CITY OF LOS ANGELES

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK ROOM 395, CITY HALL

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

LEAD CITY AGENCY:		COUNCIL DISTRICT:	
City of Los Angeles		CD 13 – MITCH O'FARRELL	
PROJECT TITLE:	ENVIRONMENTAL	CASE NO.	
Montecito II Senior	CASE:	CPC 2017-1503-DB-CU-SPR	
Housing Project	ENV-2017-1504-SCEA	AA-2017-1505-PMLA	

PROJECT LOCATION: 6650-6668 Franklin Avenue, 1855 N. Cherokee Avenue

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Proposed Project is a senior residential housing development at 6650-6668 Franklin Avenue, 1855 N. Cherokee Avenue in the Hollywood Community Plan Area of the City of Los Angeles. The 33,750 square-foot corner site (0.77 acres) is bounded by Franklin Avenue to the north, North Cherokee Avenue to the east, the Las Palmas Senior Center and Canyon Co-Op School to the west, and a multi-family residential building to the south. Existing development on the site includes the Montecito Apartments and an outdoor courtyard.

The Proposed Project would include 68 new multi-family residential units (67 affordable senior units and one on-site-manager's unit) and ancillary spaces, totaling approximately 53,370 square feet of new building area, approximately 7,000 square feet of recreation/open space areas, and 54 new parking spaces on two subterranean levels, for a total of 101 on-site parking spaces. The Proposed Project would be six stories tall, up to a maximum of 76'-8" feet in height. The new building would be physically connected by a new common lobby to the existing Montecito Apartments Building, providing the residents access to both facilities and the amenities within.

The applicant is requesting: (1) A Density Bonus (DB) pursuant to CA Government Code Section 65915(f)(3) and LAMC Section 12.22.A.25 to permit a Senior Residential Housing Development Project with 118 existing non-conforming units and 68 new units, dedicating 99% of proposed units restricted to Low and Very Low Income Households in exchange for the following incentives: (a) An On-Menu Incentive for an increase in height to permit a new building with 76-feet, 8-inches in height in lieu of the otherwise permitted 72-foot height limit pursuant to Ordinance 165,656 and LAMC 12.21.1 B.2 for a site with more than 20 feet of grade change; (b) An Off-Menu Incentive for a decrease in yards to permit a 4-foot, 6-inch northerly side yard fronting Franklin Boulevard in lieu of the otherwise required 9-foot front yard for a 6-story building pursuant to LAMC 12.11 C.2; (c) An Off-Menu Incentive for a decrease in yards to permit a 10-foot rear yard in lieu of the otherwise required 18-foot rear yard for a 6-story building pursuant to LAMC 12.11 C.3; (2) A Conditional Use Permit to permit pursuant to 12.24 U.26, to permit a housing development project with a density increase greater than the maximum permitted in LAMC 12.22 A.25, for a total of 186 units; (3) Site Plan Review (SPR) pursuant to LAMC 16.05 C, to permit the construction, use, and maintenance of more than 50 new residential units; (4) Preliminary Parcel Map (PMLA) pursuant to LAMC 17.50, a to permit the merger and re-subdivision of five (5) ground lots into one (1) ground lot and two (2) air space lots; and (5) Adoption of the Sustainable Communities Environmental Assessment (SCEA).

NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT IF OTHER THAN CITY AGENCY

Thomas Safran & Associates 11812 San Vicente Blvd, #600 Los Angeles, CA 90049

FINDING:

The Department of City Planning of the City of Los Angeles finds that the Proposed Project will NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is NOT required

SEE ATTACHED SHEET(S) FOR ANY MITIGATION MEASURES IMPOSED

FINDING:						
The Department of City Planning of the City of Los Angeles finds that the Proposed Project will NOT have a						
significant effect on the environment, and an I	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is	s NOT required				
SEE ATTACHED SHEET(S) I	FOR ANY MITIGATION MEASUI	RES IMPOSED				
THE SUSTAINABLE COMMU	JNITIES ENVIRONMENTAL ASS	SESSMENT				
PREPARED FOR	THIS PROJECT IS ATTACHED.					
NAME OF PERSON PREPARING FORM	TITLE	TELEPHONE				
Jenna Monterrosa	City Planner	NUMBER				
* *	_	213-978-1377				
ADDRESS	SIGNATURE (Official)	DATE				
200 North Spring Street						
Room 720	Witherto Hondral	Mai/ 2210				
Los Angeles, CA 90012	Senior City Planner	0100 /2 /11/4				

