

## DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

## APPEAL REPORT

#### East Los Angeles Area Planning Commission

Date: Time: Place:	February 14, 2024 After 4:30 p.m.* Ramona Hall Community Center 4580 North Figueroa Street
	Los Angeles, CA 90065

The meeting may be available virtually, in a hybrid format. Please check the meeting agenda approximately 72 hours before the meeting for additional information. Please see planning4la.org/hearings for the meeting agenda.

Case No.: DIR-2016-4998-SPP-HCA-1A CEQA No.: ENV-2016-4999-MND Incidental Cases: None Related Cases: DIR-2016-5000-SPP-HCA Council No.: 1-Hernandez Plan Area: Northeast Los Angeles Specific Plan: Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan Certified NC: Greater Cypress Park GPLU: Low Residential Zone: R1-1-HCR

Public Hearing:	Required
Appeal Status:	Not further appealable under LAMC
Expiration Date:	February 14, 2024

**PROJECT** 3152 East Future Street

- LOCATION:
- **PROPOSED** The construction, use, and maintenance of a new 2,502.09-square foot single-family dwelling with an attached garage, on a 6,470.2-square foot vacant lot that is within the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan.
- **APPLICANT:** Andre Ohanian Highrise, Inc.
- APPELLANT: Andrew Westwell and George Northy
- **ACTION:** Appeal of the Director of Planning's determination to approve a Project Permit Compliance Review, pursuant to LAMC Section 11.5.7 C, to allow the construction, use, and maintenance of a new 2,502.09-square foot single-family dwelling with an attached garage, on a 6,470.2-square foot vacant lot that is within the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan.

#### **RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:**

 FIND, pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15074(b), after consideration of the whole of the administrative record, including the Mitigated Negative Declaration, No. ENV-2016-4999-MND, as circulated on December 14, 2023 ("Mitigated Negative Declaration"), all comments received, and Errata dated February 5, 2024, with the imposition of mitigation measures, there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment; **FIND** the Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City; **FIND** the mitigation measures have been made enforceable conditions on the Project; and **ADOPT** the Mitigated Negative Declaration, Errata dated February 5, 2024, and the Mitigation Monitoring Program prepared for the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

- 2. **Deny** the appeal and **sustain** the decision of the Director of Planning to approve a Project Permit Compliance Review for the Project with modifications and the exception of the previously adopted environmental clearance.
- 3. **Adopt** the conditions of approval and the findings of the Director of Planning as the Conditions and Findings of the Commission.

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP Director of Planning

ane Choi

Jane Choi, AICP, Principal City Planner

Jourse Sto

Vanessa Soto, AICP, Senior City Planner

Nicole Sanche:

Nicole Sánchez, City Planner

Nashya Sadono-

Nashya Sadono-Jensen, City Planning Associate

**ADVICE TO PUBLIC:** \*The exact time this report will be considered during the meeting is uncertain since there may be several other items on the agenda. Written communications may be mailed to the Commission Secretariat, Room 272, City Hall, 200 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012 (Phone No. 213-978-1295) or emailed to apceastla@lacity.org. While all written communications are given to the Commission for consideration, the initial packets are sent to the Commission the week prior to the Commission's meeting date. If you challenge these agenda items in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing agendized herein, or in written correspondence on these matters delivered to this agency at or prior to the public hearing. As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability, and upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to these programs, services and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or other services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request no later than three working days (72 hours) prior to the meeting by calling the Commission Secretariat at (213) 978-1295.

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Project Analysis ...... A-1

Project Summary Background Appeal Points and Staff Responses Conclusion

#### Exhibits

- A. Appeal of DIR-2016-4998-SPP-HCA
- B. Director of Planning Determination DIR-2016-4998-SPP-HCA
- C. Project Plans
- D. Hillside Referral Form
- E. Construction Traffic Management Plan
- F. Soils and Geology Investigation Report dated July 30, 2014
- G. Department of Building and Safety's Geology and Soils Report Approval Letter dated April 26, 2016
- H. Mitigated Negative Declaration and Appendices
- I. Errata dated February 5, 2024
- J. Mitigation Monitoring Program

#### **PROJECT ANALYSIS**

Pursuant to the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 11.5.7, appeals of Project Permit Compliance cases are made to the Area Planning Commission. The decision of the East Los Angeles Area Planning Commission is final and effective as provided for in Charter Section 245.

#### Project Summary

The Proposed Project is the construction, use, and maintenance of a new 2,502.09-square foot single-family dwelling with an attached garage, on a 6,470.2-square foot vacant lot.

#### Background

The larger Project, which was analyzed in the technical reports, studies, and environmental clearance for the Proposed Project, involves the immediate development of two (2) single-family homes on two separate parcels and future development of eight (8) additional single-family homes on separate parcels at a later date. The Project Applicant owns a total of 10 parcels along Future Street. Two (2) of those parcels will be developed immediately. The Applicant intends to develop the eight (8) remaining parcels at a later date. The Project site is comprised of one (1) rectangular lot totaling 6,470.2 square feet and is zoned R1-1-HCR with a General Plan Land Use Designation of Low Residential. The subject site is within a Hillside Area, a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, a Special Grading Area (BOE Basic Grid Map A-13372) and is 1.93 kilometers from the Hollywood Fault. The site is currently vacant and fronts Future Street, which is considered a Substandard Hillside Limited Street with an improved 30-foot right-of-way width and a 20-foot roadway width according to the Bureau of Engineering's (BOE) Hillside Referral Form. The Project is within the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan (Specific Plan).

The properties to the north, east, and west of the Project site are zoned R1-1-HCR and are mostly developed with single-family homes. The properties abutting the Project site to the south, along Future Street, are zoned R1-1-HCR and are vacant, and are owned by the Applicant. There is one (1) Significant Tree on site. The Project does not require the removal of any trees from this lot.

On September 26, 2023, the Director of Planning approved with conditions a Project Permit Compliance Review for the Proposed Project. On October 6, 2023, an appeal of the entire decision was filed.

An environmental review of the Project was originally circulated on March 23, 2023, as a Negative Declaration, with an Errata dated September 25, 2023, and found that there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment. Upon further review, the Department of City Planning determined that a Mitigated Negative Declaration was the appropriate environmental clearance for the Project. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15072, a Mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated on December 14, 2023 through the State Clearinghouse and distributed to trustee agency, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and Errata dated February 5, 2024, to further support and clarify the environmental analysis, and found that there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment, with the incorporated mitigation measure. The Mitigated Negative Declaration circulated on December 14, 2023 and Errata dated February 5, 2024 supersede previously issued Negative Declaration and Errata dated September 25, 2023.

The following is a summary of the appellants' initial justifications for the appeal followed by responses by Department of City Planning Staff.

#### Appeal Points and Staff Responses

#### Appeal Point 1:

The Proposed Project is on a narrow road and restricts access for Emergency Services. The narrow road will not be able to accommodate construction vehicles, and the road is poorly surfaced.

#### Response:

The Director of Planning's decision to approve a Project Permit Compliance Review pursuant to LAMC Section 11.5.7 C includes regulations under the purview of the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan (Specific Plan). The Project site is located on Future Street, which is a Substandard Limited Hillside Street. LAMC Section 12.21 C10(i) regulates street dedication, street improvements, and access to the Project site, not the Specific Plan. As part of the case filing, the Applicant was required to submit a Hillside Referral Form (Exhibit D) completed by the BOE to verify whether proper street improvements and dedications exist for 3152 East Future Street. The Hillside Referral Form submitted with the application indicates that the Project site has an existing right-ofway width of 30 feet and a roadway width of 20 feet, and the Project site has a Continuous Paved Roadway of at least 20 feet wide to the boundaries of the Hillside Area. As indicated on the Hillside Referral Form, additional street improvements are not required if the project site presently meets Code requirements and as described above, the Project site currently meets Code requirements. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not required to provide any street dedications or improvements. Furthermore, compliance with BOE requirements relative to street improvements will be required as part of the plan check permit approval process.

The Applicant submitted a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) for review by the City's Department of Transportation (LADOT), pursuant to the LADOT's Hillside Development Construction Traffic Management Guidelines released on June 16, 2020. These guidelines state the purpose of a Construction Traffic Management Plan is to address transportation concerns specific to hillside communities, including narrow streets, limited emergency access, and location in a Very High Fire Severity Zone. The Proposed Project will be subject to the conditions detailed in the Project's CTMP, included in the case file, which was reviewed and stamped-approved by LADOT on July 19, 2021 (Exhibit E). These conditions include a requirement that emergency access to and around the Project site be kept clear, limits on construction hours, limits on construction truck arrival and departure hours, limits on equipment and material delivery hours, follow a LADOT sanctioned Traffic Control Plan, provide a flagman for hauling activities when needed, and prohibit grading and hauling activities on Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) determined high wind and red flag days. The conditions imposed on the Proposed Project as well as the 3110-3164 East Future Street lots ensure that emergency access remains clear, limit the traffic related to the Proposed Project, and reduce the fire hazards from grading and hauling activities.

While there are active building permits in the vicinity of the Project site, all projects in the Project vicinity would be required to adopt a similar Hillside CTMP, which, similar to the Proposed Project's Plan described in detail above, would ensure that emergency access remains clear, limit the traffic related to the Proposed Project, and reduce the fire hazards from grading and hauling activities. These projects would also be required to obtain proper permits, which, through inspections, will ensure that the project follows all applicable provisions. Per LAMC Section 62.45, any use of the right-of-way for activities such as staging of construction materials or large construction vehicles is required to be by permit,

which is issued by the Bureau of Street Services Investigations and Enforcement Division. The issuance of a permit includes notification of the LAFD and the Police Department, who make adjustments to emergency access routes used for a particular day when such a permit is issued. This is also true of any other projects within the vicinity. For roadway access during construction, because staging of equipment in the right-of-way is done by permit, coordination of the use of the right-of-way by the construction sites in proximity to the Project site will occur by Bureau of Street Services review. The Proposed Project and other development in and around the Project area are required to develop their own Hillside Development CTMP and comply with applicable traffic measures and any transportation related Regulatory Compliance Measures. As a result, cumulative transportation impacts would be less than significant.

The following appeal points were raised in a separate appeal from Dana Agens, but relate to the 3152 East Future Street Project. The appeal points and responses are, therefore, repeated in this staff report to provide a comprehensive response to the Proposed Project's appeals.

#### Appeal Point 2:

There are hillside stabilization issues.

#### **Response:**

In filing an Application for Project Permit Compliance, the Applicant is required to submit a Soils Report, as the Proposed Project is in the Hillside Area. The LADBS Grading Division is responsible for reviewing grading and construction work for projects on private property. The Planning Department's standard protocol for Hillside Area cases is that Planning Staff awaits a determination from LADBS Grading Division prior to proceeding with the review of the case filed with the Planning Department. The Soils and Geology Investigation Report, dated July 30, 2014, (Exhibit F) was submitted to the case file and to LADBS for review, and a Geology and Soils Report Approval Letter was issued by LADBS on April 26, 2016 (Exhibit G). This letter approved the referenced report, provided that the conditions of approval listed in the Approval letter are complied with. Review and approval of the detailed plans by the geologist and soils engineer prior to the issuance of permits are required under Condition No. 3 in the Approval Letter. This states that the approval shall be by signature on the plans that clearly indicates the geologist and soils engineer have reviewed the plans prepared by the design engineer; and, that the plans include the recommendations contained in their reports. Compliance with Regulatory Compliance Measures (RCMs) relative to grading will be required as part of the grading permit approval process. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not expected to result in any significant impacts to geology and soils.

#### **Appeal Point 3:**

Owner is trying to get around the applicable rules and regulations by segmenting review of the project.

#### Response:

An Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration were prepared analyzing all 10 lots that the Owner owns and intends to develop, including the immediately proposed developments on 3152 and 3164 Future Street. In addition, the Biological Report and Protected Tree Report also analyzed all 10 lots, including the immediately proposed developments on 3152 and 3164 Future Street. As a result, the environmental review within the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Project analyzed the whole of the Project and did not split it up to avoid the application of any rules or regulations.

#### Appeal Point 4:

The Project should conduct an Environmental Impact Report for the project, addressing potential traffic and parking impacts, green space, wildlife issues, and trees.

