification of the meetings was via the same venues noted for the initial 2008 public scoping meetings: hardcopy notification, website posting, and publishing in PEPC. More than 50 people attended the two workshops. The workshops were structured to receive participants' input on desired visitor center amenities and services through their responses to a

guided qualitative survey. Overall, the public expressed preferences for a less-developed facility with typical visitor center amenities.

Upon initiating preparation of a joint federal/state compliance document for the proposed DCP, the NPS and partner agency staff found the level of impact analysis necessary for the project-level visitor center and a programmatic review of a long-term vision for the full 588-acre ranch would be exceedingly complex and confusing for the public to review. The partner agencies agreed that, for the appropriate level of conservation planning and impact analysis for the visitor center project and for facilitating the public understanding and review, the environmental impact analysis would be facilitated through a separate NEPA compliance document. The NPS then proceeded with preparation of the *Anthony C. Beilenson Visitor Center at King Gillette Ranch EA*. The NPS used the public scoping input received for the proposed DCP, inclusive of the Visitor Center, to define the purpose and need, identify potential actions to address the need, to determine the likely issues and impact topics, and to identify the relationship of the preferred alternative to other planning efforts in the park.

## **Public Review**

The EA was released for public review from February 12, 2010, through March 15, 2010. Over 400 members of the public and various agencies were notified of the EA's availability, including NPS and partner agency staff. Forty-three hardcopies were mailed to the public and other agencies, 109 notifications were mailed via U.S. Postal Service, and 261 notifications were sent via e-mail. The EA was also made available at public libraries in Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Malibu, Santa Monica, Thousand Oaks, and Westlake Village, and on SMMNRA website ([www.nps.gov/samo](http://www.nps.gov/samo)) and the PEPC public review website (<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/samo>). A press release was distributed to 41 reporters and was published in four newspapers, including the *Ventura County Star*, *LAist.com*, the *Acorn*, and the *Topanga Messenger*. Notification of the EA's availability was also provided in newsletters of the Las Virgenes Homeowners Federation, the Sierra Club's Santa Monica Mountains Task Force, and the California Native Plant Society.

In response to the EA, 18 written comments were received from the public. Twelve individuals and six organizations commented, including Thousand Oaks Plein Air Watercolorists, Las Virgenes Homeowners Federation, Viewridge Owners Involved in the Community and Environment (VOICE), Monte Nido Valley Community Association, ETI Corral #36, and the City Project. No letters were received from public agencies, including any regulatory agencies. All comments received will be maintained in the project administrative record.

Most comments addressed issues already adequately covered in the EA, including selection of the Visitor Center location at the Stable building, its visual impacts as viewed from nearby public roads, and protection of the original architectural style; the selected and alternative circulation options; consideration of equestrian uses of the Stable building and lands within the project planning area; parking space at the Visitor Center for horse trailers; and noise and lighting associated with nighttime permitted special events. Other comments addressed design elements that will be covered in

the final design phase of the project, including Visitor Center exhibits, provision for hitching rails and equestrian-friendly picnicking facilities, catering-oriented facilities, and design-related seismic safety features. Yet other comments addressed issues that will be covered in the forthcoming environmental review document for the King Gillette Ranch Design Concept Plan (DCP). Topics to be addressed in the DCP process include trail connections, use designation, trail signs, and trailhead facilities including horse trailer parking; special permitted uses at locations throughout King Gillette Ranch; recreational tours of the ranch estate and use of the White House; environmental education and recreation programs throughout the ranch; and wildfire hazard and evacuation needs for activities around the ranch. All public comments relevant to the DCP are maintained in the administrative record and will be used in beginning the DCP effort. No comments warranted development of an additional alternative or reconsideration of alternatives that were dismissed. No new substantive issues were presented. No comments brought into question the adequacy of the Environmental Consequences assessment. Therefore, the alternatives remain as described in the EA, and no changes were made in the assessment of environmental consequences other than minor word-processing edits and corrections to sentences or graphics in response to NPS staff review comments; all such comments are documented in errata sheets prepared as a technical attachment to the original EA.

## **Agency Consultation**

### ***Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, California State Historic Preservation Officer***

The 1966 National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), amended 1992, requires agencies to consult with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and State Historic Preservation Officer regarding undertakings that may affect historic properties. §106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to consider effects of their actions on properties that may be eligible for listing or are listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

NPS commissioned the NPS, Pacific West Region, Cultural Resources Division, to conduct a cultural resources survey and inventory report within the area of potential effect for the entire King Gillette Ranch property, including the Visitor Center project planning area, to document the cultural resource effect determination for consideration by the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). This study indicated that, although the site was deemed significant, it does not retain sufficient integrity from its period of significance, and therefore it is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NPS 2007). The results of this study were incorporated into the EA, resulting in a dismissal of historic structures and cultural landscapes from further review.