February 2018

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK ROOM 395, CITY HALL

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

INITIAL STUDY and CHECKLIST (CEQA Guidelines Section 15063)

LEAD CITY AGENCY:	COUNCIL DISTRICT: DATE:				
City of Los Angeles	C	CD 13 – MITCH O'FARRELL February 26, 2018			
RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES: Departn	nen	t of City Planning			
ENVIRONMENTAL CASE:	RELATED CASES:				
ENV-2017-1504-SCEA	CPC 2017-1503-DB-CU-SPR				
	AA-2017-1505-PMLA				
PREVIOUS ACTIONS CASE NO.	□ DOES have significant changes from previous actions.				
		DOES NOT have significant changes	from previous actions.		

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Proposed Project is a senior housing residential development at 6650-6668 Franklin Avenue, 1855 N. Cherokee Avenue in the Hollywood Community Plan Area of the City of Los Angeles. The 33,750 square-foot corner site (0.77 acres) is bounded by Franklin Avenue to the north, North Cherokee Avenue to the east, the Las Palmas Senior Center and Canyon Co-Op School to the west, and a multi-family residential building to the south. Existing development on the site includes the Montecito Apartments and an outdoor courtyard.

The Proposed Project would include 68 new multi-family residential units (67 affordable senior units and one on-site-manager's unit) and ancillary spaces, totaling approximately 53,370 square feet of new building area, approximately 7,000 square feet of recreation/open space areas, and 54 new parking spaces on two subterranean levels, for a total of 101 on-site parking spaces. The Proposed Project would be six stories tall, up to a maximum of 76′-8″ feet in height. The new building would be physically connected by a new common lobby to the existing Montecito Apartments Building, providing the residents access to both facilities and the amenities within.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Proposed Project would include 68 new multi-family residential units (67 affordable senior units and one on-site-manager's unit) and ancillary spaces, totaling approximately 53,370 square feet of new building area, approximately 7,000 square feet of recreation/open space areas, and 54 new parking spaces on two subterranean levels, for a total of 101 on-site parking spaces. The Proposed Project would be six stories tall, up to a maximum of 76′-8″ feet in height. Existing development includes the Montecito Apartments and an outdoor courtyard. This courtyard is the location for the Proposed Project and would be demolished prior to construction.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The rectangular-shaped site is comprised of five legal parcels totaling approximately 33,793 square feet (0.78 acres); bounded by West Franklin Avenue to the north, North Cherokee Avenue to the west, the Las Palmas Senior Center on the west and a multi-family housing building to the south; multi-family housing buildings are located immediately north, east, and west of the Project Site, along Franklin Avenue. The site is currently improved with one structure, a 118-unit, 10-story residential apartment building containing affordable senior housing.

PROJECT LOCATION: 6650-6668 W. Franklin Avenue, 1855 N. Cherokee Avenue						
COMMUNITY PLAN AREA: Hollywood STATUS: □ Preliminary □ Proposed ■ ADOPTED in 1988	☑ Does Conform to Plan☑ Does NOT Conform to Plan	AREA PLANNING COMMISSION: Central	CERTFIED NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL: Hollywood Hills West			
EXISTING ZONING: (Q) R4-2	MAX DENSITY ZONING:	LA River Adjacer No	nt:			
GENERAL PLAN LAND USE: High Density Residential	MAX. DENSITY PLAN:					

Determination (To be completed by Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions on the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

I find that the Project is a qualified "transit priority project" that satisfies the requirements of Sections 21155 and 21155.2 of the Public Resources Code (PRC), and/or a qualified "residential or mixed use residential project" that satisfies the requirements of Section 21159.28(d) of the PRC, and although the Project could have a potentially significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case, because this Sustainable Communities Environmental Assessment (SCEA) identifies measures that either avoid or mitigate to a level of insignificance all potentially significant or significant effects of the Project.

