

APPENDIX A-2:
INITIAL STUDY

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
ROOM 615, CITY HALL
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

INITIAL STUDY AND CHECKLIST

(Article IV B City CEQA Guidelines)

LEAD CITY AGENCY	COUNCIL DISTRICT	DATE
City of Los Angeles	CD 11	October 29, 2002

RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES

PROJECT TITLE/NO.

The Village at Playa Vista

CASE NO.

ENV-2002-6129

PREVIOUS ACTIONS CASE NO.

EIR No. 90-0200-SUB(C) (CUZ) (CUB)
EIR No. 90-0086-(PA) (ZC) (CUB) (SUB)

☒ DOES have significant changes from previous actions.

☐ DOES NOT have significant changes from previous actions.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

See Attachment A

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

See Attachment A

PROJECT LOCATION

See Attachment A

PLANNING DISTRICT

Westchester Playa del Rey District Plan
Playa Vista Area D Specific Plan

STATUS:

☐ PRELIMINARY

☐ PROPOSED June 13, 1974

☒ ADOPTED date

EXISTING ZONING	MAX. DENSITY ZONING	<input type="checkbox"/> DOES CONFORM TO PLAN <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DOES NOT CONFORM TO PLAN <input type="checkbox"/> NO DISTRICT PLAN
M(PV), M2(PV) Industrial R4(PV) Residential	60 DU/gross acre	
PLANNED LAND USE & ZONE	MAX. DENSITY PLAN	
Light/Limited Industry High Medium Density Housing Low Density Housing	60 DU/gross acre	
SURROUNDING LAND USES	PROJECT DENSITY	
See Attachment A	See Attachment A	



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.


SIGNATURE


TITLE

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 than 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 Section

"Earlier Analysis," 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:
- 1) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) 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:
- 1) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - 2) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

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.

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing | |

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST (To be completed by the Lead City Agency)



BACKGROUND

PROPONENT NAME	PHONE NUMBER
Playa Capital Company LLC	(310) 822-0074
PROPONENT ADDRESS	
12555 Jefferson Boulevard, Suite 300, Los Angeles, CA 90066	
AGENCY REQUIRING CHECKLIST	DATE SUBMITTED
City Planning Department	
PROPOSAL NAME (If Applicable)	
The Village at Playa Vista	

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

(Explanations of all potentially and less than significant impacts are required to be attached on separate sheets)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict the existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
III. AIR QUALITY. The significance criteria established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project result in:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the SCAQMD or Congestion Management Plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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 ?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 ?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA §15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

a. Exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving :

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the proposal result in:

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Place within a 100-year flood plain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

XI. NOISE. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Exposure of people to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Fire protection? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Police protection? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Schools?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other governmental services (including roads)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XIV. 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XV. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the project:

a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to ratio capacity on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XVI. UTILITIES. Would the project:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resource, or are new or expanded	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
entitlements needed?				
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Does the project have environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



DISCUSSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

PREPARED BY	<i>Sue Chang</i>	TITLE	<i>City Planner</i>	TELEPHONE #	DATE <i>10/29/02</i>
				<i>(203) 978-1397</i>	

EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST DETERMINATIONS

I. AESTHETICS. *Would the Project:*

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Available scenic vistas across and over the project site are limited to a viewline of the Westchester Bluffs (a scenic resource), from Jefferson Boulevard (a public thoroughfare). Proposed development would alter the views of the bluffs. A potentially significant view impact could occur, and the issue should be addressed further in an EIR.

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?