#### Response:

The Appellant lists several points without any explanation, description, or detail of why the environmental review, CTMP, Biological Report, Tree Report, or Geological and Soils Report prepared for the Project are insufficient or provide any substantial evidence that the Proposed Project will not have a significant effect on the environment. An Initial Study, Mitigated Negative Declaration, and Errata were prepared analyzing all 10 lots that the Owner owns and intends to develop, including the immediately proposed developments on 3152 and 3164 Future Street. In addition, a Biological Report, Protected Tree Report, and MND analyzed the effects of the Project, including the nine (9) other lots owned by the Applicant and provided recommendations to limit impacts to trees, identified applicable Protected and Significant Tree regulations such as replacement tree ratios, and proposed mitigations measures to eliminate significant impacts to wildlife. CDFW did not have any comments on the MND. As stated previously, a CMTP was also adopted for the Proposed Project to address construction traffic and safety measures. The Proposed Project and other development in and around the Project area are required to develop their own Hillside Development CTMP and comply with applicable traffic measures and any transportation related Regulatory Compliance Measures.

#### Appeal Point 5:

Street Parking and overcrowding creates public safety issues.

#### Response:

As described in Response to Appeal Point 1, the Proposed Project meets the minimum roadway requirements under the applicable Code as provided in the Hillside Referral Form. In addition, the CTMP developed for the Proposed Project includes several mandatory conditions to prevent blocking the roadway or inhibiting emergency access. Although LAMC Section 12.21 C.10 and Section 6.D of the Specific Plan do not require the Proposed Project to provide street parking, off-street parking is required, which helps to reduce the need for street parking. As seen on Sheet A0.00 of the Project Plans (Exhibit C), the Proposed Project includes a 423.68-square foot attached garage which provides two (2) covered parking spaces. Therefore, the Proposed Project complies with LAMC Section 12.21 C.10 and Section 6.D of the Specific Plan.

#### **Conclusion**

Staff recommends that the East Los Angeles Area Planning Commission deny the appeal of the decision of the Director of Planning to approve a Project Permit Compliance Review for a One-Family Project within the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan, and adopt the Conditions and Findings of the Director as the Conditions and Findings of the Commission with modifications, determine that, based on the whole of the record, there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment with mitigation incorporated, and adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration, Errata dated February 5, 2024, and the Mitigation Monitoring Program prepared for the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

## APPLICATIONS

#### APPEAL APPLICATION Instructions and Checklist



DIR-2016-4998-SPP-HCA-1A

#### **RELATED CODE SECTION**

Refer to the Letter of Determination (LOD) for the subject case to identify the applicable Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section for the entitlement and the appeal procedures.

#### PURPOSE

This application is for the appeal of Los Angeles City Planning determinations, as authorized by the LAMC, as well as first-level Building and Safety Appeals.

#### APPELLATE BODY

Check only one. If unsure of the Appe	llate Body, check with City Planning staff before
submission.	
Area Blanning Commission (ADO)	

□ Area Planning Commission (APC) <sup>1</sup> City Planning Commission (CPC) □ City Council
Zoning Administrator (ZA) Director of Planning (DIR)
CASE INFORMATION
Case Number: DIR - 2016 - 4998 - SPP - HKA
Project Address: 3152 Force St 65 Ances CA 90065
Final Date to Appeal: OCTOBER 11 2023
APPELLANT
For main entitlement cases, except for Building and Safety Appeals:
Check all that apply.
Person, other than the Applicant, Owner or Operator claiming to be aggrieved
□ Representative □ Property Owner □ Applicant □ Operator of the Use/Site
For Building and Safety Appeals <u>only</u> :
Check all that apply.
Person claiming to be aggrieved by the determination made by Building and Safety <sup>1</sup>
□ Representative □ Property Owner □ Applicant □ Operator of the Use/Site
Appellants of a Building and Safety Appeal are considered the Applicant and must provide the Noticing Requirements identified on page 4 of this form at the time of filing. Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.26 K, an appeal fee shall be required pursuant to LAMC Section 19.01 B.2.

APPELLANT INFORMATION		
Appellant Name: <u>ANDREN WESTWELL</u> + GEORGE NORTHY		
Company/Organization:		
Mailing Address: 3172 FUTURE STREET		
City: Los Ancoros State: CA Zip Code: 90065	5	
Telephone: 323 573 2096 E-mail: awestwell e hotmail.com		
Is the appeal being filed on your behalf or on behalf of another party, organization, or company?		
Is the appeal being filed to support the original applicant's position? $\Box$ YES $\bigvee$ N	0	
REPRESENTATIVE / AGENT INFORMATION		
Representative/Agent Name (if applicable):		
Company:		
Mailing Address:		
City: State: Zip Code:		
Telephone: E-mail:		
JUSTIFICATION / REASON FOR APPEAL		
Is the decision being appealed in its entirety or in part?	art	
Are specific Conditions of Approval being appealed?	0	
If Yes, list the Condition Number(s) here:		
On a separate sheet provide the following:		
Reason(s) for the appeal		
Specific points at issue		
How you are aggrieved by the decision		
☐ How the decision-maker erred or abused their decision		
APPLICANT'S AFFIDAVIT		
Appellant Signature: Automatication and true Date: 10/17/23	_	

#### **GENERAL NOTES**

A Certified Neighborhood Council (CNC) or a person identified as a member of a CNC or as representing the CNC may not file an appeal on behalf of the Neighborhood Council; persons affiliated with a CNC may only file as an individual on behalf of self.

The appellate body must act on the appeal within a time period specified in the LAMC Section(s) pertaining to the type of appeal being filed. Los Angeles City Planning will make its best efforts to have appeals scheduled prior to the appellate body's last day to act in order to provide due process to the appellant. If the appellate body is unable to come to a consensus or is unable to hear and consider the appeal prior to the last day to act, the appeal is automatically deemed denied, and the original decision will stand. The last day to act as defined in the LAMC may only be extended if formally agreed upon by the applicant.

## THIS SECTION FOR CITY PLANNING STAFF USE ONLY

B	ase	Fee	:	
			_	_

Reviewed & Accepted by (DSC Planner): \_\_\_\_\_

Receipt No.: \_

Determination authority notified

Original receipt and BTC receipt (if original applicant)

Date : \_



#### **RELATED CODE SECTION**

Refer to the Letter of Determination (LOD) for the subject case to identify the applicable Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section for the entitlement and the appeal procedures.

#### PURPOSE

This application is for the appeal of Los Angeles City Planning determinations, as authorized by the LAMC, as well as first-level Building and Safety Appeals.

#### APPELLATE BODY

Check only one. If unsure of the Appellate Body, check with City Planning staff before submission.
🗌 Area Planning Commission (APC) 🛛 🗹 City Planning Commission (CPC) 🔹 City Council
□ Zoning Administrator (ZA) □ Director of Planning (DIR)
CASE INFORMATION
Case Number: DIR-2016-4998-SPP-HKA + DIR-2016-5000-SPP-HCA
Project Address: 3152 Furus St + 3164 Furus St, bis Anderes
Final Date to Appeal: OcroBec 11, 2023
APPELLANT
For main entitlement cases, except for Building and Safety Appeals:
Check all that apply.
Person, other than the Applicant, Owner or Operator claiming to be aggrieved
□ Representative □ Property Owner □ Applicant □ Operator of the Use/Site
For Building and Safety Appeals <u>only</u> :
Check all that apply.
Person claiming to be aggrieved by the determination made by Building and Safety <sup>1</sup>
Representative Property Owner Applicant Operator of the Use/Site
Appellants of a Building and Safety Appeal are considered the Applicant and must provide the Noticing Requirements identified on page 4 of this form at the time of filing. Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.26 K, an appeal fee shall be required pursuant to LAMC Section 19.01 B.2.

APPELLANT INFORMATION	APPELLANT INFORMATION			
Appellant Name: ANDREN NOOTHELL + GEORGE NORTHY				
Company/Organization:				
Mailing Address: 3172 FUTURE ST	a.	-		
City: Los Anisales	State: CA	Zin Code: 9006	5	
Telephone: 323 573 2096 E-	mail: awestwell ehr	stmail.com		
Is the appeal being filed on your behalf or on Self Other:	behalf of another party, organi	zation, or company?		
Is the appeal being filed to support the origina	al applicant's position?	🗆 YES 🗹	NO	
REPRESENTATIVE / AGENT INFO	RMATION			
Representative/Agent Name (if applicable)	:			
Company:				
Mailing Address:				
City:	State:	Zip Code:		
Telephone: E-r	nail:			
JUSTIFICATION / REASON FOR A	PPEAL			
Is the decision being appealed in its entirety of	or in part?	Entire	Part	
Are specific Conditions of Approval being app	ealed?		NO	
If Yes, list the Condition Number(s) here:				
On a separate sheet provide the following:				
Reason(s) for the appeal				
Specific points at issue				
☐ How you are aggrieved by the decision				
☐ How the decision-maker erred or abused their decision				
APPLICANT'S AFFIDAVIT				
I certify that the statements contained in this a Appellant Signature:	application are complete and tr	ue. Date: <u>107672</u>	3	

#### **GENERAL NOTES**

A Certified Neighborhood Council (CNC) or a person identified as a member of a CNC or as representing the CNC may not file an appeal on behalf of the Neighborhood Council; persons affiliated with a CNC may only file as an individual on behalf of self.

The appellate body must act on the appeal within a time period specified in the LAMC Section(s) pertaining to the type of appeal being filed. Los Angeles City Planning will make its best efforts to have appeals scheduled prior to the appellate body's last day to act in order to provide due process to the appellant. If the appellate body is unable to come to a consensus or is unable to hear and consider the appeal prior to the last day to act, the appeal is automatically deemed denied, and the original decision will stand. The last day to act as defined in the LAMC may only be extended if formally agreed upon by the applicant.

#### THIS SECTION FOR CITY PLANNING STAFF USE ONLY

Base Fee:	
Reviewed & Accepted by (DSC Pla	nner):
Receipt No.:	Date :
Determination authority notified	Original receipt and BTC receipt (if original applicant)

Department of City Planning, City of Los Angeles, 200 N Spring St, Room 525, Los Angeles, CA 90012 3172 Future St, Los Angeles, CA 90065

Friday 6<sup>th</sup> October 2023

#### RE: APPEAL AGAINST DEVELOPMENT OF 3152 and 3164 FUTURE ST, LOS ANGELES CASE Numbers: DIR-2016-4998-SPP-HCA and DIR-2016-5000-SPP-HCA

We are writing as an Aggrieved Party to appeal against the recent decisions to grant permission to develop 3152 and 3164 Future Street. We are the owner occupiers of 3172 Future Street, a property in the immediate vicinity and have very serious concerns about the proposed work.

#### SAFETY

Future Street is a very narrow road and there is street parking down one side. Therefore, there is only enough room for a single passenger vehicle to pass. Construction will require multiple large trucks to drive up the road and park on the road, in front of the lot, on a daily basis. The road will be almost entirely blocked.

This will undoubtedly restrict access for Emergency Services. Mount Washington is a very high fire risk area. If a road is blocked or access is made difficult due to the construction vehicles, it will undoubtedly result in serious injury and fatalities. Further, in the event of an emergency, construction vehicles will block the path of residents attempting to leave the area.

We see no evidence that these issues have been sufficiently addressed in granting permission for development.

#### ACCESS

The road is especially narrow in front of the lots for the proposed development. Mid-size pick up trucks struggle to manoeuvre along the road, let alone the large trucks and vehicles that will be required to complete the development on these sites. The presence of such large vehicles and construction equipment, including dumpsters, will prevent local residents from accessing their homes and the already limited parking areas available

The route up to the site, in all directions is near impossible for large vehicles to pass. The entrance from Division St is a single track laneway. Entering from Isabel Drive would not be possible due to street parking on both sides. Entering from Kemper St / Isabel St is impossible due to the narrow road and street parking along one side. If construction goes ahead, local roads will be continually blocked with stranded trucks, adding to the safety issues as detailed above.

Again, we see no evidence that these issues have been sufficiently addressed in granting permission for development.

1

#### **ROAD QUALITY**

Future Street is a very poorly surfaced road, in urgent need of maintenance and resurfacing. Large scale construction will only degrade the road further and as far as we're aware, there are no plans to resurface or maintain the road properly after construction.

For these important reasons and because of our legitimate grievances, we urge the Department of City Planning to reconsider their decision or make further significant considerations to ensure the safety of local residents.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Westwell & George Northy (323 573 2096)

is only enough room for a single passenger vehicle to pass. Construction will require multiple large trucks to drive up the road and park on the read, in front of the fot, as a Gally basis. The road will be almost entirely blocked.

