

## IV. INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

<b>LEAD AGENCY:</b> City of Los Angeles		<b>COUNCIL DISTRICT:</b> CD 14-Jose Huizar	<b>DATE:</b>
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES:</b> City of Los Angeles			
<b>PROJECT TITLE:</b> Equity Residential Mixed-Use Project		<b>CASE NO.:</b> ENV-2015-982-SCEA	
<p><b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION:</b> The proposed Project includes the demolition of an 850-square-foot restaurant and a 109-space surface parking lot and the development of a new 31-story mixed-use development. The proposed Project consists of 428 multi-family residential units and up to 5,610 square feet of commercial uses, on a 0.75-acre site. The 428 residential units comprise 226 studio units, 75 one-bedroom units, and 127 two-bedroom units, and include 320 market-rate units and 108 Restricted Affordable units, including 22 units for Very Low Income households, and one of the following: 1) 10 percent of the total number of units for Low Income households; 2) 15 percent of the total number of units for Moderate Income households; or 3) 20 percent of the total number of units for Workforce Income households. Of the 5,610 square feet of commercial uses, approximately 2,980 square feet would include a leasing office and up to 2,630 square feet would accommodate neighborhood-serving retail uses. The proposed Project would provide approximately 41,378 square feet of open space, including (but not limited to) 10,100 square feet of private open space, a 14,332-square-foot courtyard, a 1,453-square-foot business lounge, a 5,179-square-foot club room, a 1,730-square-foot fitness room, a 5,508-square-foot sky deck, and a 3,126-square-foot sky lounge. The proposed Project would provide 375 parking spaces within a three levels of subterranean parking and a four-story parking podium. The proposed Project is also seeking, through LADBS approval process, a haul route for 48,000 cubic yards of export and 5,000 cubic yards of import. See Section II (Project Description) for a detailed description of the Project.</p>			
<p><b>ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:</b> The Project Site is made up of one parcel (Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 5149-015-036, and is bound by Hill Street to the west, a restaurant/bar building to the north, commercial/retail buildings to the east, and 4<sup>th</sup> Street and a Metro subway portal to the south. Surrounding land uses include Angel's Knoll and Angels Flight Lower Station to the west/northwest and commercial to the east and south, and a restaurant to the immediate north. The Project Site is adjacent to the Metro Red Line's Pershing Square northeast portal. See Section II (Project Description) for a detailed description of the Environmental Setting.</p>			
<b>PROJECT LOCATION:</b> 338, 340, 342, 348, 352, 356 South Hill Street and 311, 321 West 4 <sup>th</sup> Street, Los Angeles, CA 90013			
<b>PLANNING DISTRICT:</b> Central City		<b>STATUS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> PRELIMINARY <input type="checkbox"/> PROPOSED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ADOPTED	
<b>EXISTING ZONING:</b> C2-4D	<b>MAX. DENSITY ZONING:</b> Unlimited density permitted per LAMC Section 12.22C3(c)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DOES CONFORM TO PLAN  <input type="checkbox"/> DOES NOT CONFORM TO PLAN  <input type="checkbox"/> NO DISTRICT PLAN	
<b>PLANNED LAND USE &amp; ZONING:</b> Regional Center Commercial	<b>MAX. DENSITY PLAN:</b> Unlimited density permitted per LAMC Section 12.22C3(c)		
<b>SURROUNDING LAND USES:</b> C2-4D, C4-4D, PF-4D	<b>PROJECT DENSITY:</b> 9.6:1; 428 dwelling units		

---

**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 "Less Than Significant With 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.