No Impact. The Proposed Project site does not lie along a scenic highway. The nearest scenic highway lies approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ miles to the west. That highway is designated in regard to visual coastal resources and the Ballona wetlands west of Lincoln Boulevard. No scenic resources occur on the Proposed Project site, and none are apparent for travelers along the scenic highway. No further analysis is required.

c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would replace an open space area with urban development, thus substantially altering the appearance of the site. From the north, the site is easily viewed by travelers along Jefferson Boulevard. Occupants in existing apartments, office/commercial uses along Jefferson Boulevard, and some more distant elevated areas also view, or have views over the Proposed Project site. From the south, the site is easily viewed from the edge of the adjacent bluff top by residents and population associated with the Loyola Marymount University. A potentially significant impact could occur if the Project does not include design features that avoid an appearance of degradation. The issue should be addressed further in an EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The Project would include new sources of lighting, typical of that in urban/suburban areas. Appropriate measures to control lighting effects are required. A potentially significant impact could occur without such measures. The issue should be addressed further in an EIR.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. *In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California agricultural land evaluation and site assessment model (1997) prepared by the California department of conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the Project:*

- 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?**
- b. Conflict the existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?**
- c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?**

Items a., b. and c. No Impact. The Proposed Project site is a former industrial site and contains no agricultural resources. The Project site is an isolated pocket of land lying within an urbanized setting. The land is currently zoned for light industrial and high/medium density residential uses. Urban development currently exists to the south and north of the Project site. Lands to the east and west are currently under construction and/or planned for urban development. No agricultural resources have been mapped under the cited agricultural programs. No impacts would occur to an existing agricultural resource. No further analysis is required.

III. AIR QUALITY. *The significance criteria established by the south coast air quality management district (SCAQMD) may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project result in:*

- a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the SCAQMD or Congestion Management Plan?**
- b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?**
- 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?**
- d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

Items a., b., c. and d. Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project is located in the South Coast Air Basin, which is a “non-attainment” area for ozone, carbon monoxide and PM₁₀. At the same time, the Project would allow a maximum development of 2,600 dwelling units, 175,000 sq.ft. of office space, 150,000 sq.ft. of retail space, and 40,000 sq.ft. of community-serving uses. Such development would require a considerable amount of construction and attract a new population to the Project site. Such activities would result in an increase in air emissions of non-attainment pollutants. As NOC and ROx are precursor pollutants in the creation of ozone, these pollutants are also of interest. Increased pollutants would contribute to the level of regional emissions and could potentially affect nearby sensitive receptor locations (e.g. residences and schools located in the vicinity of the Project site). Impacts on air quality are potentially significant. These issues should be addressed further in an EIR.

- e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed uses (residential, retail, office, and community serving) are not uses associated with the generation of objectionable odor. Furthermore, they are not included in the SCAQMD’s list of “Land Uses Associated with Odor Complaints” (Figure 5-5, CEQA Air Quality Handbook). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No further analysis is required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

- 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 ?**
- 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 ?**

Items a. and b. Potentially Significant Impact. The portion of the Proposed Project site designated for urban development is of a cleared/graded nature with pockets of non-native, ruderal vegetation. Other portions of the Project site, including those containing coastal sage scrub along the southern edge of the site, are proposed for restoration/enhancement and/or establishment of riparian habitat. These Project activities would be positive impacts on biotic resources. No special status species have been recently observed on the Project site. Notwithstanding, construction of the Project would disturb wildlife on the site. Long term operations of the Project would introduce new population, domestic pets, lighting and non-native species to the Project site; all of which could have impacts on wildlife. Further, mitigation would be required to reduce potential impacts, and ensure successful implementation of the proposed habitat improvements to the Project site. Therefore the impacts on habitat should be considered potentially significant. This issue should be addressed further in an EIR.

- 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?**

No Impact. There are approximately 0.7 acres of wetlands located within the Proposed Project area. Alteration to wetlands on the Proposed Project site have been addressed in United States Army Corps of Engineers Permit Number 90-426-EV for the fill of wetlands.. Pursuant to this permit, these wetlands may be filled for development located within the Proposed Project area. No further analysis is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. No significant wildlife movement corridors or nursery sites are known to occur within the Proposed Project site. Notwithstanding, this issue would be addressed further in an EIR, as described under Items IV.a. and IV.b., above.

- 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)?**

No Impact. There are no resources on the Proposed Project site that are subject to protection under local policies or ordinances. No further analysis is required.