This will underlittedly restrict access for Emergiancy Services. Mount Washington is a very orgh fife risk great if a made is blocked or access is made difficult due to the construction vehicles. It will undoubtedly result in serious injury and fatalities. Further, in the event of an emergency, construction vehicles will block the path of residents untempting to leave the area.

Weispe horevidence that these issues have been sufficiently addressed in granting parmission for development.

#### 22300A

The road is especially harrow in Iront of the lots for UIA proposed development. Mid-size pick up trucks struggle to manoeuvre along the road, let along the large trucks and vehicles that will ou required to complete the development on these sites. The prosence of such large vehicles and construction equipment, including dumpsters, will prevent tocal residents from accessing their homes and the almost scale black.

The route up to the site, in all directions is rear impossible for large veniclus topacs. The antiance from Division 5t is a single track laneway. Entering from Stated Drive would not be possible due to street parking on both sides. Entering from Kompur 5t / Isabel St is impossible due to the narrow road and street parking along one side. If construction goes ahead, local roads will be continually blocked, with stranded trucks, adding to the softwark issues as detailed above.

Again, we see no evidence that these issues have been sufficiently bioressed in granting permission for development.

## DEPARTMENT OF

COMMISSION OFFICE (213) 978-1300

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

SAMANTHA MILLMAN PRESIDENT

> CAROLINE CHOE VICE-PRESIDENT

MARIA CABILDO ILISSA GOLD MONIQUE LAWSHE HELEN LEUNG KAREN MACK JACOB NOONAN ELIZABETH ZAMORA CITY OF LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA



KAREN BASS

#### MOUNT WASHINGTON-GLASSELL PARK SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT PERMIT COMPLIANCE REVIEW

September 26, 2023

Applicant/Owner Andre Ohanian Highrise, Inc. 10955 Penrose Street Sun Valley, CA 91352

DIR-2016-4998-SPP- HCA
ENV-2016-4999-ND
3152 East Future
Street
1 – Hernandez
Greater Cypress Park
Northeast Los Angeles
Low Residential
R1-1-HCR
Lot 116; Tract TR 4417

Last Day to File an Appeal: October 11, 2023

#### DETERMINATION

Pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 11.5.7 C, and the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan Ordinance No. 168,707, I have reviewed the proposed project and as the designee of the Director of Planning, I hereby:

**FIND**, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15074(b), after consideration of the whole of the administrative record, including the Negative Declaration, No. ENV-2016-4999-ND, as circulated on March 23, 2023, ("Negative Declaration"), Errata dated September 25, 2023, there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment; **FIND** the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgement and analysis of the City; and **ADOPT** the Negative Declaration.

**Approve with Conditions** a Project Permit Compliance Review for the construction, use, and maintenance of a new 2,502.09-square foot single-family dwelling with an attached garage, on a 6,470.2-square foot vacant lot that is within the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan area.

DIR-2016-4998-SPP-HCA-1A

# EXHIBIT B

Director's Determination

DIRECTOR

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN DEPUTY DIRECTOR ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP DEPUTY DIRECTOR LISA M. WEBBER, AICP DEPUTY DIRECTOR The project approval is based upon the attached Findings, and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval:

#### CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- 1. **Site Development.** Except as modified herein, the project shall be in substantial conformance with the plans and materials submitted by the Applicant, stamped "Exhibit A," and attached to the subject case file. No change to the plans will be made without prior review by the Department of City Planning, Central Project Planning Division, and written approval by the Director of Planning. Each change shall be identified and justified in writing. Minor deviations may be allowed in order to comply with the provisions of the Municipal Code, the project conditions, or the project permit authorization.
- 2. Floor Area. The total floor area of all proposed buildings shall be limited to a total of 2,502.09 square feet of floor area. As defined by the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan, Floor Area is that area in square feet confined within the exterior walls of a building of a One-Family Project, including the area of stairways, shafts, covered automobile parking areas and basement storage areas, and excluding uncovered outdoor decks. For lots greater than or equal to 5,000 square feet in size, but less than 10,000 square feet in size, the maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is determined by using the following equation: 0.50 {[(Lot Area 5,000) X 0.10] ÷ 5,000}. For this project, the lot size is 6,470.2 square feet, and therefore the allowable maximum floor area ratio based on the formula is 0.47 or 3,040.99 square feet. The proposed project's FAR is 0.39:1 or 2,502.09 square feet of floor area, including a 423.68-square foot garage.
- 3. Height. The project shall be limited to 37 feet, 7 inches in height as measured per Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Sections 12.03 and 12.21.1. The Specific Plan also limits building and structure heights within six (6)-foot and 12-foot distances as measured from the front property line by requiring a stepback. The portion of the building or structures located within six (6) feet of the front lot line shall be below the permitted height of 15 feet. The portion of the building or structures located within six (6) to 12 feet shall be below the permitted height of 24 feet.
- 4. **Parking.** The project shall provide parking pursuant to LAMC Section 12.21 C.10.
- 5. **Prevailing Front Yard Setback.** The project shall provide a six (6)-foot, two (2)-inch front yard setback.

#### 6. Landscape Plan:

- a. <u>Xeriscape Requirements</u>. The project shall comply with the existing xeriscape requirements set forth under Sections 12.40 through 12.43 of the LAMC.
- b. <u>Landform Planting Design</u>. The subject property falls within a Hillside Area and Special Grading Area. To the extent feasible, the type and placement of landscape materials on graded sloped shall conform to the standards set forth in the Landform Grading Manual.

- c. <u>Fire Safety.</u> The landscaping and preservation, relocation, and removal of Native and Significant Trees shall not require any planting in violation of applicable fire safety regulations.
- d. <u>Replacement, Relocation and Removal of Trees</u>. Prior to any work on the adjacent public right-of-way, the applicant shall be required to obtain approved plans from the Department of Public Works. As there currently is no approved right-of-way improvement plan and for purposes of conservative analysis under CEQA, Planning has analyzed the worst-case potential for removal of all street trees. Note that street trees and Protected Trees shall not be removed without prior approval of the Board of Public Works/Urban Forestry (BPW) under Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Sections 62.161-62.171. At the time of preparation of this environmental document, no approvals have been given for any tree removals on-site or in the right-of-way by BPW. The City has required a Tree Report to identify all Protected Trees/shrubs on the project site and all street trees in the adjacent public right-of-way. As identified in the Tree Report prepared by Arsen Margossian, Certified Arborist (#WE-7233A) on October 30, 2021, there is one (1) Significant Tree on site. The project does not require the removal of any trees from this lot.

# NOTE: Attachment "Exhibit B" lists the regulating codes and statutes regarding construction requirements and restrictions.

#### Administrative Conditions

- 7. **Final Plans.** Prior to the issuance of any building permits for the project by the Department of Building and Safety, the applicant shall submit all final construction plans that are awaiting issuance of a building permit by the Department of Building and Safety for final review and approval by the Department of City Planning. All plans that are awaiting issuance of a building permit by the Department of Building and Safety shall be stamped by Department of City Planning staff "Final Plans". A copy of the Final Plans, supplied by the applicant, shall be retained in the subject case file.
- 8. **Notations on Plans.** Plans submitted to the Department of Building and Safety, for the purpose of processing a building permit application shall include all of the Conditions of Approval herein attached as a cover sheet, and shall include any modifications or notations required herein.
- 9. **Approval, Verification and Submittals.** Copies of any approvals, guarantees or verification of consultations, review of approval, plans, etc., as may be required by the subject conditions, shall be provided to the Department of City Planning prior to clearance of any building permits, for placement in the subject file.
- 10. **Code Compliance.** Use, area, height, and yard regulations of the zone classification of the subject property shall be complied with, except where granted conditions differ herein.
- 11. **Department of Building and Safety**. The granting of this determination by the Director of Planning does not in any way indicate full compliance with applicable provisions of the Los Angeles Municipal Code Chapter IX (Building Code). Any corrections and/or modifications

to plans made subsequent to this determination by a Department of Building and Safety Plan Check Engineer that affect any part of the exterior design or appearance of the project as approved by the Director, and which are deemed necessary by the Department of Building and Safety for Building Code Compliance, shall require a referral of the revised plans back to the Department of City Planning for additional review and sign-off prior to the issuance of any permit in connection with those plans.

- 12. **Enforcement.** Compliance with these conditions and the intent of these conditions shall be to the satisfaction of the Department of City Planning.
- 13. **Covenant.** Prior to the issuance of any permits relative to this matter, a covenant acknowledging and agreeing to comply with all the terms and conditions established herein shall be recorded in the County Recorder's Office. The agreement (standard covenant and agreement form CP-6770) shall run with the land and shall be binding on any subsequent owners, heirs or assigns. The agreement with the conditions attached must be submitted to the Department of City Planning, Development Services Center for approval before being recorded. After recordation, a certified copy bearing the Recorder's number and date shall be provided to the Development Services Center for attachment to the subject case file.
- 14. **Expiration.** In the event that this grant is not utilized within three years of its effective date (the day following the last day that an appeal may be filed), the grant shall be considered null and void. Issuance of a building permit, and the initiation of, and diligent continuation of, construction activity shall constitute utilization for the purposes of this grant.
- 15. Indemnification and Reimbursement of Litigation Costs. Applicant shall do all of the following:
  - a. Defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City from any and all actions against the City relating to or arising out of, in whole or in part, the City's processing and approval of this entitlement, including <u>but not limited to</u>, an action to attack, challenge, set aside, void or otherwise modify or annul the approval of the entitlement, the environmental review of the entitlement, or the approval of subsequent permit decisions or to claim personal property damage, including from inverse condemnation or any other constitutional claim.
  - b. Reimburse the City for any and all costs incurred in defense of an action related to or arising out of, in whole or in part, the City's processing and approval of the entitlement, including but not limited to payment of all court costs and attorney's fees, costs of any judgments or awards against the City (including an award of attorney's fees), damages and/or settlement costs.
  - c. Submit an initial deposit for the City's litigation costs to the City within 10 days' notice of the City tendering defense to the Applicant and requesting a deposit. The initial deposit shall be in an amount set by the City Attorney's Office, in its sole discretion, based on the nature and scope of action, but in no event shall the initial deposit be less than \$50,000. The City's failure to notice or collect the deposit does not relieve the Applicant from responsibility to reimburse the City pursuant to the requirement in paragraph (b).

d. Submit supplemental deposits upon notice by the City. Supplemental deposits may be required in an increased amount from the initial deposit if found necessary by the City to protect the City's interests. The City's failure to notice or collect the deposit does not relieve the Applicant from responsibility to reimburse the City pursuant to the requirement (b).

e. If the City determines it necessary to protect the City's interests, execute an indemnity and reimbursement agreement with the City under terms consistent with the requirements of this condition.

The City shall notify the applicant within a reasonable period of time of its receipt of any action and the City shall cooperate in the defense. If the City fails to notify the applicant of any claim, action or proceeding in a reasonable time, or if the City fails to reasonably cooperate in the defense, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify or hold harmless the City.

The City shall have the sole right to choose its counsel, including the City Attorney's office or outside counsel. At its sole discretion, the City may participate at its own expense in the defense of any action, but such participation shall not relieve the applicant of any obligation imposed by this condition. In the event the Applicant fails to comply with this condition, in whole or in part, the City may withdraw its defense of the action, void its approval of the entitlement, or take any other action. The City retains the right to make all decisions with respect to its representations in any legal proceeding, including its inherent right to abandon or settle litigation.

For purposes of this condition, the following definitions apply:

"City" shall be defined to include the City, its agents, officers, boards, commission, committees, employees and volunteers.

"Action" shall be defined to include suits, proceedings (including those held under alternative dispute resolution procedures), claims or lawsuits. Actions includes actions, as defined herein, alleging failure to comply with any federal, state or local law.

Nothing in the definitions included in this paragraph are intended to limit the rights of the City or the obligations of the Applicant otherwise created by this condition.

#### FINDINGS

The project includes the construction, use, and maintenance of a new 2,502.09-square foot single-family dwelling with an attached garage, on a 6,470.2-square foot vacant lot that is within the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan area.

The parcels surrounding this project site have a land use designation of Low Residential and are zoned R1-1-HCR. The surrounding area is vacant or developed with single-family dwellings.

The proposed residential project meets the requirements of Section 6 of the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan for One-Family Project standards and Los Angeles Municipal Code 11.5.7, as follows:

## 1. The project substantially complies with the applicable regulations, findings, standards, and provisions of the specific plan.