An archaeological assessment was also prepared in 2006 for use in environmental impact analysis of the proposed King Gillette Ranch Design Concept Plan (DCP), inclusive of the Visitor Center EA's Area of Potential Effect (APE). The archaeological site of a former village, Talepop, lies within the APE, along with two other documented archaeological sites within or adjacent to the APE. Given the notoriety of the Talepop site, staff assumed its eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places and included

resource protection measures in the EA (and this FONSI) for Phase II testing. The results of the Phase II work will be used to design the final construction plans for maximum avoidance of disturbance of archaeological resources. Other measures were addressed in the EA and documented in the Mitigation Matrix (above), including professional archaeological monitoring.

On February 12, 2010, the NPS submitted the EA to the SHPO requesting concurrence with the park's finding of no adverse effect on historic properties, providing that the resource protection measures identified in the EA are implemented. On March 17, the NPS contacted the SHPO to inquire as to whether SHPO intended to provide comments on the EA. The SHPO contact requested additional, cultural resource-specific information on the proposed Visitor Center undertaking. In a letter dated March 30, 2010, the NPS submitted to SHPO the additional information along with the 2006 archaeological assessment report. In a series of telephone consultations (and eMail exchanges) during May 6-10, 2010, SHPO and NPS staff reviewed NPS findings, SHPO concerns, and jointly crafted an acceptable course of action for implementing the project. In particular: (1) the NPS confirmed that further consultation with SHPO will occur during the Phase II testing; and (2) the NPS will continue to consult with the SHPO during the design-build process and prior to ground-disturbance to further ensure avoiding or\and minimizing adverse impacts.

### **Native American Indian Tribes**

Several members of the local and regional Native American community were invited to comment on the EA. Included among the community members is the Santa Ynez Band of Mission Indians, the officially recognized representatives of Native Americans of Chumash heritage. The EA was distributed to ten members of recognized and unrecognized Native American communities in California. No written comments were received. On March 9, 2010, the Santa Ynez Band of Mission Indians representative informed NPS that the band would not be getting involved with the Visitor Center project. Despite of the absence of written comments and the verbally reported decline of involvement by the Santa Ynez Band, there has been long-running interest on the part of Chumash in projects having potential to affect Native American archaeological sites within the park. NPS staff has found the most effective means of receiving input from Chumash has been through personal interactions and meetings rather than written comments on public review documents. To that end, the EA assigned resource protection measures prescribing continued coordination with contemporary Native Americans in California during implementation of the selected alternative. Chumash input will be sought via invitations to attend on-site meetings and, if warranted, to discuss strategies to address archaeological resource findings.

### **California Coastal Commission**

The project planning area is located within the California Coastal Zone, and therefore is subject to terms of the 1972 federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA). As part of the EA's release for public review, copies of the EA were provided to the Coastal Commission's South Central Coast field office and to the Federal Consistency



Coordinator in the agency's San Francisco office. In compliance with the CZMA, NPS prepared an analysis of the selected alternative's consistency with policies of Chapter 3 of the 1976 California Coastal Act and submitted it to Coastal Commission on March 9, 2010. A request for concurrence with the park's finding of a negative determination, i.e. that the project would not negatively impact coastal resources. In a letter dated March 30, 2010, the park received the Coastal Commission concurrence with our finding of a negative determination.

### **Los Angeles County**

King Gillette Ranch is located in Los Angeles County, and is subject to the County's land use policies and zoning prescriptions. The subject project planning area lies wholly within the California Coastal Zone. As such, the NPS acknowledges and, as part of adhering to the previously mentioned federal CZMA, attempts to maintain consistency with land use policies in the Malibu Land Use Plan (LUP), prepared and approved by the Coastal Commission in 1986. The land use designations are described in §3.2.6. However, the Malibu LUP is only one component of the required two-component Local Coastal Programs that are certified by the Coastal Commission before permitting authority in the Coastal Zone is transferred from Coastal Commission to the local agency—Los Angeles County in this case. Therefore, Los Angeles County defers to the California Coastal Commission for approval of projects in the Coastal Zone. In this case, the previously mentioned federal consistency determination is the NPS's obligation to Coastal Commission, and indirectly, to Los Angeles County. The EA was submitted to the Los Angeles County Third Supervisorial District and to the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning; no comments were received.