---

- X 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 the SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT Initial Study identifies measures that either avoid or mitigate to a level of insignificance all potentially significant or significant effects of the Project.
- 

	Planning Assistant
<b>SIGNATURE</b>	<b>TITLE</b>

---

**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 “Earlier Analysis,” as described in (5) below, may be cross referenced).
5. Earlier analysis must be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR, or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - A. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - B. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - C. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A sources list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whichever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:

A. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

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

---

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

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

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

---

**INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST (to be completed by the Lead Agency)**

**BACKGROUND**

<b>PROPOSER NAME</b> EQR 4 <sup>th</sup> & Hill LP		<b>PHONE NUMBER</b> Tel: 424-732-4207
<b>PROPOSER ADDRESS</b> 6100 Center Drive, Suite 750 Los Angeles, CA 90045	<b>PROPOSER REPRESENTATIVE</b> John Hrovat, Vice President, Development	
<b>AGENCY REQUIRING CHECKLIST</b> City of Los Angeles (Lead Agency) Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Responsible Agency)		<b>DATE SUBMITTED</b>
<b>PROPOSAL NAME (if applicable)</b> Equity Residential Mixed-Use Project		

---

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

1. **Aesthetics.** Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

- a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
- b. In non-urbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?
- c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
- d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓

2. **Agriculture and Forestry Resources.** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. 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 with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
- c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104 (g))?
- d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
- e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓

3. **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:

- a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan
- b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?
- c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) affecting a substantial number of people?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			✓
	✓		
	✓		
		✓	

4. **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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in the City or regional plans, policies, regulations by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?
- e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance
- f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		✓	
			✓
			✓
		✓	
		✓	
			✓

5. **Cultural Resources.** Would the project:

- a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?
- b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?
- c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		✓	
		✓	
		✓	

6. **Energy.** Would the project:

- a. Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?
- b. Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		✓	
		✓	

7. **Geology & Soils.** Would the project exacerbate existing conditions so as to:

- a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
  - i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
  - ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?
  - iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
  - iv. Landslides?
- b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
- c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
- d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?
- e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?
- f. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		✓	
		✓	
		✓	
		✓	✓
		✓	
			✓
			✓
		✓	

8. **Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** Would the project:

- a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		✓	
		✓	

9. **Hazards & 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?
- 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	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		✓	
	✓		

9. **Hazards & Hazardous Materials.** Would the project:

- c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
- e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?
- f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- g. Exacerbate existing environmental conditions so as to increase the potential to expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		✓	
			✓
		✓	
		✓	
			✓

10. **Hydrology & Water Quality.** Would the project:

- a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?
- b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?
- c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:
  - i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site;
  - ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;
  - iii. create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or
  - iv. impede or redirect flood flows?
- d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?
- e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		✓	
			✓
		✓	
		✓	
			✓
			✓
		✓	

11. **Land Use and Planning.** Would the project:

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			✓
		✓	



**12. Mineral Resources.** Would the project:

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			✓
			✓

**13. Noise.** Would the project result in:

- a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
- c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	✓		
	✓		
			✓

**14. Population and Housing.** Would the project:

- a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
- b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		✓	
			✓

**15. Public Services.**

- a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
  - i. Fire protection?
  - ii. Police protection?
  - iii. Schools?
  - iv. Parks?
  - v. Other public facilities?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		✓	
		✓	
		✓	
		✓	
	✓		

**16. 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?
- b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion on recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		✓	
		✓	

**17. Transportation.** Would the project:

- a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?
- b. Conflict 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 count congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?<sup>1</sup>
- c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- d. Result in inadequate emergency access?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	✓		
		✓	
		✓	
		✓	

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

- a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?
- b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		✓	
		✓	

<sup>1</sup> While this Appendix G Checklist Question has been modified by the Natural Resources Agency to address consistency with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b), which relates to use of the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as the methodology for evaluating traffic impact, the City has not yet adopted a VMT methodology to address this updated Appendix G Checklist Question. Thus, the analysis is based on LADOT's adopted methodology under its Transportation Impact Study Guidelines, which requires use of LOS to evaluate traffic impacts of a project.

**19. Utilities & Service Systems.** Would the project:

- a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of a new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the relocation or construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?
- c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?
- d. Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?
- e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		✓	
		✓	
		✓	
		✓	
			✓

**20. Wildfire.** If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

- a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- b. Do to the slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, would the project exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby, expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire
- c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?
- d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓

**21. Mandatory Findings of Significance.**

- a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects?)
- c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	✓		
		✓	
	✓		