#### a. Floor Area.

Per the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan Ordinance, for lots that are greater than or equal to 5,000 square feet in size, but less than 10,000 square feet in size, the maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is determined by using the following equation:  $0.50 - \{[(Lot Area - 5,000) \times 0.10] \div 5,000\}$ . For this project, the lot size is 6,470.2 square feet, and therefore the allowable maximum floor area ratio based on the formula is 0.47 or 3,040.99 square feet. As the project includes an FAR of 0.39:1 or 2,502.09 square feet of floor area, the project would be in conformance with Section 6.A of the Specific Plan.

#### b. Building Height and Stepback.

The Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan permits a maximum height of 45 feet and requires that any portion of a building or structure located within six (6) and 12 feet of the front lot line be stepped back. Within six (6) feet of the property line, no building or structure shall exceed a height of 15 feet and within six (6) to 12 feet, no building or structure shall exceed a height of 24 feet above the street curb elevation at the centerline of the front lot line. As proposed, the single-family dwelling will have a height of 37 feet, 7 inches. The portion of the building or structures located within six (6) feet of the permitted height of 15 feet. The portion of the building or structures located within six (6) to 12 feet are below the permitted height of 24 feet. As proposed, the building height and stepback distances are in compliance with Section 6.B of the Specific Plan.

#### c. Prevailing Front Yard Setback.

As indicated on Sheet A0.01 of the stamped "Exhibit A," the prevailing front yard setback was calculated in accordance with Section 6.C of the Specific Plan. As calculated, the project would be required to observe a minimum five (5)-foot front yard setback. As proposed, the single-family dwelling will provide a six (6)-foot,

two (2)-inch setback from the front lot line, which complies with Section 6.C of the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan.

#### d. Off-street Automobile Parking Requirements for Additions and Remodeling.

Off-street automobile parking requirements for additions and remodeling does not apply since the proposed project is new construction. The project includes a 423.68-square foot attached garage, which provides two (2) covered parking spaces. The project complies with Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 12.21 C.10 and Section 6.D of the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan.

#### e. Public Health and Safety.

Haul routes are required only when the removal of earth from on-site exceeds 1,000 cubic yards. The project requires the cut of 820 cubic yards of soil, the fill of 115 cubic yards of soil, the import of zero (0) cubic yards of soil, and the export of 705 cubic yards of soil. A haul route is required to export a total of 1,415 cubic yards of soil for both 3152 and 3164 Future Street and therefore, the project is compliant with Section 6.E of the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan and the LAMC.

## f. Landscaping and preservation, relocation, and removal of native and significant trees.

The City has required a Tree Report to identify all protected trees/shrubs on the project site and all street trees in the adjacent public right-of-way. As identified in the Tree Report prepared by Arsen Margossian, Certified Arborist (#WE-7233A) on October 30, 2021, there is one (1) Significant Tree on site. The project does not require the removal of any trees from this lot. The project has been conditioned to comply with the Landscape Ordinance, which satisfies the requirements of Section 6.F of the Specific Plan.

## g. The architectural design elements of the front and rear building elevations vary from the adjacent buildings.

The architectural design elements of the exterior for the first level of the dwelling will consist of only stone veneer on the exterior, with dark gray garage doors. This first level will contrast from the second and third levels, which will mainly consist of off-white stucco. A portion of the second and third level front façade will have a dark gray horizontal panel down the center of the dwelling to create a change in plane and to contrast from the off-white stucco. The proposed decks will have an aluminum guard rail and the dwelling will also have multiple windows to allow for more transparency. The overall design aesthetic of the home will be modern and contemporary and provide varied massing of the architectural elements that vary from the adjacent buildings to the north. The existing single-family dwellings along Future Street, north of the project site are vacant. The proposed single-family dwelling will differ from adjacent buildings in that the dwelling will have varied modulation

along the front façade, as opposed to the existing dwellings that have little to no plane changes to the front facades. The proposed flat roof will also differ from the proposed gable roof at 3164 East Future Street. As proposed, the architectural elevations and sections, attached as "Exhibit A" are in conformance with the Design Variation standards contained in Section 8.C of the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan.

# 2. The project incorporates mitigation measures, monitoring measures when necessary, or alternatives identified in the environmental review, which would mitigate the negative environmental effects of the project, to the extent physically feasible.

A Negative Declaration, ENV-2016-4999-ND, and Errata, dated September 25, 2023, were prepared for the proposed project. On the basis of the whole of the record before the lead agency including any comments received, the lead agency finds that, there is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have a significant effect on the environment. The attached Negative Declaration reflects the lead agency's independent judgement and analysis. The records upon which those decisions are based are with the Department of City Planning in 1350, 221 North Figueroa.

#### **OBSERVANCE OF CONDITIONS - TIME LIMIT - LAPSE OF PRIVILEGES**

All terms and conditions of the Director's Determination shall be fulfilled before the use may be established. The instant authorization is further conditioned upon the privileges being utilized within **three years** after the effective date of this determination and, if such privileges are not utilized, building permits are not issued, or substantial physical construction work is not begun within said time and carried on diligently so that building permits do not lapse, the authorization shall terminate and become void.

#### TRANSFERABILITY

This determination runs with the land. In the event the property is to be sold, leased, rented or occupied by any person or corporation other than yourself, it is incumbent that you advise them regarding the conditions of this grant. If any portion of this approval is utilized, then all other conditions and requirements set forth herein become immediately operative and must be strictly observed.

#### FINAL PLAN SIGN OFF AND APPROVAL

Verification of condition compliance with building plans and/or building permit applications are done at the Development Services Center of the Department of City Planning at either Figueroa Plaza in Downtown Los Angeles, the Marvin Braude Building in the San Fernando Valley, or the West Los Angeles Development Services Center. In order to assure that you receive services without waiting, applicants are encouraged to schedule an appointment with the Development Services Center by calling (213) 482-7077 (Figueroa Plaza) or (818) 374-5050 (Marvin Braude Building) San Fernando Valley or (310) 231-2901 (West LA) or through the Department of City Planning website at <a href="https://www.planning.lacity.org">www.planning.lacity.org</a>. The applicant is further advised to notify any consultant representing you of this requirement.

#### VIOLATIONS OF THESE CONDITIONS, A MISDEMEANOR

Section 11.00 of the LAMC states in part (m): "It shall be unlawful for any person to violate any provision or fail to comply with any of the requirements of this Code. Any person violating any of the provisions or failing to comply with any of the mandatory requirements of this Code shall be guilty of a misdemeanor unless that violation or failure is declared in that section to be an infraction. An infraction shall be tried and be punishable as provided in Section 19.6 of the Penal Code and the provisions of this section. Any violation of this Code that is designated as a misdemeanor may be charged by the City Attorney as either a misdemeanor or an infraction.

Every violation of this determination is punishable as a misdemeanor unless provision is otherwise made, and shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both a fine and imprisonment."

#### APPEAL PERIOD - EFFECTIVE DATE

This grant is not a permit or license and any permits and/or licenses required by law must be obtained from the proper public agency. If any Condition of this grant is violated or not complied with, then the applicant or their successor in interest may be prosecuted for violating these Conditions the same as for any violation of the requirements contained in the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC).

This determination will become effective after the end of appeal period date on the first page of this document, unless an appeal is filed with the Department of City Planning. An appeal application must be submitted and paid for before 4:30 PM (PST) on the final day to appeal the determination. Should the final day fall on a weekend or legal City holiday, the time for filing an appeal shall be extended to 4:30 PM (PST) on the next succeeding working day. Appeals should be filed early to ensure the Development Services Center (DSC) staff has adequate time to review and accept the documents, and to allow appellants time to submit payment.

An appeal may be filed utilizing the following options:

**Online Application System (OAS):** The OAS (<u>https://planning.lacity.org/oas</u>) allows entitlement appeals to be submitted entirely electronically by allowing an appellant to fill out and submit an appeal application online directly to City Planning's DSC, and submit fee payment by credit card or e-check.

**Drop off at DSC.** Appeals of this determination can be submitted in-person at the Metro or Van Nuys DSC locations, and payment can be made by credit card or check. City Planning has established drop-off areas at the DSCs with physical boxes where appellants can drop off appeal applications; alternatively, appeal applications can be filed with staff at DSC public counters. Appeal applications must be on the prescribed forms, and accompanied by the required fee and a copy of the determination letter. Appeal applications shall be received by the DSC public counter and paid for on or before the above date or the appeal will not be accepted.

Forms are available online at <u>http://planning.lacity.org/development-services/forms</u>. Public offices are located at:

Metro DSC (213) 482-7077 201 N. Figueroa Street Los Angeles, CA 90012 planning.figcounter@lacity.org

Van Nuys DSC (818) 374-5050 6262 Van Nuys Boulevard Van Nuys, CA 91401 planning.mbc2@lacity.org

West Los Angeles DSC (CURRENTLY CLOSED) (310) 231-2901 1828 Sawtelle Boulevard West Los Angeles, CA 90025 planning.westla@lacity.org

City Planning staff may follow up with the appellant via email and/or phone if there are any questions or missing materials in the appeal submission, to ensure that the appeal package is complete and meets the applicable LAMC provisions.

If you seek judicial review of any decision of the City pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5, the petition for writ of mandate pursuant to that section must be filed no later than the 90th day following the date on which the City's decision became final pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6. There may be other time limits which also affect your ability to seek judicial review.

Verification of condition compliance with building plans and/or building permit applications are done at the City Planning Metro or Valley DSC locations. An in-person or virtual appointment for Condition Clearance can be made through the City's BuildLA portal (appointments.lacity.org). The applicant is further advised to notify any consultant representing you of this requirement as well.



QR Code to Online Appeal Filing



QR Code to Forms for In-Person Appeal Filing



QR Code to BuildLA Appointment Portal for Condition Clearance

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP Director of Planning

DIR-2016-4998-SPP-HCA

Approved by:

Reviewed by:

Jane Choi Jone J. Choi, AICP, Principal City Planner

Nicole Sanchez

Nicole Sanchez, City Planner

Prepared by:

Nashya Sadono-Jensen Nashya Sadono-Jensen City Planning Associate nashya.sadono-jensen@lacity.org

Regulating Codes and Statutes Regarding Construction Requirements and Restrictions. "Exhibit B"

All departments listed below are within the City of Los Angeles unless otherwise noted. As shown on the following table, each required regulating Code and Statute for the proposed project is listed and categorized by area, with accompanying enforcement agencies and The Applicant or Owner shall be responsible for implementing all regulating Codes and Statutes in regards to construction regulations. contact numbers:

	Construction Requirements	Enforcement	CONTACT
		Agency*	
5 0	nen temporarily blocking portions of streets for deliveries of construction iterials, please provide flag persons to assist with pedestrian and vehicular	BOSS	(800) 996-2489
(TT	ffic. LAMC 62.46		
1	eet closures shall not take place during peak traffic hours. Any street,	BOSS	(800) 996-2489
0 0	ewalk, or other improvement work shall be in conformance with the latest inual on Work Area Traffic Control. LAMC 62.1-07		
	re should be taken to not overfill concrete trucks during deliveries. If spills	BOSS	(800) 996-2489
0	cur it is the responsibility of the concrete company to immediately provide		
Ð	an up. LAMC 62.130.		
0	instruction noise should be kept to a minimum with consideration of the	LAPD,	311 or
-	rrounding neighbors and only during hours permitted. Unnecessary noise	LADBS,	(323) -344-5701 (non-
-	all be kept below legal levels. LAMC 112.01, 112.03, 112.04, 112.05 (City of	BOSS	emergency)
C	s Angeles Noise Ordinance No. 144,331 and 161,574)		(800)-996-2489
	eets and sidewalks adjacent to construction sites shall be swept and free of	BOSS	(800) 996-2489
0	nstruction debris at all times. LAMC 62.45 through 62.54.		15
	ire should be taken to not interfere with trash pick-up by the Bureau of	LADOT	(213) 485-4184
S CO	initation. Construction and delivery vehicles are subject to trash pick-up		
5	rking restrictions. LAMC 80.69.		
	ouilding materials are to be stored in the public right of way, it shall be by	BOSS	(800) 996-2489
0)	rmit from the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Street Services,		1
-	restigations and Enforcement Division and shall conform to all applicable		
-	es. LAMC 62.45 through 62.54.		