- 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?**

No Impact. The Proposed Project site does not fall within the boundaries of an adopted conservation plan. No further analysis is required.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: *Would the project:*

- a. Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA §15064.5?**

No Impact. Two existing buildings on the Project site are components of the former Hughes Plant site. These buildings have been determined to be non-contributors to the Hughes Industrial Historic District, adjacent to the Proposed Project site. The Proposed Project includes no development within the boundaries of the Historic District, or the transition zone adjacent to the structures within the Historic District. Development within the District will occur pursuant to a Historic Resources Treatment Plan for the Playa Vista First Phase Project. (Previous site surveys did not discover historical resources within the Proposed Project site.) No impacts to historic resources are anticipated; however, some sub-surface artifacts could be present. Per item V.b below, potential impacts on cultural resources should be addressed further in an EIR. Historic resources would be addressed in an EIR, as a component of the broader classification of Cultural Resources.

- b. Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA §15064.5?**
- c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**
- d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

Items b., c. and d. Potentially Significant Impacts. Cultural sites considered eligible for listing on the National Register occur within the Project site and its vicinity. Geologic formations similar to those on the Project sites have also revealed paleontologic resources. Proposed development could cover and/or destroy potential resources, unless properly mitigated. Impacts could be potentially significant and should be addressed further in an EIR.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. *Would the project:*

- a. Cause 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 delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.**
 - ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?**
 - iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

Items i., ii. and iii. Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project site is not located within a City of Los Angeles Fault Rupture Studies Zone or within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone. However, the Proposed Project site is located in southern California, which is a seismically active region. Several major faults traverse the Los Angeles Basin, and several are located within the vicinity of the Project site. The risks to people or structures from rupture of a fault, ground shaking, and ground failure (including liquefaction) would be the same for the Proposed Project site as for almost any other location in the region. As such, impacts related to fault rupture, ground shaking, and ground failure should be considered potentially significant and analyzed further in an EIR.

iv. Landslides?

Potentially Significant Impact. The southern portion of the Proposed Project site is located in an area with landslide potential (from failure of the Westchester Bluffs). Slope repair is occurring within the First Phase Project site, and if necessary may be required to continue into the Proposed Project site. Impacts related to landslides should be considered potentially significant and analyzed further in an EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would involve grading for roadways and building pads, which would remove vegetation and expose substantial amounts of topsoil; consequently, the potential exists for substantial soil erosion. Therefore, erosion impacts should be considered potentially significant and analyzed further in an EIR.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. The specific geologic conditions at the Proposed Project site could potentially result in on- or off-site unstable geologic units or soils. As such, risks associated with unstable soils should be considered potentially significant and analyzed further in an EIR.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. Alluvial soils characterize the shallow geology of much of the Proposed Project site, which have shrink-swell potential (i.e., they exhibit expansive properties when exposed to water). Consequently, impacts associated with expansive soils should be considered potentially significant and analyzed further in an EIR.

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?

No Impact. The Proposed Project would connect to the existing sewer system, and would not incorporate use of septic systems into Project development. No impacts related to septic systems or alternative wastewater disposal systems are anticipated, and no further analysis is required.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. *Would the project:*

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would involve residential, commercial, community-serving, and mixed-use land uses, which typically do not generate or handle large amounts of hazardous materials. Furthermore, compliance with all regulations would preclude a significant impact from the transport, use or deposit of hazardous materials. Thus, impacts would be considered less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

- 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?**

Potentially Significant Impact. Previous soil gas sampling analyses have concluded that methane and other soil gases naturally occur in soils at the Proposed Project site. Impacts should be considered potentially significant and analyzed further in an EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Existing or proposed schools exist, or could exist, within ¼ mile of the Proposed Project site. Impacts could be potentially significant and should be addressed further in an EIR.

- 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?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project site contains sites formerly used for industrial applications. These sites are listed and are known to contain various hazardous materials in soil and groundwater. Consequently, impacts from listed hazardous materials sites should be considered potentially significant and analyzed further in an EIR.