### **California Department of Fish and Game**

The California Endangered Species Act (California Fish and Game Code §2050, et seq.) generally parallels the main provisions of the Federal Endangered Species Act and is enforced by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). The NPS recognizes and manages state-listed threatened and endangered species similarly to federally listed species. Thus, NPS consults with the CDFG to ensure that any actions undertaken are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species or result in destruction or adverse modification of essential habitat. The EA was submitted to staff at CDFG Region 5. No written comments were received. On March 31, 2010, the park contacted CDFG and confirmed that the CDFG biologist had no concerns with the findings of the EA.

### **Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board/State Water Resources Control Board**

NPS will seek any necessary permits from the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board to ensure compliance with Section 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act, as the project may be subject to permitting under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II requirements. The State Water Resources Control Board, with the applicable regional office covering Los Angeles, is delegated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as the state water pollution control agency, responsible for implementing federal and state water pollution control laws and

regulations. The NPS will prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and submit it for approval as recommended in the EA and including in the resource protection measures in this FONSI. The EA was provided to the agency during the public review period; no comments were received.

**U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), National Marine Fisheries Service**

NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) has identified Malibu Creek Watershed as critical habitat for the endangered southern steelhead trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) and for the endangered tidewater goby (*Eucyclogobius newberryi*). Because Stokes Creek is a tributary to the Malibu Creek Watershed, NPS sought NMFS input during public scoping to assure that the proposed project would have no effect on critical habitat for this species or for its potential restoration. NMFS provided comments during public scoping. The comments recommended the park clearly identify and describe the project, address the interrelated and interdependent actions to give NMFS an understanding of the potential effects on steelhead and their critical habitat, to include measures for avoiding and minimizing potential such negative effects, and to identify any compensatory mitigation measures. The NPS considered the comments during EA preparation. The biological survey used for the EA concluded that Stokes Creek is too ephemeral to provide consistently appropriate habitat for steelhead (NPS 2009) and therefore, the project has no direct impact on these two species. The EA (and this FONSI) included resource protection measures that would minimize any potential indirect effects on critical habitat, such as water quality impacts, and identified restoration within the 100-foot setback for Stokes Creek to improve riparian habitat for all species.

The EA was provided to NMFS during the public review period; no written comments were received. On April 5, 2010, the park submitted a letter to NMFS requesting their review of the EA and concurrence with the EA's findings concerning listed fish species and critical habitat. NMFS notified NPS that, owing to the findings in the EA that the project was not likely to adversely affect the listed fish species and would have no adverse effect on essential fish habitat, no consultation with NMFS would be needed. On April 22, 2010, the NPS sent a letter to NMFS confirming their corroboration with the park's findings.

**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service**

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (1973) as amended (16 United States Code 1531 et seq.), requires federal agencies to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) regarding any action authorized, funded, or carried out by a federal agency to ensure that it does not jeopardize any listed species or its critical habitat. The EA was sent to the USFWS for their review during the public comment period. In addition, on April 5, 2010, the NPS sent a letter requesting concurrence of USFWS with the EA's finding that the project is not likely to adversely affect threatened, endangered, or otherwise sensitive species. In a letter dated April 21, 2010, USFWS offered their concurrence with the EA's findings and recommended resource protection measures.

## Non-Impairment of Park Resources

Pursuant to the 1916 Organic Act, the NPS manager has responsibility "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of future generations." The NPS cannot take actions that would "impair" park resources or values. Based on the analysis provided in the *Anthony C. Beilenson Visitor Center at King Gillette Ranch EA*, the NPS concludes that implementing Alternative B will result in no major impacts to a resource or value whose conservation is (1) necessary to fulfill specific purpose and significance of SMMNRA; (2) key to the natural or cultural integrity of SMMNRA or to opportunities for enjoyment of the national recreation area; or (3) identified as a goal in the GMP or other relevant NPS planning documents. Consequently, implementation of the selected action will not violate the NPS Organic Act.

## Conclusion


On the basis of the information contained in the Environmental Assessment as summarized above, and with consideration for other agency comments and project stipulations, it is the determination of the NPS that the selected alternative is not a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. Nor are the approved actions without precedent nor similar to any activities that normally require an preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement. The conclusions of non-significance are supported by the conservation planning and environmental impact analysis completed and the capability of listed mitigation measures to avoid, reduce or eliminate all foreseeable environmental consequences. There are no unacceptable impacts, nor will any impairment of cultural or natural resources or park values occur. This determination also included due consideration of the minor nature of public commentary received and incorporated federal, state, and local agency recommendations. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared, and the selected alternative may be implemented as soon as practicable.

### Recommended:

  
Woody Smeck, Superintendent  
Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area

5-11-10  
Date

### Approved:

  
George Turnbull, Acting Regional Director  
Pacific West Region

5/11/10  
Date