APD BOSS 3- LADBS t SCAQMD ver SCAQMD	(323) -344-5701	1-800-CUT SMOG 1-800-CUT SMOG 1-800-CUT SMOG
der t	LAPD	SCAQMD SCAQMD SCAQMD
<ul> <li>8 Comply with the following Permitted Construction/Demolition Hours. LAMC 41.40</li> <li>A1.40</li> <li>Monday- Friday</li> <li>Saturday or National Holiday</li> <li>8 AM – 6 PM</li> <li>Saturday or National Holiday</li> <li>8 AM – 6 PM</li> <li>Sunday</li> <li>The applicant shall provide a staked signage at the site with a minimum of inch lettering containing contact information for the Senior Street Use Inspector (Department of Public Works), the Senior Grading Inspector (LADBS) and the hauling or general contractor.</li> <li>10 Compliance with provisions of the Southern California Air Quality Managemen District Rule 403 for dust and air pollution from construction activities.</li> <li>11 The Project shall comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 4113 limiting the volatile organic compound content of architectural coatings.</li> <li>12 In accordance with Sections 2485 in Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, the idling of all diesel-fueled commercial vehicles (weighing over the other commercial vehicles (weighing over the other commercial vehicles (weighing over the commercial vehicles (weig</li></ul>	8 Comply with the following Permitted Construction/Demolition Hours. LAMC	<ul> <li>(LADBS) and the hauling or general contractor.</li> <li>(LADBS) and the hauling or general contractor.</li> <li>(LADBS) and the hauling or general contractor.</li> <li>10 Compliance with provisions of the Southern California Air Quality Management District Rule 403 for dust and air pollution from construction activities.</li> <li>11 The Project shall comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113 limiting the volatile organic compound content of architectural coatings.</li> <li>12 In accordance with Sections 2485 in Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, the idling of all diesel-fueled commercial vehicles (weighing over 10,000 pounds) during construction shall be limited to five minutes at any location.</li> </ul>

NOTE: Report a haul route violation online using this link:

http://ladbs.org/services/core-services/inspection/inspection-special-assistance/haul-route-monitoring-program/haul-routemonitoring-program-complaint-form

KEY:

LADBS—Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety BOSS----Bureau of Street Services LADOT--- Los Angeles Department of Transportation LAPD--- Los Angeles Police Department SCAQMD--- Southern California Air Quality Management District



# **Project Plans** ARCHIBUILD al Construction, Building Pennits, Architectuta Drafting Services, 3D-Design, Tetoring V 121 N Kenwood St. Tel/Fax (818) 850-2022 Glendale, CA 91206 cell (818) 389-6043 e-mail: saymarina@hotmail.com ANDRE OHANIAN, TEL: 818-636-1594 NEW 3-STORY SFD-S WITH 2-CAR GARAGE 3152 FUTURE ST, LOS ANGELES, CA 90065 Date Description No. Consultant Address Address Phone Fax e-mail TITLE PAGE Project numbe Project Number Date Issue Date Drawn by Author Checked by Checker A0.00 Scale 1/8" = 1'-0"

DIR-2016-4998-SPP-HCA-1A

EXHIBIT C

PREVALING	SET BAC	K MATRI)	( FOR 3152	<b>FUTURE S</b>	T (LOT #116)	
NUMBI	ROFLO	TS INCLU	DED INTO 1	THE CALCU	LATION	
LOT NUMBER	42	43	115	117	118	119
( E) SETBACK	3.5'	6'	VACANT	VACANT	VACANT	VACANT
LOT FRONTAGE	45.58'	58.14'				
DICARD TOP AND BOTTOM 20%	YES	YES	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
VACANT LOTS	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
LOTS USED	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SET BACK FOR THIS	LOT WHEN	NO SPECIFI	C PLANS OR L	D85 METHO	DS ARE APPLICABE	ELE
SEC. 12.21.A.17 (a)	5			FT		





#### Andre Ohanian 10118 Fernglen Avenue #3 Tujunga, CA 91042 January 22, 2015

Dear Applicant:

SUBJECT: 3152 Future Street ~ DETERMINATION OF DEDICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE HILLSIDE ORDINANCE (LAMC 12.21.C.10)

his correspondence is in response to your request received January 7, 2015, that the surseu of Engineering walves the requirement for a street dedication for this project

This determination is valid for a by-right project only and shall not be considered by the CKy Planning Department (Planning) for any discretionary action under review for the subject property. Dedication regularements from Planning may differ from requirements stated herein. If a Planning Case is involved, the appropriate feee must be paid to the Bureau of Engineering, Land Development Group prior to an investigation and report of recommendations to Planning.

Existing Conditions: The subject parcel is located 166 feet southeast of the intersection of Future Street and Kilbourn Street, with a legal description of Lot 1150 TTALTR 4417. Future Street is a Substandard Hillside Limited Street with a right-of-way of 30 feet and a randway of 20 feet. The width of the continuous paved randway from the subject property to the boundary of the Hillside Ordinance must be 23-dest wide. Findings

The owner has requested that the 3-foot dedisation along Future Street be walved based on the following measure: 1. Existing improvements on neighboring properties make widening improvide. 2. Unique shape of let cruatus a targer impact from dedication.

AN EQUAL REPLOYEERS OFFORTUNITY ENFLOYER



Per the Hilkaids Ordinance (LAMC Soci. 12.21.C.10), the Bureau of Engineering must determine the Street Classification, required devication and any required improvements prior to issuance of a building permit. Per the Hilkaide Ordinance, the City Engineer shall obtain decication for public right-of-way for one-half of the width of the street(s) for the full frontage of text to Standard Hilkaide Limited Street dimensions or to a lesser width as determined by the City Engineer.

One of the basic requirements of the Hiliside Ordinance is that a continuously paved readway of twarty feet or greater in with canned the proposed project to the bundary of the Hiliside Ordinance Area. The other requirement is that a minimum 20-locat way paved readway occupies the frontage of the property. Due to minimum 20-locat way proved readway occupies the frontage of the property. Due to the existing conditions it payers hold merginaments have beam met. The 3-bord dedication along Future Street will not be required for approval of your building at this thms. This decision is based on classmana from property line to the existing roadway which a sufficient for any future improvements that may be done.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please call me at (213) 482-7062. Sincerely,

Carl Mills, P.E. Bureau of Engine Central District O

3152 future about




















6 3D View 1\_1 04-16-23











|--|--|

# LEGAL DESCRIPTION

LOTS 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123 AND 124 OF TRACT NO. 4417 IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 48 PAGE 95 INCLUSIVE OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY.

THIS MAP WAS CREATED WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF A TITLE REPORT, BOUNDARIES SHOWN PER RECORD DATA.

# BENCHMARK

SPIKE FOUND IN CENTERLINE OF FUTURE STREET PER CEFB 12933 PG 21R AS SHOWN HEREON.

ELEVATION - 550.30 (PER GPS OBSERVATION, NAVD 1988)

# BASIS OF BEARING

THE BEARINGS HEREON ARE BASED ON THE BEARING THE BEARINGS HENEON ARE BASED ON THE BEARING NORTH 12:46'10" EAST OF A COURSE IN THE CENTERLINE OF FUTURE STREET (FORMERLY KEATING DRIVE) AS SHOWN ON TRACT MAP No. 4417 AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 48 PAGE 95, INCLUSIVE OF MAPS, RECORDS OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY.

# TREE LIST EXISTING

FOR DESCRIPTION AND TREE REMOVAL SEE ARBORIST REPORT.

<b>e</b> #1	JUGLANS CALIFORNICA OR BLACK WALNUT
#2	FRAXINUS VELUINA OR ARIZONA ASH
#3	ULMUS PARVIFOLIA OR CHINESE ELM
#4	ULMUS PARVIFOLIA
#5	ULMUS PARVIFOLIA
#6	ULMUS PARVIFOLIA
●∦7	JUGLANS CALIFORNICA
#8	ULMUS PARVIFOLIA
#9	ULMUS PARVIFOLIA
●#10	ULMUS PARVIFOLIA
●#11	ULMUS PARVIFOLIA
#12	ULMUS PARVIFOLIA
#13	ULMUS PARVIFOLIA
#14	ULMUS PARVIFOLIA
#15	ULMUS PARVIFOLIA
●∦16	JUGLANS CALIFORNICA
●#17	SCHINUS MOLLE OR CALIFORNIA PEPPER
<b>9</b> #18	JUGLANS CALIFORNICA
6 #19	JUGLANS CALIFORNICA
₿#20	ULMUS PARVIFOLIA
9#21	JUGLANS CALIFORNICA
₿ #22	JUGLANS CALIFORNICA
#23	ULMUS PARVIFOLIA

	FUTURE ST PROPERTY ADDRESS	LOT AREA S.F.	BUILDING FOOTPRINT S.F.
	3164	6626.1	1248
	3152	6470.2	1248
	3144	6993.9	1350
	3138	5288.4	1248
	3134	5840.0	1248
	3126	7917.3	1248
	3122	7053.9	1248
	3118	5605.5	1144
	3114	5776.5	1144
	3110	5910.0	1144
4	L LOT AREA	63,481.80	12,274.00

		3
$\Delta^{n}$		3
1		3
	TOTAL	L LO
s-spp	-HCA	

_	TREE PL	N DOCUME	DOCUMENT NUMBER T-1			$\square$	
	1	AS	HOWN	GRADING	2013.58		
	TILE	SCALE		FILE NAME	JOB NUMBER	REVISION	
	FUTURE STREET, LOS ANGELES CA 90065						
	AT						
	PROPOSED GRADING & DRAINAGE						

DEPARTMENT OF

#### LDING AND SAFETY/ DEPARTMEN JE F PRELIMINARY REFERRAL FORM FOR BASELINE HILLSIDE ORDINANCE No. 181,6: Hillside Referral Form HILLSIDE ORDINANCE No. 168,159

DIR-2016-4998-SPP-HCA-1A

EXHIBIT D

Building and Safety	Date: 02/10/2015		PIN: 148-5A217-261
Address: 3152 E FUTURE	E ST	Applicant:	
District Map: 148-5A217	Tract: TR 4417	Project Description:	
Block:	Lot: 116	Phone:	
APN: 5454006016		Fax:	
		PCIS No.:	
Public Works:			
Vehicular Access:			
1. Is the Continuous Pave apron of the subject lot	d Roadway (CPR)* at least 28ft wide fr to the boundary of the Hillside Area?	om the driveway	🗌 Yes 🖪 No
2. Is the CPR at least 20ft boundary of the Hillside	wide, from the driveway apron of the se Area?	ubject lot to the	Yes 🗌 No
3. Is the street adjacent to (Note: all streets adjacent to street frontages, such as a c	the subject lot at least 20ft wide? a lot must be considered when the lot has mult corner lot or a through lot.)	tiple	🖬 Yes 🗌 No
* CPR = begins at the driveway apron If "2" and "3" are Yes: COMPLY WI If "2" or "3" are No: REFER TO P	and must be continuous and without permanent obstact TH HILLSIDE ORD. ZA APPROVAL IS NOT REQ'D PLANNING FOR APPROVAL PER 12.24X21 OR 12.24X	cles to the boundary of the Hillside Area. <28	
Street Type:			
1st Street Name:FUTURE	ST	R/W width: 30ft	Roadway width: 20ft
Lot fronts on a standard hill	side limited street	Dedication required width: <u>3ft</u>	Plan Index: AERIAL
Lot fronts on a sub standard	d hillside limited street	Improvement required	
Comments:			
2nd Street Name:		R/W width:	Roadway width:
Lot fronts on a standard hill	side limited street	Dedication required width:	Plan Index:
Lot fronts on a sub standard	d hillside limited street	Improvement required	
Comments:			
Sewer Connection:	F	ND 2014 4000	
Lot located less than 200	ft from sewer mainline:	MR 2016-4998	
Use existing wye and per	mit	Obtain new connection and new permit	
Use existing wye, obtain I	new permit	Obtain B-Permit from PW/BOE to construct ne	ew mainline
Lot located greater than 2	200 ft from sewer mainline:		
Obtain LADBS approval f	or on-site sewer	Obtain B-Permit from PW/BOE to construct ne	ew mainline
Public Works Employee completing th Sign:	Mali/	Print Name: JAMES MORALE2	
Date: 2-10-1	15 Phone: (213)4	187-7030 Location: CENT	RAL
i The final determination of Hillside Ordinance	e applicability shall be made after any and all dedication/improvements $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{D}$	entset required) have been made 2 0 9	

DIR-2016-4998-SPP-HCA-1A **EXHIBIT E** Construction Traffic Management Plan

# 3152-3164 East Future Street Hillside Development Construction Traffic Management Plan

July 14, 2021

**Prepared by:** 

Jano Baghdanian, P.E., T.E., PTOE

Fax: 818.888.4541



# 3152-3164 East Future Street Hillside Development Construction Traffic Management Plan

Per the LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines Addendum – Hillside Developments, new land use development projects requiring discretionary entitlements proposed in hillside communities on streets less than 24-feet wide (on any roadway segment used by the project for hauling materials and equipment) should develop a Traffic Management Plan ("Plan") that identifies measures to offset access, circulation, and parking issues for LADOT review and approval.