- 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?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project site is located less than two miles north of Los Angeles International Airport. The Proposed Project is not expected to affect, or be affected by, aircraft/airport operations. Therefore, impacts associated with the airport would be less than significant. No further analysis is required.

- 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?**

Potentially Significant Impact. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the Proposed Project site. However, there are heliports on and adjacent to the Project site. As such, impacts should be considered potentially significant and analyzed further in an EIR.

- g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Impacts to emergency response and evacuation plans would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

- 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?**

No Impact. The Proposed Project site is located within a highly urbanized area of the City of Los Angeles, with little vegetation or fuel materials in the vicinity with the potential to cause significant wildland fires. No substantial areas of brush or wooded areas exist in close proximity to the Proposed Project site. Therefore, no impacts from wildland fires are anticipated to occur and no further analysis is required.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. *Would the proposal result in:***a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?**

Potentially Significant Impact. Urban runoff associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Project would have the potential to violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. As such, a potentially significant impact could occur, and the issues should be analyzed further in an EIR.

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)?

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would increase urban runoff and impervious surfaces that could adversely affect local groundwater resources. Impacts to groundwater supplies should be considered potentially significant and analyzed further in an EIR.

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?**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 a manner which would result in flooding on- or off site?**

Items c. and d. Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would alter the drainage pattern of the site. Erosion/siltation and flooding impacts, both on- and off-site, could be potentially significant and these issues should be addressed further in an EIR.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would add impermeable surfaces over most of the site; consequently, the Project could result in additional sources of polluted runoff. Impacts should be considered potentially significant and analyzed further in an EIR.

f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Potentially Significant Impact. Urban runoff associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Project could result in water quality degradation. This impact would be potentially significant and should be analyzed further in an EIR.

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?**h. Place within a 100-year flood plain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?****i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

Items g., h. and i. No Impact. Although the Proposed Project site is located in proximity to a 100-year floodplain, the Project would not place housing within such a flood hazard area. Additionally, no dams or levees with the potential to result in substantial flooding on-site exist in the vicinity of the Proposed Project site. No impacts are expected and no further analysis is required.

j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Potentially Significant Impact. No large water bodies with the potential to experience seiche effects (e.g., reservoirs, lakes) exist in proximity to the Proposed Project site. The Project site is located approximately two miles inland from the Pacific Ocean. Proposed Project elevations would be higher than areas subject to tsunami. However, the existing site elevations lie within a range (7 feet above mean sea level) that could be affected by tsunami. Additionally, the site is located adjacent to the Westchester Bluffs, that may have the potential to be the source of mudflows. As such, impacts from seiche, tsunami, and mudflows could be potentially significant and should be analyzed further in an EIR.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. *Would the project:***a. Physically divide an established community?**

No Impact. The Proposed Project site is an infill development located between the eastern and western portions of the Playa Vista First Phase Project. The Proposed Project has been designed to complete the Playa Vista development, with a continuity of design and uses.

The Proposed Project includes new roadways that would enhance linkages between itself and all portions of the First Phase Project. Uses to the north and south of the Project site lie within distinct, non-connected neighborhoods. They are separated by approximately 0.5 miles of horizontal distance; and the uses to the south, atop the Westchester Bluffs, are elevated above the uses to the north by approximately 120 feet. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not divide an existing community and would not have a related impact. No further analysis is required.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project includes amendments to existing general and specific plans that are applicable to the Project site. The proposed amendments would alter the anticipated uses from those included in the existing plans. Therefore, impacts should be considered potentially significant and addressed further in an EIR.

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impact. The Proposed Project site does not lie within any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Therefore, no impacts on such a plan are anticipated. No further analysis is required.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

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

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

Items a. and b. No Impact. The Proposed Project site does not contain any significant mineral resources, as delineated in any applicable land use plan. There would be no impacts on mineral resources and no further analysis is required.