m/ -		, _N
AAVK	City Planner	213-978-1377
Signature	Title	Phone

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:

- 1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less that significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of a mitigation measure has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analysis," as described in (5) below, may be cross referenced).
- 5. Earlier analysis must be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR, or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated
- 7. Supporting Information Sources: A sources list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whichever format is selected.
- 9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

 □ AESTHETICS □ AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES □ AIR QUALITY □ BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES □ CULTURAL RESOURCES □ GEOLOGY AND SOILS □ GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS 	 □ HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS □ HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY □ LAND USE AND PLANNING □ MINERAL RESOURCES □ NOISE 	 □ POPULATION AND HOUSING □ PUBLIC SERVICES □ RECREATION □ TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC □ TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES □ UTILITIES □ MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE
SUSTAINABLE COMMO (To be completed by the Lead City Background PROPONENT NAME: Thomas Safran & Associa		ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST PHONE NUMBER: (310) 820-4888
APPLICANT ADDRESS 11812 San Vicente Blvd, #600 Los Angeles, CA 90049 AGENCY REQUIRING Of Department of City Plann	CHECKLIST:	DATE SUBMITTED: February 26, 2018
PROPOSAL NAME (If A	pplicable):	

Montecito II Senior Housing Project

	Potentially		
	Significant		
Potentially	Unless	Less Than	
Significant	Mitigation	Significant	No
Impact	Incorporated	Impact	Impact

PLEASE NOTE THAT EACH AND EVERY RESPONSE IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES INITIAL STUDY AND CHECKLIST IS SUMMARIZED FROM AND BASED UPON THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS CONTAINED IN ATTACHEMENT B, EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST DETERMINATIONS. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE RESPONSE IN ATTACHMENT B FOR A DETAILED DISCUSSION OF CHECKLIST DETERMINATIONS.