This document represents said Plan to be followed by Andre Ohanian & Highrise, Incorporated and its successors and assigns (collectively, the "Owner"), the General Contractors, and Subcontractors, in connection with the construction of ten single family dwellings at 3152-3164 East Future Street, Los Angeles, CA 90065.

#### **Project Description**

The Owner proposes the construction of ten single- family dwellings with a two car garages, and associated grading (herein referred to as the "Project").

# **Purpose of the Plan**

The purpose of this Plan is to facilitate timely completion of the Project, coordinate schedules and parking with other developers within the affected area and to minimize any potential impacts that may be experienced by the surrounding community in connection with the construction of the Project. The Plan shall apply during all aspects of construction related to the Project and the Owner and his/her/their agents will coordinate with LADOT to ensure the construction of each project should be scheduled so as not to create adverse construction traffic in the area.

# **Construction Activities**

# **Construction Hours**

Construction shall take place in compliance with the provisions of Section 41.40 and62.61 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC). In order to ensure timely completion of the Project while minimizing impacts on the surrounding community, exterior noise- generating construction shall be limited to Monday through Friday from 7:00 AM to 9:00 PM and Saturday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM. No construction activities shall occur on Sundays or any national holidays without a separate permit. Management, supervisory, administrative and inspection activities shall take place with the designated construction hours to the extent feasible; however, such activities may take place outside of the designed construction hours if approved by the appropriate agencies.

# **Construction Contact**

The Owner shall appoint a Construction Contact ("CC") to respond to inquiries or concerns of surrounding residents as well as the general public. The CC may be an employee or representative of either the General Contractor or Owner. A project hotline will be provided for local neighbor complaints or any inquiries and the construction process. A response to comments or inquiries will be provided within 72 hours of receipt. The project hotline number is (818) 636-1594 and shall be conspicuously posted at each construction site. The CC shall notify the Owner if the CC is notified of any construction activities that potentially violate this Plan or any of the construction-related conditions of approval.

# **Construction Phasing**

It is anticipated that construction of the Project would be continuous and in two phases. Once mobilized, the construction barricades (Fencing) would remain in place for the duration of the construction (or returned once that area is complete).

The on-site construction process will be conducted in two phases to further ensure material staging and employee parking can be accommodated.

**Phase 1** consists of grading the property and foundation work in order to create the pads to build upon the single-family dwellings. Traffic control measures will be implemented during excavations or other work within the existing roadway per the latest standards of *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]) or the latest edition of *Work Area Traffic Control Handbook* (American Public Works Association) WATCH Manual. East Future Street is a roadway of approximately 25 single family homes, so traffic impacts are expected to be minimal.

Phase 2 is the construction of the main houses, and the garages.

# **Barricades**

All construction barriers will be maintained in accordance with City regulations and their appearance will be maintained in a visually attractive manner throughout the construction period.

Signs will be posted along the fencing stating that no unauthorized materials are permitted to be posted. The General Contractor will ensure with daily morning walks by designated personnel that no unauthorized materials are posted on any temporary barricades or any temporary fencing. Graffiti on barricades will be removed or covered at the earliest possible time after the General Contractor is aware of its existence.

# **Construction Site Security**

The Owner will utilize all appropriate security measures, including but not limited to security guards, lighting, fencing and locks at all entrances as appropriate to maintain safety in and around the

construction site.

# **Emergency Access**

Emergency access to the projects and adjacent areas shall be kept clear and unobstructed during all phases of construction.

The nearest hospital is LAC+USC Medical Center, located at 2051 Marengo Street, Los Angeles, CA 90033 and the nearest fire station is Fire Station 44, located at 1410 Cypress Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90065.

# Very High Fire Severity Zone

In accordance with Section 57.322.1.1, the project shall adhere to LAFD brush clearance regulations to ensure that certain vegetation does not provide a ready fuel supply to augment the spread or intensity of a fire.

Additionally, grading and hauling activities shall be discontinued during periods of high winds and Red Flag days as determined by the Los Angeles Fire Department. The Owner and General Contractor will cooperate with Fire Station 44 to ensure that the Project ensures fire safety and minimizes fire hazards during construction.

# **Construction Circulation**

# **Traffic Control Plans**

The Owner will generate all worksite traffic control plans ("TCP") and obtain prior Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) approval for any lane closures, detours, on-street staging areas and/or temporary changes in street traffic control that may be required during construction. Temporary traffic control procedures will be employed as appropriate to address circulation requirements. These procedures could include, but are not limited to; traffic cones, temporary signs, changeable message signs, and flagmen.

All traffic control procedures shall be undertaken in accordance with the standards in the latest edition of *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]) or the latest edition of *Work Area Traffic Control Handbook* (American Public Works Association). The General Contractors will be responsible for replacing any signs missing or damaged due to construction activities according to LADOT specifications. In addition, the General Contractor will be responsible for striping (proposed and exiting) to be in good condition and visible. Any faded existing striping would be repainted as directed by LADOT.

Per LAMC Section 62.61, construction activities that are within or obstruct the public right of way on East Future Street are restricted during peak traffic hours, defined as the hours of 6:00 AM - 9:00 AM and

3:30 PM – 7:00 PM, unless an exemption is approved by the Department of Public Works.

# **Truck Access**

All vehicle access to the Project site is via East Future Street. Ingress and Egress to the Project would occur along East Future Street entering from Future Street and Cypress Avenue to the South. The following are the anticipated truck routes for hauling and other large construction vehicles.

Inbound trucks, Southbound Glendale Freeway (2): Exit 14 San Fernando Road Left onto San Fernando Road, Left on Cazador Street Right onto Cypress Avenue Left onto Future Street Right onto Kemper Street Left onto Future Street Continue to Project site

Inbound trucks, Northbound Glendale Freeway (2): Exit 14 San Fernando Road Right onto San Fernando Road, Left on Cazador Street Right onto Cypress Avenue Left onto Future Street Right onto Kemper Street Left onto Future Street Continue to Project site

Outbound trucks: Exit Project site turn left and head southbound Right onto Kemper Street Left on Future Street Right on Cypress Avenue Left on Cazador Street Right on San Fernando Road Turn left onto the 2 Freeway (southbound) Turn right onto 2 Freeway (northbound)

Where necessary, flagmen with communication devices shall be used to coordinate hauling activities. The Owner and General Contractor will be responsible to submit the necessary documents to the Board of Building & Safety in order to get an approved haul route to be used during construction.

Permits for oversized or overweight loads, if needed, will be obtained from the Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Street Services (and Caltrans, if the oversized or overweight load will be traveling on a state highway). Such permit loads will be subject to the conditions of the permit and the time of issuance.

# **Construction Truck Hours**

To the extent feasible, the arrival and departure of construction trucks shall occur outside of peak commute hours and shall be minimized when not feasible. On weekdays, haul truck trips shall be scheduled between the hours of (9:00 AM to 3:00 PM) of the permitted construction work period to avoid generating trips during the weekday peak periods. Hauling is prohibited on weekends and federal holidays.

Equipment and material deliveries and pick-ups shall be coordinated to reduce the potential for trucks to wait to load or unload on public or private streets for protracted periods for time to ensure that trucks are not impeding traffic flow on the surrounding streets while waiting to enter the Project site.

# **Construction Employee Parking and Material Staging**

It shall be the responsibility of the General Contractor to minimize on-street employee parking during the construction periods. However there does not seem to be any viable off-street parking areas that can be used. Therefore it is anticipated that 2 to 3 vehicles will be parked on-street during the grading and foundation work phase of construction. Once the concrete work and retaining walls are completed and fully cured, these areas can be used for parking and material staging. During the building construction phase, some parking can be on-site and employees will be encouraged to carpool to minimize on-street parking. All material staging will take place on site. If required, the General Contractor can provide the desired parking and staging information to the satisfaction of The City prior to the issuance of any permits.

The on-site construction process will be conducted in 2 phases to further ensure material staging can be accommodated on-site.

The General Contractor shall provide all construction contractors with written information on where their workers and subcontractors are permitted to park, including identification of clear consequences to violators for failure to following these regulations.

The General Contractor shall be responsible for informing subcontractors and construction workers of these requirements and will monitor the compliance of the subcontractors.

# **Traffic Related Environmental Controls**

# Vehicle Air Ouality Measures

Loads shall be secured by trimming or watering or may be covered to prevent the spilling or blowing of the earth material. If the load, where it contacts the sides, front, and back of the truck cargo container area, remains six inches from the upper edge of the container area, and if the load does not extend, at its peak, above any part of the upper edge of the cargo container area, the load is not required to be covered, pursuant to California Vehicle Code Section 23114(e)(4).

Trucks and loads are to be watered at the Project site to prevent blowing dirt and are to be cleaned of loose earth at the Project site to prevent spilling.

Adjacent streets will be swept as needed to remove dirt dropped by the construction vehicles or mud

that would otherwise be carried off by trucks departing the site.

# Vehicle Water Ouality Measure

Where truck traffic is frequent, gravel approaches shall be used to reduce soil compaction and limit the racking of sediment into streets.

All vehicle/equipment maintenance, repair, and washing shall be conducted away from storm remains. All major repairs shall be conducted off-site. Drip Pans or drop cloths shall be used to catch drips and spills.

# <u>Idling</u>

All construction vehicles shall be prohibited from idling in excess of five minutes, both on-site and off-site.

# **Nearby Construction/Permit Activity**

This area is mainly built out with single family dwellings, however there are twelve vacant parcels on this segment of East Future Street, including the subject project. The vacant parcel at 3233 Future Street has submitted plans to the Department of Building & Safety to build a new single family home with garage and retaining walls on the parcel. The vacant parcel at 1420 Killarney Avenue has also submitted plans to the Department of Building & Safety to build a new single family home with attached garage and retaining walls on the parcel. The vacant parcel at 1538 Randall Court has submitted plans to the Department of Building & Safety to build a new single family home with attached garage and retaining walls on the parcel. The vacant parcel at 1538 Randall Court has submitted plans to the Department of Building & Safety to build a new single family home with garage and retaining walls on the parcel. The vacant parcel at 1538 Randall Court has submitted plans to the Department of Building & Safety to build a new single family home with garage and retaining walls on the parcel. The vacant parcel at 1538 Randall Court has submitted plans to the Department of Building & Safety to build a new single family home with garage and retaining walls on the parcel. It does not seem that any other parcel has submitted any requests to the City to be developed at this time. If any other projects do appear during the construction of 3152-3164 East Future Street, The Owner and General Contractor will attempt to work with the other projects in good faith to coordinate activity as best as feasibly possible.



DIR-2016-5000-SPP-HCA-1A **EXHIBIT F** Soils Report

# REPORT SOIL AND GEOLOGY INVESTIGATION Proposed Residences Lots 115 through 124,Tract 4417 3164, 3152, 3144, 3138, 3134 3126, 3122, 3118, 3114, 3110 East Future Street Los Angeles, California

for

Andre Ohanian 10118 Fernglen Avenue # 3 Tujunga, CA 91042

> Project: G-2621-FG TECHNOSOIL, INC. July 30, 2014

GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING / ENGINEERING GEOLOGY

**TECHNOSOIL, INC.** 

341 West Arden Ave., Glendale, CA 91203 Tel: (818) 500-4995 Fax: (818) 500-4986 E-mail: technosoil@sbcglobal.net

July 30, 2014

Project: G-2621-FG

Mr. Andre Ohanian 10118 Fernglen Avenue # 3 Tujunga, CA 91042

Re: Soil and Geology Investigation Proposed Residences Lots 115 through 124, Tract 4417 3164, 3152, 3144, 3138, 3134 3126, 3122, 3118, 3114, 3110 East Future Street Los Angeles, California

Dear Mr. Ohanian:

Submitted herewith is the report of a soil and geology investigation conducted at the above referenced site, at your request. The scope and details of this investigation were set forth in the proposal/agreement dated December 17, 2013.

This investigation was conducted in accordance with generally accepted geotechnical engineering procedures and included such field and laboratory tests considered necessary under the circumstances. In the opinion of the undersigned, the accompanying report has been substantiated by engineering analysis in conformance with generally accepted engineering principles and presents fairly the information requested. No other warranty expressed or implied is made as to the professional advice included in this report.