XI. NOISE. *Would the project:*

- 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?**
- b. Exposure of people to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**
- c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**
- d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

Items a., b., c. and d. Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project consists of the development of 2,600 dwelling units, 175,000 sq.ft. of office space, 150,000 sq.ft. of retail space, and 40,000 sq.ft. of community-serving uses. Such development would require a considerable amount of construction, attract a new population to the Project site and increase traffic volumes on local roads. Such activities have the potential to generate short-term construction noise impacts and increase ambient noise levels on a long-term basis. Such impacts should be considered potentially significant and analyzed further in an EIR.

- 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?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) lies approximately two miles to the south of the Proposed Project. This airport is addressed in the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan (LACALUP), prepared by the Department of Regional Planning (Adopted December 19, 1991). The LACALUP has created a noise boundary around LAX, using a 65 Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL), whereby land uses including residential, educational, commercial, industrial, agricultural and recreational uses would be significantly impacted. As illustrated in the LACALUP, the Proposed Project site lies approximately 0.75 miles north of the 65 CNEL boundary. Therefore, noise impacts associated with the airport would be less than significant. No further analysis is required.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the Project site. However, there are heliports on and adjacent to the Second Phase site. Impacts from helicopter noise may be potentially significant, and should be analyzed further in an EIR.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. *Would the project:*

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)?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would attract a substantial amount of new population to the Project site. Therefore, the impacts on population and housing would be considered potentially significant. This issue should be analyzed further in an EIR.

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c. Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Items b. and c. No Impact. The Proposed development would not require the displacement of an existing site population, Therefore, no relocation impacts would occur. No further analysis is required.

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

a. Fire protection?

b. Police protection?

c. Schools?

d. Parks?**e. Other governmental services (including roads)?**

Items a., b., c., d., and e. Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project consists of the development of 2,600 dwelling units, 175,000 sq.ft. of office space, 150,000 sq.ft. of retail space, and 40,000 sq.ft. of community-serving uses. Such development would attract a considerable amount of new population to the Project site. This population would increase the demand for public services to meet the needs of the new population, including: sufficient police and fire facility capacity to meet Project needs within recommended distances; sufficient classroom space for new students residing within the Project site; and sufficient park space to accommodate the new site population. In addition to the services listed, the Project would also generate additional demand on the need for library facilities. Existing library facilities may or may not be sufficient to accommodate the additional population. Until studied further, the new population generated by the Proposed Project should be considered a potentially significant impact on the delivery of public services. Potential impacts on these public services should be addressed further in an EIR. Further, as described in Section XV below, the Proposed Project will generate a considerable amount of new traffic. The analysis of those impacts may indicate a need to alter/improve roadways in the Project area as mitigation for the Project's traffic impacts. Any such alterations to the roadway systems should also be analyzed in the recommended EIR.

XIV. 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?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would allow a maximum development of 2,600 dwelling units adding a considerable amount of new residential development to the area. New development would contribute to the demand for park space, and could potentially cause a significant impact on recreation facilities. This issue should be analyzed further, and may be analyzed in conjunction with the analysis of park space, per Item XIII.d, above.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project includes approximately 9.3 acres of park space located at several locations throughout the Project site. Construction of this park

space should be considered an integral component of the Project. The analyses of potentially significant impacts in the recommended EIR should consider the new parks as a component of the Project.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. *Would the project:*

- a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to ratio capacity on roads, or congestion at intersections)?**
- b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

Items a. and b. Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would require a considerable amount of construction and attract a new population to the Project site. These activities would cause substantial increases in traffic, affecting road capacities, congestion and City and County-congestion-management standards. The traffic impacts of the Proposed Project should be considered potentially significant. All traffic issues should be addressed further in an EIR.

- 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?**

No Impact. The Proposed Project includes no uses that would affect air traffic patterns. Height limits within the Project are well below those permitted under FAA regulations. The Proposed Project is located approximately 1.5 miles north of the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) associated with the Los Angeles International Airport ("Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan," Prepared by the Department of Regional Planning, Adopted December 19, 1991). There would be no Project impacts on air traffic patterns. No further analysis is required.