KESI	ONSE IN ATTACHMENT B FOR A DETAILED DISCUSSION	OF CHECKI	JSI DETERMI	NATIONS.	
1.	AESTHETICS				
a.	HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT ON A SCENIC VISTA?			X	
b.	SUBSTANTIALLY DAMAGE SCENIC RESOURCES, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, TREES, ROCK OUTCROPPINGS, AND HISTORIC BUILDINGS, OR OTHER LOCALLY RECOGNIZED DESIRABLE AESTHETIC NATURAL FEATURE WITHIN A CITY-DESIGNATED SCENIC HIGHWAY?			X	
c.	SUBSTANTIALLY DEGRADE THE EXISTING VISUAL CHARACTER OR QUALITY OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS?			X	
d.	CREATE A NEW SOURCE OF SUBSTANTIAL LIGHT OR GLARE WHICH WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT DAY OR NIGHTTIME VIEWS IN THE AREA?			X	
2.	AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES				
a.	CONVERT PRIME FARMLAND, UNIQUE FARMLAND, OR FARMLAND OF STATEWIDE IMPORTANCE, AS SHOWN ON THE MAPS PREPARED PURSUANT TO THE FARMLAND MAPPING AND MONITORING PROGRAM OF THE CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY, TO NON-AGRICULTURAL USE?				X
b.	CONFLICT WITH EXISTING ZONING FOR AGRICULTURAL USE, OR A WILLIAMSON ACT CONTRACT?				X
c.	CONFLICT WITH EXISTING ZONING FOR, OR CAUSE REZONING OF, FOREST LAND (AS DEFINED IN PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 1220(G)), TIMBERLAND (AS DEFINED BY PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 4526), OR TIMBERLAND ZONED TIMBERLAND PRODUCTION (AS DEFINED BY GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 51104(G))?				☒
d.	RESULT IN THE LOSS OF FOREST LAND OR CONVERSION OF FOREST LAND TO NON-FOREST USE?				X
e.	INVOLVE OTHER CHANGES IN THE EXISTING ENVIRONMENT WHICH, DUE TO THEIR LOCATION OR NATURE, COULD RESULT IN CONVERSION OF FARMLAND, TO NON-AGRICULTURAL USE OR CONVERSION OF FOREST LAND TO NON-FOREST USE?				X
3.	AIR QUALITY				
a.	CONFLICT WITH OR OBSTRUCT IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SCAQMD OR CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PLAN?			X	
b.	VIOLATE ANY AIR QUALITY STANDARD OR CONTRIBUTE SUBSTANTIALLY TO AN EXISTING OR PROJECTED AIR QUALITY VIOLATION?			X	
c.	RESULT IN A CUMULATIVELY CONSIDERABLE NET INCREASE OF ANY CRITERIA POLLUTANT FOR WHICH THE AIR BASIN IS NON-ATTAINMENT (OZONE, CARBON MONOXIDE, & PM 10) UNDER AN APPLICABLE FEDERAL OR STATE AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARD?			X	
d.	EXPOSE SENSITIVE RECEPTORS TO SUBSTANTIAL POLLUTANT			X	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	CONCENTRATIONS?				
e.	CREATE OBJECTIONABLE ODORS AFFECTING A SUBSTANTIAL NUMBER OF PEOPLE?			X	
4.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
a.	HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT, EITHER DIRECTLY OR THROUGH HABITAT MODIFICATION, ON ANY SPECIES IDENTIFIED AS A CANDIDATE, SENSITIVE, OR SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES IN LOCAL OR REGIONAL PLANS, POLICIES, OR REGULATIONS BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME OR U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE?				X
b.	HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT ON ANY RIPARIAN HABITAT OR OTHER SENSITIVE NATURAL COMMUNITY IDENTIFIED IN THE CITY OR REGIONAL PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME OR U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE?				X
c.	HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT ON FEDERALLY PROTECTED WETLANDS AS DEFINED BY SECTION 404 OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT (INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, MARSH VERNAL POOL, COASTAL, ETC.) THROUGH DIRECT REMOVAL, FILLING, HYDROLOGICAL INTERRUPTION, OR OTHER MEANS?				X