Respectfully submitted,

TECHNOSOIL, INC.

M. Minassian, RCE #33813 AMM:MK:sv 3381

Mark Kruger, CE

SIONAL lo. 2345 Exp. 6-30-12 CERTIFIFD

#### INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to review previous subsurface investigation reports by this office and others for Lots 115 through 124, Tract 4417 at 3164, 3152, 3144, 3138, 3134, 3126, 3122, 3118, 3114 and 3110 East Future Street, Los Angeles, California and to provide updated design recommendations for the currently proposed project.

It is currently proposed to construct ten, two-story single-family residences, one on each lot. (see Plates A through L).

#### SITE LOCATION AND CONDITIONS

The subject site consists of ten contiguous lots located on west and southwest facing slope, in the Glassell Park area of the City of Los Angeles, California.

From the street, a 10 to 35-foot high road cut ascends at an average slope gradient of approximately 1.0:1.0 (horizontal to vertical). From the top of the road cut the slope continues to ascend up to approximately 60 vertical feet to the rear property line at an average slope gradient of 2.0:1.0. Beyond, the slope ascends an additional approximately 35 vertical feet at an average slope gradient of 3.0:1.0 to Kilbourn Street above. The maximum slope height from Future Street to Kilbourn Street is approximately 130 feet.

Runoff from the site slope is by sheet flow to the street.

Vegetation on the site consists of annual weeds and grasses and a few small to large bushes.



1

No evidence of shallow groundwater, seepage or springs was observed anywhere on the site including within the test pits.

# PREVIOUS EXPLORATIONS AND REPORTS

The following reports were reviewed during the preparation of this report.

- Soil and Geology Investigation, Proposed Residence, 3110 Future Street, Los Angeles, California, by Technosoil, Inc. dated July 26, 1991.
- Geologic and Soils Engineering Report, "Proposed Nine-Lot Development, Lots 115-123 Tract 4417, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3152 and 3164 Future Street, Los Angeles, California" by Parmelee/Geology Inc. dated September 25, 2008.
- 3. Laboratory Test Results by C.Y. Geotech, Inc. dated April 23, 2007.

Based on the review of the above reports, we concur with the findings by Parmelee/Geology, Inc. and C.Y. Geotech, Inc. Design recommendations contained in the above referenced reports, not superseded in this report shall be complied with.

# CURRENT FIELD EXPLORATION

Field exploration consisted of observing and mapping existing road cuts. The results of the field mapping along with mapping performed by Parmelee/Geology, Inc. are shown on "Geologic Plan and Test Pit Locations", Plate A.



# LABORATORY TESTING

No additional laboratory testing was undertaken. The results of laboratory testing for moisture/density and direct shear tests performed by C.Y. Geotech, Inc. and Technosoil, Inc. are tabulated below:

Consultant	Material	Dry Density (pcf)	Field Moisture Content %	Location	Cohesion (Psf)	Angle of Friction (Degrees)	Comment
C.Y.Geotech	Shale	82	19	Tp-3@2'	1210	15	Ultimate
C.Y.Geotech	Shale	90	21	Tp-4@3'	390	28	Peak
C.Y.Geotech	Shale	90	21	Tp-4@3'	240	22.5	Along Bedding
C.Y.Geotech	Siliceous Shale	121	3	On-Site	1380	37	Peak
C.Y.Geotech	Siliceous Shale	121	3	On-Site	1275	36	Ultimate
C.Y.Geotech	Sandstone	139	2	On-Site	1425	39	Peak
C.Y.Geotech	Sandstone	139	2	On-Site	1360	38	Ultimate
Technosoil	Sandstone/ Siltstone	77	18.8	Tp-3@5'	420	44	Ultimate

Based on the review of the above laboratory test results, the following shear strength parameters for bedrock were adopted and utilized for analyses.

# **Ultimate Values:**

Cohesion c = 470 psf

Angle of Friction  $\phi = 36^{\circ}$ 

# **Residual Values:**

Cohesion c = 240 psf

Angle of Friction  $\phi = 15^{\circ}$ 

# **GEOLOGIC AND SOIL CONDITIONS**

Review of the test pit logs, as well as review of published geologic maps, indicates that the site is underlain by artificial fill, residual soil (colluvium) and bedrock of the Miocene age Modelo Formation. Descriptions and distribution of these units are as follows:

Artificial Fill (Af): Minor amount of localized artificial fill consisting of brown, loose to moderately compact, slightly sandy silt is present on Lot 124 which appears to be the result of localized digging.

**<u>Residual Soil</u> (Rs):** Residual soil (colluvium) consisting of brown to dark brown, loose to moderately stiff, slightly clayey, sandy silt and silty clay is present on the slopes above the road cut. Residual soil does not appear to exceed one foot in depth.

**<u>Bedrock</u>** (Tm): The bedrock consists primarily of tan to yellow-brown, firm to hard, well-indurated, locally massive to moderately well bedded, sandstone, siltstone and shale.





Bedding on the site is relatively uniform with northwesterly strikes and north dips of 30 to 50 degrees. The bedrock orientation is considered favorable with respect to the gross stability of the site.

# STABILITY OF SLOPES

Slope stability analyses, both static and seismic were conducted with respect to the gross stability of the existing slopes, upon which the proposed residences are to be constructed.

Based on static and seismic slope stability analyses with respect to the gross stability of the slope, the factors of safety exceed the minimum required values of 1.5 and 1.0 for static and seismic conditions, respectively (see the Appendix).

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The currently proposed residences will be constructed by excavating into the slope for the garages and the level above the garages. Additional excavation for backyard area, minimum 15 feet in width, will be required for the rear toe-of-slope setback retaining walls. Behind the retaining walls the bedrock slope will be cut back to 1.5:1.0 (horizontal to vertical) (see Sections A-A' through K-K').

Temporary cuts ranging from approximately 10 to 20 feet may be required. All temporary cuts with the exception of the temporary cuts facing north, are expected to encounter favorable geologic conditions (supported bedding).

All temporary cuts facing north will encounter unsupported bedding planes, therefore shall be shored prior to excavation.



Based on the evaluation of site conditions and review of the previous reports the proposed residences and retaining walls may be supported on spread footings and/or friction piles founded in bedrock underlying the subject site.

# Spread Footings in Bedrock

An allowable bearing value of 4000 pounds per square foot is recommended for spread footings embedded a minimum of 18 inches into very firm to slightly hard bedrock. The bearing value is for dead plus live loads and may be increased by one-third for combined dead, live and seismic loads.

All footings shall be embedded in bedrock such that the horizontal distance from the lowest outside edge of the footings is one-third the height of the slope below, with minimum of 5 feet measured from the sloping face of the bedrock.

Settlement of footings founded in bedrock is expected to be negligible.

All foundations excavations shall be inspected and approved by representative of this office prior to the placement of reinforcing steel and pouring concrete.

# Cast-in-Place Friction Piles

Cast-in-place concrete friction piles bearing in bedrock may be designed for 600 pounds per square foot allowable skin friction for portions of piles in bedrock. The uplift capacities may be taken as one-half of downward capacities of the piles.



The bottom outside edge of the friction piles should be setback a distance equal to one-third the height of the slope below with a minimum of 5 feet, measured horizontally from the sloping bedrock surface. Effective portion of all piles shall be considered below a line where horizontal distance from the face of the pile to the sloping face of the bedrock is minimum 5 feet.

Point of fixity for friction piles may be assumed at 3 feet embedment in bedrock.

All pile excavations should be observed by a representative of this office during drilling to determine compliance with the recommended embedment in competent bedrock.

Provided the recommendations with respect to design and construction of friction piles are implemented, settlement of the friction piles in rock is expected to be negligible.

# Lateral Bearing

An allowable lateral bearing value against the sides of footings and pile shafts equivalent to a fluid weighing 400 pounds per cubic foot to a maximum of 4000 pounds per square foot may be used provided there is positive contact between the vertical bearing surface and the undisturbed bedrock.

Friction between the base of footings and the underlying bedrock may be assumed as 0.35 times the dead load. Friction and the lateral bearing may be combined provided the lateral bearing value is limited to two-thirds of the allowable.



# Temporary Cuts

Based on the currently proposed plans, temporary cuts up to approximately 20 feet in height may be required.

Temporary cuts in bedrock facing south, east and west may be made to stand vertical to a maximum height of 12 feet. Portion of temporary cut exceeding 12 feet to a maximum total height of 20 feet shall be sloped back to 1.5:1.0 (horizontal to vertical) (see Plate M).

All temporary cuts in soil shall be sloped back to 1.0:1.0.

If portion of the temporary cuts exceeding 12 feet may not be sloped back as recommended, shoring shall be provided. Temporary shoring may be designed for 25 pounds per cubic foot equivalent fluid weigh.

Temporary cuts facing north will expose unsupported bedding planes, therefore shall be shored prior to excavation.

Based on the analyses, shoring for cuts facing north where steep out dipping bedding planes will be exposed shall be designed for 64 pounds per cubic foot equivalent fluid weight (see Plate N).

Temporary shoring may consist of cast-in-place concrete piles. Lagging may be omitted in bedrock provided the clear space between piles does not exceed 6 feet and no out dipping joints are present.



All unshored temporary cuts shall be inspected by the geologist after every 5 vertical feet is exposed to determine if conditions are as anticipated. If inspections of temporary cuts by the geologist reveal adverse geologic conditions not currently anticipated, additional recommendations will be provided and those recommendations shall be complied with by the owner and the contractor.

# **Retaining Walls**

Retaining walls facing south, east and west retaining drained earth to a maximum height of 20 feet (stacked walls) may be designed for the following (see Plates O and P)

Slope of Retained Material <u>(Horizontal to Vertical)</u>	Equivalent Fluid Weight Bedrock (pcf)
Level	30
5.0 to 1.0	32
4.0 to 1.0	35
3.0 to 1.0	38
2.0 to 1.0	43
1.5 to 1.0	55

Retaining walls facing north, surcharged by outdipping bedding planes shall be designed for 64 pounds per cubic foot equivalent fluid weight (see Plate N).

All retaining walls exceeding 6 feet in height shall also be designed for seismic forces (see Plate Q).

Backfill behind all retaining walls shall consist of granular soil or gravel and shall be compacted to minimum 90 percent.



9

No backfill shall be placed behind the retaining walls until such time that the subdrain system is inspected and approved by a representative of this office and City of Los Angeles, grading inspector.

All retaining walls retaining sloped surface shall be provided with standard surface backdrain and 18 inches freeboard.

# Seismic Design Parameters

Based on the Section 1613A of the 2013 California Building Code and City of Los Angeles 2014 Building Code the following seismic design parameters are applicable:

SEISMIC COEFFICIENTS (2013 California Building Code)					
Occupancy Category (Table 1604A.5)	II				
Importance Factor (Table 11.5-1 ASCE 7)	1.0				
Soil Profile Name (Table 20.3-1 ASCE7)	Soft Rock				
Site Class (Table 20.3-1 ASCE7)	С				
	Short Period	One-Second			
	(0.2s)	Period			
Mapped Spectral Accelerations (Section 1613A.3.1)	S <sub>s</sub> =2.874g	S <sub>1</sub> =0.951g			
Site Coefficients (Table 1613A.3.3 (1) and 1613A.3.3 (2))	F <sub>a</sub> =1.0	F <sub>v</sub> =1.3			
Spectral Response Accelerations (Equations 16A-37 and 16A-38)	S <sub>MS</sub> =2.874g	S <sub>M1</sub> =1.236g			
Design Accelerations Equations 16A-39 and 16A-40)	S <sub>DS</sub> =1.916g	S <sub>D1</sub> =0.824g			
Seismic Design Category (Section 1613A.3.5)	E				



#### REMARKS

The conclusions and recommendations presented in this report are based on review of exploratory test pit logs and reports by Parmelee/Geology, Inc. and Technosoil, Inc. and field observations made at existing road cuts and outcrops. It is not unusual to find conditions in between or beyond the test pit locations that differ from those reported.

If conditions are encountered during construction which appear to differ from those observed during this investigation, this office should be notified so as to consider the need for modification of recommendations contained herein.

On-site construction observations should be performed by a representative of this office to evaluate compliance with the recommendations contained herein.