- d. Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project's design would be subject to approval regarding standard roadway configurations. The roadways adjacent to the Project site are links in an urban roadway network. They contain no sharp curves or dangerous intersections. The Project's uses are similar to other urban uses in the area. Impacts regarding local roadway hazards would be less than significant. No further analysis is required.

e. Result in inadequate emergency access?

Potentially Significant Impact. As described in items XV.a. and XV.b. above, the Project would add a considerable amount of new population to the Project site, and to the surrounding roadways. Therefore, impacts on emergency access should be considered potentially significant. This issue should be analyzed further in an EIR.

f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?

Potentially Significant Impact. As described in items XV.a and XV.b above, the Proposed Project would generate a considerable number of new vehicle trips, and a resultant need for parking at the Project site. Impacts related to parking should be considered potentially significant. This issue should be analyzed further in an EIR.

g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

Potentially Significant Impact. As described in items XV.a and XV.b above, the Proposed Project would generate a considerable number of vehicular trips. Potential impacts could be reduced through compliance with policies, plans and/or programs supporting alternative transportation. The Proposed Project would be affected by a number transportation plans under the jurisdiction of the City of Los Angeles as well as the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program, the Regional Mobility Plan of the Southern California Association of Governments and the Caltrans Statewide Transportation Improvement Program. Due to the large amount of trips that would be generated by the Proposed Project, impacts regarding the appropriate application of such policies to this Project should be considered potentially significant. This issue should be addressed further in an EIR.

XVI. UTILITIES. *Would the project:***a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**

Potentially Significant Impact. Wastewater generated by the Proposed Project would be treated at the Hyperion Treatment Plant, which may experience a peak month treatment capacity shortfall by 2010 if treatment capacity is not expanded. As such, the Proposed Project's contribution to system-wide wastewater treatment demand could result in exceedance of the wastewater treatment requirements of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Consequently, the Proposed Project could result in a potentially significant impact, and should be analyzed further in an EIR.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. The wastewater treatment provider for the Proposed Project would be the City of Los Angeles' Hyperion Treatment System, which is anticipated to experience a peak-month treatment capacity shortfall by 2010, unless planned expansion of one of the three treatment plants in the system occurs prior to that time. As such, any project in the Hyperion service area would contribute to an overall peak month treatment shortfall. Inasmuch as the Proposed Project would contribute wastewater flows to the wastewater treatment system, it could require expansion of City wastewater treatment facilities. This impact would be considered potentially significant and further analysis in an EIR is required.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project could require construction of new stormwater facilities, and the construction of such infrastructure could result in significant environmental effects. Impacts would be considered potentially significant and further analysis in an EIR is required.

d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resource, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Potentially Significant Impact. The water treatment provider for the Proposed Project would be the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. The Proposed Project would consume substantial amounts of potable and recycled water. Consequently, impacts to water supplies could be potentially significant and should be addressed further in an EIR.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. As discussed in b) above, a projected peak-month treatment capacity shortfall within the Hyperion Treatment System would occur by 2010 if

planned plant expansions are not completed. Accordingly, a potentially significant impact could occur relative to wastewater treatment capacity, and further analysis in an EIR is required.

f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would contribute solid waste to regional landfills. A regional Class III (municipal solid waste) disposal capacity shortfall is anticipated to occur as early as 2006. Therefore, this impact should be considered potentially significant and analyzed further in an EIR.

g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would comply with all applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Impacts with regard to solid waste regulations would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact. As described above, the Project site includes a potential to degrade the environment and/or effect wildlife habitat, and/or affect cultural resources. As described above, these issues should be addressed further in an EIR.

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).

Potentially Significant Impact. There are located within the vicinity of the Proposed Project site other past, current and/or probable future projects whose development would contribute with the Proposed Project to potential significant cumulative impacts. Thus,

cumulative impacts should be addressed in the EIR, for topics where the Proposed Project would contribute to the impact.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. As described above, the Proposed Project poses potentially significant impacts with regard to safety and risk of upset. Therefore, impacts on human beings should be considered potentially significant. As described above, this issue should be addressed further in an EIR.