d.	INTERFERE SUBSTANTIALLY WITH THE MOVEMENT OF ANY NATIVE RESIDENT OR MIGRATORY FISH OR WILDLIFE SPECIES OR WITH ESTABLISHED NATIVE RESIDENT OR MIGRATORY WILDLIFE CORRIDORS, OR IMPEDE THE USE OF NATIVE WILDLIFE NURSERY SITES?				X
e.	CONFLICT WITH ANY LOCAL POLICIES OR ORDINANCES PROTECTING BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES, SUCH AS TREE PRESERVATION POLICY OR ORDINANCE (E.G., OAK TREES OR CALIFORNIA WALNUT WOODLANDS)?			X	
f.	CONFLICT WITH THE PROVISIONS OF AN ADOPTED HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN, NATURAL COMMUNITY CONSERVATION PLAN, OR OTHER APPROVED LOCAL, REGIONAL, OR STATE HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN?				X
5.	CULTURAL RESOURCES				
a.	CAUSE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE CHANGE IN SIGNIFICANCE OF A HISTORICAL RESOURCE AS DEFINED IN STATE CEQA SECTION 15064.5?		X		
b.	CAUSE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE CHANGE IN SIGNIFICANCE OF AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE PURSUANT TO STATE CEQA SECTION 15064.5?			X	
c.	DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY DESTROY A UNIQUE PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCE OR SITE OR UNIQUE GEOLOGIC FEATURE?			X	
d.	DISTURB ANY HUMAN REMAINS, INCLUDING THOSE INTERRED OUTSIDE OF FORMAL CEMETERIES?			X	
6.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS			1	
a.	EXPOSURE OF PEOPLE OR STRUCTURES TO POTENTIAL SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS, INCLUDING THE RISK OF LOSS, INJURY OR DEATH INVOLVING:				
i.	RUPTURE OF A KNOWN EARTHQUAKE FAULT, AS			X	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	DELINEATED ON THE MOST RECENT ALQUIST-PRIOLO EARTHQUAKE FAULT ZONING MAP ISSUED BY THE STATE GEOLOGIST FOR THE AREA OR BASED ON OTHER SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE OF A KNOWN FAULT? REFER TO DIVISION OF MINES AND GEOLOGY SPECIAL PUBLICATION 42.				
ii.	STRONG SEISMIC GROUND SHAKING?			X	
iii.	SEISMIC-RELATED GROUND FAILURE, INCLUDING LIQUEFACTION?			X	
iv.	LANDSLIDES?				X
b.	RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL SOIL EROSION OR THE LOSS OF TOPSOIL?			X	
c.	BE LOCATED ON A GEOLOGIC UNIT OR SOIL THAT IS UNSTABLE, OR THAT WOULD BECOME UNSTABLE AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT, AND POTENTIAL RESULT IN ON- OR OFF-SITE LANDSLIDE, LATERAL SPREADING, SUBSIDENCE, LIQUEFACTION, OR COLLAPSE?			X	
d.	BE LOCATED ON EXPANSIVE SOIL, AS DEFINED IN TABLE 18-1-B OF THE UNIFORM BUILDING CODE (1994), CREATING SUBSTANTIAL RISKS TO LIFE OR PROPERTY?			X	
e.	HAVE SOILS INCAPABLE OF ADEQUATELY SUPPORTING THE USE OF SEPTIC TANKS OR ALTERNATIVE WASTE WATER DISPOSAL SYSTEMS WHERE SEWERS ARE NOT AVAILABLE FOR THE DISPOSAL OF WASTE WATER?				X
7.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				
a.	GENERATE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, THAT MAY HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT?			X	
b.	CONFLICT WITH AN APPLICABLE PLAN, POLICY OR REGULATION ADOPTED FOR THE PURPOSE OF REDUCING THE EMISSIONS OF GREENHOUSE GASES?			X	
7.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				
a.	CREATE A SIGNIFICANT HAZARD TO THE PUBLIC OR THE ENVIRONMENT THROUGH THE ROUTINE TRANSPORT, USE, OR DISPOSAL OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			X	
b.	CREATE A SIGNIFICANT HAZARD TO THE PUBLIC OR THE ENVIRONMENT THROUGH REASONABLY FORESEEABLE UPSET AND ACCIDENT CONDITIONS INVOLVING THE RELEASE OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS INTO THE ENVIRONMENT?			X	
c.	EMIT HAZARDOUS EMISSIONS OR HANDLE HAZARDOUS OR ACUTELY HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, SUBSTANCES, OR WASTE WITHIN ONE-QUARTER MILE OF AN EXISTING OR PROPOSED SCHOOL?			X	

		Potentially	Potentially Significant Unless	Less Than	
		Significant Impact	Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact	No Impact
d.	BE LOCATED ON A SITE WHICH IS INCLUDED ON A LIST OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SITES COMPILED PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65962.5 AND, AS A RESULT, WOULD IT CREATE A SIGNIFICANT HAZARD TO THE PUBLIC OR THE ENVIRONMENT?			X	
e.	FOR A PROJECT LOCATED WITHIN AN AIRPORT LAND USE PLAN OR, WHERE SUCH A PLAN HAS NOT BEEN ADOPTED, WITHIN TWO MILES OF A PUBLIC AIRPORT OR PUBLIC USE AIRPORT, WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN A SAFETY HAZARD FOR PEOPLE RESIDING OR WORKING IN THE PROJECT AREA?				X
f.	FOR A PROJECT WITHIN THE VICINITY OF A PRIVATE AIRSTRIP, WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN A SAFETY HAZARD FOR THE PEOPLE RESIDING OR WORKING IN THE AREA?				X
g.	IMPAIR IMPLEMENTATION OF OR PHYSICALLY INTERFERE WITH AN ADOPTED EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN OR EMERGENCY EVACUATION PLAN?			X	
h.	EXPOSE PEOPLE OR STRUCTURES TO A SIGNIFICANT RISK OF LOSS, INJURY OR DEATH INVOLVING WILDLAND FIRES, INCLUDING WHERE WILDLANDS ARE ADJACENT TO URBANIZED AREAS OR WHERE RESIDENCES ARE INTERMIXED WITH WILDLANDS?			X	
9.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY				
a.	VIOLATE ANY WATER QUALITY STANDARDS OR WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS?			X	
b.	SUBSTANTIALLY DEPLETE GROUNDWATER SUPPLIES OR INTERFERE WITH GROUNDWATER RECHARGE SUCH THAT THERE WOULD BE A NET DEFICIT IN AQUIFER VOLUME OR A LOWERING OF THE LOCAL GROUNDWATER TABLE LEVEL (E.G., THE PRODUCTION RATE OF PRE-EXISTING NEARBY WELLS WOULD DROP TO A LEVEL WHICH WOULD NOT SUPPORT EXISTING LAND USES OR PLANNED LAND USES FOR WHICH PERMITS HAVE BEEN GRANTED)?			X	
C.	SUBSTANTIALLY ALTER THE EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERN OF THE SITE OR AREA, INCLUDING THROUGH THE ALTERATION OF THE COURSE OF A STREAM OR RIVER, IN A MANNER WHICH WOULD RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL EROSION OR SILTATION ON- OR OFF-SITE?			X	
d.	SUBSTANTIALLY ALTER THE EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERN OF THE SITE OR AREA, INCLUDING THROUGH THE ALTERATION OF THE COURSE OF A STREAM OR RIVER, OR SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE THE RATE OR AMOUNT OF SURFACE RUNOFF IN AN MANNER WHICH WOULD RESULT IN FLOODING ON- OR OFF SITE?			X	
e.	CREATE OR CONTRIBUTE RUNOFF WATER WHICH WOULD EXCEED THE CAPACITY OF EXISTING OR PLANNED STORMWATER DRAINAGE SYSTEMS OR PROVIDE SUBSTANTIAL ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF POLLUTED RUNOFF?			X	
f.	OTHERWISE SUBSTANTIALLY DEGRADE WATER QUALITY?			X	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g.	PLACE HOUSING WITHIN A 100-YEAR FLOOD PLAIN AS MAPPED ON FEDERAL FLOOD HAZARD BOUNDARY OR FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP OR OTHER FLOOD HAZARD DELINEATION MAP?			X	
h.	PLACE WITHIN A 100-YEAR FLOOD PLAIN STRUCTURES WHICH WOULD IMPEDE OR REDIRECT FLOOD FLOWS?			X	
i.	EXPOSE PEOPLE OR STRUCTURES TO A SIGNIFICANT RISK OF LOSS, INQUIRY OR DEATH INVOLVING FLOODING, INCLUDING FLOODING AS A RESULT OF THE FAILURE OF A LEVEE OR DAM?			X	
j.	INUNDATION BY SEICHE, TSUNAMI, OR MUDFLOW?				X
10.	LAND USE AND PLANNING				
a.	PHYSICALLY DIVIDE AN ESTABLISHED COMMUNITY?			X	
b.	CONFLICT WITH APPLICABLE LAND USE PLAN, POLICY OR REGULATION OF AN AGENCY WITH JURISDICTION OVER THE PROJECT (INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE GENERAL PLAN, SPECIFIC PLAN, COASTAL PROGRAM, OR ZONING ORDINANCE) ADOPTED FOR THE PURPOSE OF AVOIDING OR MITIGATING AN ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT?			X	
c.	CONFLICT WITH ANY APPLICABLE HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN OR NATURAL COMMUNITY CONSERVATION PLAN?				X
11.	MINERAL RESOURCES				
a.	RESULT IN THE LOSS OF AVAILABILITY OF A KNOWN MINERAL RESOURCE THAT WOULD BE OF VALUE TO THE REGION AND THE RESIDENTS OF THE STATE?				X
b.	RESULT IN THE LOSS OF AVAILABILITY OF A LOCALLY-IMPORTANT MINERAL RESOURCE RECOVERY SITE DELINEATED ON A LOCAL GENERAL PLAN, SPECIFIC PLAN, OR OTHER LAND USE PLAN?				X
12.	NOISE				
a.	EXPOSURE OF PERSONS TO OR GENERATION OF NOISE IN LEVEL IN EXCESS OF STANDARDS ESTABLISHED IN THE LOCAL GENERAL PLAN OR NOISE ORDINANCE, OR APPLICABLE STANDARDS OF OTHER AGENCIES?		X		
b.	EXPOSURE OF PEOPLE TO OR GENERATION OF EXCESSIVE GROUNDBORNE VIBRATION OR GROUNDBORNE NOISE LEVELS?			X	
c.	A SUBSTANTIAL PERMANENT INCREASE IN AMBIENT NOISE LEVELS IN THE PROJECT VICINITY ABOVE LEVELS EXISTING WITHOUT THE PROJECT?			X	
d.	A SUBSTANTIAL TEMPORARY OR PERIODIC INCREASE IN AMBIENT NOISE LEVELS IN THE PROJECT VICINITY ABOVE LEVELS EXISTING WITHOUT THE PROJECT?		X		
e.	FOR A PROJECT LOCATED WITHIN AN AIRPORT LAND USE PLAN OR, WHERE SUCH A PLAN HAS NOT BEEN ADOPTED, WITHIN TWO MILES OF A PUBLIC AIRPORT OR PUBLIC USE AIRPORT, WOULD THE PROJECT EXPOSE PEOPLE RESIDING OR WORKING IN THE PROJECT AREA TO EXCESSIVE NOISE LEVELS?				X

		Sustainable Communities Enotronmental Assessme			
		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	FOR A DROJECT MUTITION THE MICHIEV OF A DRIVATE AIRCTRID				×
f.	FOR A PROJECT WITHIN THE VICINITY OF A PRIVATE AIRSTRIP, WOULD THE PROJECT EXPOSE PEOPLE RESIDING OR WORKING IN THE PROJECT AREA TO EXCESSIVE NOISE LEVELS?				<u>ι</u> Δι
13.	POPULATION AND HOUSING				
				[[]	
a.	INDUCE SUBSTANTIAL POPULATION GROWTH IN AN AREA EITHER DIRECTLY (FOR EXAMPLE, BY PROPOSING NEW HOMES AND BUSINESSES) OR INDIRECTLY (FOR EXAMPLE, THROUGH EXTENSION OF ROADS OR OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE)?			X	
b.	DISPLACE SUBSTANTIAL NUMBERS OF EXISTING HOUSING NECESSITATING THE CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT HOUSING ELSEWHERE?				X
C.	DISPLACE SUBSTANTIAL NUMBERS OF PEOPLE NECESSITATING THE CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT HOUSING ELSEWHERE?				X
14.	PUBLIC SERVICES				
a.	FIRE PROTECTION?			X	
b.	POLICE PROTECTION?			X	
c.	SCHOOLS?			X	
d.	PARKS?			X	
e.	OTHER PUBLIC FACILITIES (LIBRARIES)?			X	
15.	RECREATION				
a.	WOULD THE PROJECT INCREASE THE USE OF EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD AND REGIONAL PARKS OR OTHER RECREATIONAL FACILITIES SUCH THAT SUBSTANTIAL PHYSICAL DETERIORATION OF THE FACILITY WOULD OCCUR OR BE ACCELERATED?			X	
b.	DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES OR REQUIRE THE CONSTRUCTION OR EXPANSION OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES WHICH MIGHT HAVE AN ADVERSE PHYSICAL EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT?			X	
16.	TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION				
a.	CONFLICT WITH AN APPLICABLE PLAN, ORDINANCE OR POLICY ESTABLISHING MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF THE CIRCULATION SYSTEM, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT ALL MODES OF TRANSPORTATION INCLUDING MASS TRANSIT AND NON-MOTORIZED TRAVEL AND RELEVANT COMPONENTS OF THE CIRCULATION SYSTEM, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO INTERSECTIONS, STREETS, HIGHWAYS AND FREEWAYS, PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE PATHS AND MASS TRANSIT?			X	
b.	CONFLICT WITH AN APPLICABLE CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS AND TRAVEL DEMAND MEASURES, OR OTHER STANDARDS ESTABLISHED BY THE COUNTY CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AGENCY FOR DESIGNATED ROADS OR HIGHWAYS?			X	
c.	RESULT IN A CHANGE IN AIR TRAFFIC PATTERNS, INCLUDING EITHER AN INCREASE IN TRAFFIC LEVELS OR A CHANGE IN LOCATION THAT RESULTS IN SUBSTANTIAL SAFETY RISKS?				X

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d.	SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE HAZARDS TO A DESIGN FEATURE (E.G., SHARP CURVES OR DANGEROUS INTERSECTIONS) OR INCOMPATIBLE USES (E.G., FARM EQUIPMENT)?		X		
e.	RESULT IN INADEQUATE EMERGENCY ACCESS?			X	
f.	CONFLICT WITH ADOPTED POLICIES, PLANS OR PROGRAMS REGARDING PUBLIC TRANSIT, BICYCLE, OR PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES, OR OTHERWISE DECREASE THE PERFORMANCE OR SAFETY OF SUCH FACILITIES?			X	
17.	UTILITIES				
a.	EXCEED WASTEWATER TREATMENT REQUIREMENTS OF THE APPLICABLE REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD?			X	
b.	REQUIRE OR RESULT IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW WATER OR WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES OR EXPANSION OF EXISTING FACILITIES, THE CONSTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS?			X	
c.	REQUIRE OR RESULT IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW STORMWATER DRAINAGE FACILITIES OR EXPANSION OF EXISTING FACILITIES, THE CONSTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS?			X	
d.	HAVE SUFFICIENT WATER SUPPLIES AVAILABLE TO SERVE THE PROJECT FROM EXISTING ENTITLEMENTS AND RESOURCE, OR ARE NEW OR EXPANDED ENTITLEMENTS NEEDED?			X	
e.	RESULT IN A DETERMINATION BY THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PROVIDER WHICH SERVES OR MAY SERVE THE PROJECT THAT IT HAS ADEQUATE CAPACITY TO SERVE THE PROJECT'S PROJECTED DEMAND IN ADDITION TO THE PROVIDER'S EXISTING COMMITMENTS?			X	
f.	BE SERVED BY A LANDFILL WITH SUFFICIENT PERMITTED CAPACITY TO ACCOMMODATE THE PROJECT'S SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL NEEDS?			X	
g.	COMPLY WITH FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL STATUTES AND REGULATIONS RELATED TO SOLID WASTE?			X	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	DOES THE PROJECT HAVE THE POTENTIAL TO DEGRADE THE QUALITY OF THE ENVIRONMENT, SUBSTANTIALLY REDUCE THE HABITAT OF FISH OR WILDLIFE SPECIES, CAUSE A FISH OR WILDLIFE POPULATION TO DROP BELOW SELF-SUSTAINING LEVELS, THREATEN TO ELIMINATE A PLANT OR ANIMAL COMMUNITY, REDUCE THE NUMBER OR RESTRICT THE RANGE OF A RARE OR ENDANGERED PLANT OR ANIMAL OR ELIMINATE IMPORTANT EXAMPLES OF THE MAJOR PERIODS OF CALIFORNIA HISTORY OR PREHISTORY?				
b.	DOES THE PROJECT HAVE IMPACTS WHICH ARE INDIVIDUALLY LIMITED, BUT CUMULATIVELY CONSIDERABLE? ("CUMULATIVELY CONSIDERABLE" MEANS THAT THE INCREMENTAL EFFECTS OF AN INDIVIDUAL PROJECT ARE CONSIDERABLE WHEN VIEWED IN CONNECTION WITH THE EFFECTS OF PAST PROJECTS, THE EFFECTS OF OTHER CURRENT PROJECTS, AND THE EFFECTS OF PROBABLE FUTURE PROJECTS).			X	
c.	DOES THE PROJECT HAVE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH CAUSE SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS ON HUMAN BEINGS, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY?			X	

PREPARED BY:	TITLE:	TELEPHONE NO.:	DATE:	
Jenna Monterrosa	City Planner	213-978-1377	3-1-18	