It should be noted that it is the current requirement of City of Los Angeles, Department of Building and Safety, Grading Division that final plans include all recommendations presented in this report and be verified by this office in form of signature on plans prior to issuance of a building permit. Therefore, it is requested that this report be thoroughly reviewed by the project architect and project structural engineer and information such as recommended bearing material, recommended depth of foundation in the bearing material, recommended horizontal distance of footings from the face of the slope, etc. be clearly indicated on notes, sections, footing details, etc. Plans not in compliance with the above will not be approved by this office and will be returned, therefore, resulting in delays and additional cost.



This report is subject to review and approval by the controlling public agencies having jurisdiction.

All shoring and bracing should be in accordance with the current requirements of CAL/OSHA, the Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California, and all other public agencies having jurisdiction.

This report has been compiled for the exclusive use of Mr. Andre Ohanian, his agents or representatives. It shall not be transferred to or used by other parties, or applied to any project on this site other than as described herein, without consent and/or thorough review by this facility.

Should the project be delayed beyond the period of one year from the date of this report, the site and report shall be reviewed to consider possible changed conditions.

Samples obtained in this investigation will deteriorate with time and become unsuitable for further laboratory testing. Unless otherwise advised, the samples will be discarded after one month from the date of this report.



12

# GEOLOGIC PLAN AND TEST PIT LOCATIONS


























Shear Strength Parameters	Rock
Cohesion - C (lbs/ft <sup>2</sup> )	470
Angel of Internal Friction- $\phi^{\circ}$	36
Saturated Unit Weight- $\gamma$ (lbs/ft <sup>3</sup> )	125

			F.S F	actor of	Safety	1.25
Slide Plane	C <sub>m</sub> (psf)	ф <sub>m</sub> °	W (K/ft)	α°	L (ft)	P <sub>a</sub> (K)
1	0.376	30.2	2.7	73	9	-1.5
2	0.376	30.2	5.3	63	10.6	-0.7
3	0.376	30.2	10.1	53	15.5	-1.2
4	0.376	30.2	20.7	45	27	-3.6







$$\begin{split} &Cm = C/F.S. \\ &\phi_m = Tan^{-1} \; (Tan \; \phi/F.S.) \\ &P_a = [W - C_m.L.Sin\alpha] \; Tan(\alpha - \phi_m) - [C_m. \; L. \; Cos\alpha] \end{split}$$

#### Equivalent Fluid Weight (pcf)

$E.F.W.=P_{a}$ . 1000/ 0.5 (H) <sup>2</sup>	Pa (K)= (	
E.F.W. = 0	H (ft)= 1	

2

TECHNOSO	IL, INC.
Proposed Residences Lots 115 through 124 , Tract 4417 3164, 3152, 3144, 3138, 3134, 3126, 3 East Future Street	3122, 3118, 3114, 3110
Los Angeles, California	

Shear Strength Parameters	ROCK
Ultimate Values	
Cohesion - C (lbs/ft <sup>2</sup> )	470
Angel of Internal Friction- $\phi^{\circ}$	36
Saturated Unit Weight- y (lbs/ft3)	125
Residual Values	
Cohesion - C (lbs/ft <sup>2</sup> )	240
Angel of Internal Friction- $\phi^{\circ}$	15

		F.S F	1.5		
C <sub>m</sub> (ksf)	<mark>ф</mark> "°	<b>W</b> (K/ft)	α°	L (ft)	P <sub>a</sub> (K)
0.160	10.1	29.7	45	26.5	15.6

## **Shoring & retaining Walls**

Cuts Facing North Unsupported Bedding

Reference: Section K-K'



Cm = C/F.S.  $\phi_m = Tan^{-1} (Tan \ \phi/F.S.)$  $P_a = [W - C_m.L.Sin\alpha] Tan(\alpha - \phi_m) - [C_m.L.Cos\alpha]$ 

		TECHNOSO
<u>Equivalent Fluid Weight (pcf)</u> E.F.W.= P <sub>a</sub> . 1000/ 0.5 (H) <sup>2</sup> E.F.W. = 64	Pa (K)= 15.6 H (ft)= 22	Proposed Residences Lots 115 through 124 , Tract 4417 3164, 3152, 3144, 3138, 3134, 3126, East Future Street Los Angeles, California

Shear Strength Parameters	Rock
Cohesion - C (lbs/ft <sup>2</sup> )	470
Angel of Internal Friction- φ°	36
Saturated Unit Weight- y (lbs/ft3)	125

## **Retaining Walls**

Facing South, East & West

			F.S F	actor of	Safety	1.5
Slide Plane	C <sub>m</sub> (psf)	φ <sub>m</sub> °	<b>W</b> (K/ft)	α°	L (ft)	P <sub>a</sub> (K)
1	0.313	25.8	8.4	73	17.5	1.8
2	0.313	25.8	14.3	63	19	4.1
3	0.313	25.8	21.1	53	21	4.2
4	0.313	25.8	27.8	45	23.5	2.6



$$\begin{split} \phi_m &= Tan^{-1} \; (Tan \; \phi/F.S.) \\ P_a &= [W - C_m.L.Sin\alpha] \; Tan(\alpha - \phi_m) - [C_m. \; L. \; Cos\alpha] \end{split}$$

Equivalent Fluid Weight (pcf)

Cm= C/F.S.

*E.F.W.* =  $P_a$ . 1000/ 0.5 (*H*)<sup>2</sup> Pa (K)= 4.2 **E.F.W.** = 17 H (ft)= 22 Scale: 1"=10' TECHNOSOIL, INC. Proposed Residences Lots 115 through 124, Tract 4417 3164, 3152, 3144, 3138, 3134, 3126, 3122, 3118, 3114, 3110 East Future Street Los Angeles, California PROJECT NO.: G-2621-FG PLATE: O

Shear Strength Parameters	Rock
Cohesion - C (lbs/ft <sup>2</sup> )	470
Angel of Internal Friction- $\phi^{\circ}$	36
Saturated Unit Weight- $\gamma$ (lbs/ft <sup>3</sup> )	125

F.S. - Factor of Safety 1.5 ф<sub>m</sub>°  $P_{a}(K)$ C (psf) a° W (K/ft) L (ft) Slide Plane 25.8 73 -0.8 0.313 2.7 9 1 5.3 63 2 0.313 25.8 10.6 0.3 25.8 10.1 53 15.5 0.3 0.313 3 27 25.8 20.7 45 0.313 -0.9 4 . .

## Retaining Walls Facing South, East & West







$$\begin{split} Cm &= C/F.S.\\ \phi_m &= Tan^{-1} \ (Tan \ \phi/F.S.)\\ P_a &= [W - C_m.L.Sin\alpha] \ Tan(\alpha - \phi_m) - [C_m.L. \ Cos\alpha] \end{split}$$

#### Equivalent Fluid Weight (pcf)

E.F.W.= P <sub>a</sub> . 1000/ 0.5 (H) <sup>2</sup>	Pa (K)= 0.3
E.F.W. = 4	H (ft)= 12

## SEISMIC EARTH PRESSURE



Seismic Earth Pressure Calculations

XXXXX

 $\gamma = 125 \text{ pcf}$ PGA<sub>M</sub> = 1.104 g PGA = 2/3 \* PGA<sub>M</sub> = 0.736 g K<sub>h</sub>= PGA/2 = 0.37  $\Delta P_{AE} = 3/8 \text{ k}_{h} \gamma \text{H}^{2} = 17.3 \text{ H}^{2}$ Seismic Pressure  $\gamma_{AE} = 35 \text{ pcf}$ 

Proposed Residences Lots 115 through 124, Tract 4417	PROJECT NO.:	G-2621-FG
3164, 3152, 3144, 3138, 3134, 3126, 3122, 3118, 3114, 3110 East Future Street Los Angeles, California	PLATE:	Q
TECHNOSOIL, INC.		

# <u>APPENDIX</u>











Figure 1. Values of  $f_{eq}$  as a Function of MHA, Magnitude and Distance for Threshold Displacements of (a) 5 cm and (b) 15 cm

	TECHNOSOIL,INC.				
<ul> <li>IHA<sub>r</sub> = Maximum horizontal acceleration at the site for soft rock condition</li> <li>= Factor related to the seismicity of the site</li> <li>= Displacement</li> <li>= Magnitude</li> </ul>	Proposed Residences Lots 115 through 124, Tract 4417 3164, 3152, 3144, 3138, 3134, 3126, 3122, 3118, 3114, 3110 East Future Street Los Angeles, California				
= Distance	PROJECT NO. : G-2621-FG PLATE: 5				



PROJECT DATA: Project: G-2621-FG Location: SECTION Z-Z' Filename: OHANIAN2 Description: PROPOSED RESIDENCES

P	ANALYS	SIS DAT	A:								
I	Point	Coordin	nates	Line	Left	Right	Soil	Soil	Density	Cohesion	Phi
ľ	NO.	Х	Y	No.	Point	Point	No.	No.	pcf	psf	Deg
	1	0.0	480.0	1	1	2	1	1	125.0	470	36.0
	2	122.0	525.0	2	2	3	1				
	3	140.0	536.0	3	3	4	1				
	4	176.0	537.0	4	4	5	1				
	5	213.0	543.0	5	5	6	1				
	6	245.0	545.0	6	6	7	1				
	7	256.0	548.0	7	7	8	1				
	8	276.0	548.0	8	8	9	1				
	9	276.1	558.0	9	9	10	1				
	10	296.0	558.0	10	10	11	1				
	11	296.1	571.0	11	11	12	1				
	12	312.0	571.0	12	12	13	1				
	13	312.1	582.0	13	13	14	1				
	14	406.0	650.0	14	14	15	1				
	15	440.0	663.0	15	15	16	1				
	16	490 0	670 0								

Circle center at X= 174.0, Y= 934.0 FS= 1.906 at R= 400.0

X = 1/4	$f_{\pm}$ .0 $f_{\pm}$	934.0	R = 400	0.0				
SLICE	X-LEFT	DX	TAN	TAN	COHESION	VERTICAL	RESISTING	DRIVING
			THETA	PHI		FORCE	TERM	TERM
1	139.2	0.8	-0.086	0.727	470	27	407	-2
2	140.0	11.3	-0.071	0.727	470	1576	6668	-112
3	151.3	11.3	-0.043	0.727	470	2933	7588	-125
4	162.7	11.3	-0.014	0.727	470	3835	8158	-54
5	174.0	2.0	0.003	0.727	470	742	1478	2
6	176.0	12.3	0.020	0.727	470	5965	10054	122
7	188.3	12.3	0.051	0.727	470	8366	11662	429
8	200.7	12.3	0.082	0.727	470	10178	12833	836
9	213.0	16.0	0.118	0.727	470	13295	16552	1562
10	229.0	16.0	0.160	0.727	470	10849	14703	1709
11	245.0	11.0	0.195	0.727	470	6980	9713	1335
12	256.0	20.0	0.236	0.727	470	7852	14238	1806
13	276.0	0.1	0.264	0.727	470	72	93	18
14	276.1	19.9	0.292	0.727	470	19516	22059	5469
15	296.0	0.1	0.320	0.727	470	143	141	44
16	296.1	15.9	0.344	0.727	470	30160	27473	9808
17	312.0	0.1	0.368	0.727	470	224	196	77
18	312.1	11.7	0.386	0.727	470	37252	30444	13409
19	323.8	11.7	0.423	0.727	470	42761	34206	16648
20	335.6	11.7	0.461	0.727	470	47624	37572	19938
21	347.3	11.7	0.501	0.727	470	51810	40531	23212
22	359.1	11.7	0.543	0.727	470	55289	43072	26393
23	370.8	11.7	0.588	0.727	470	58021	45174	29400
24	382.5	11.7	0.635	0.727	470	59963	46810	32144
25	394.3	11.7	0.686	0.727	470	61064	47947	34527
26	406.0	11.3	0.739	0.727	470	56421	44933	33528
27	417.3	11.3	0.796	0.727	470	50241	41013	31280
28	428.7	11.3	0.857	0.727	470	43109	36382	28062
29	440.0	16.2	0.941	0.727	470	42942	39207	29435
30	456.2	16.2	1.055	0.727	470	14933	19121	10840

### SB-SLOPE

Simplified Bishop Slope Stability Analysis

PROJECT: G-2621-FG

LOCATION: SECTION Z-Z'

FILE: OHANIAN2 COMPLETE SLOPE CROSS SECTION

CIRCLE	×	Y	RADIUS	FS
1	174.0	934.0	400.0	1.10



PROJECT DATA: Project: G-2621-FG Location: SECTION Z-Z' Filename: OHANIAN2 Description: PROPOSED RESIDENCES

ANALYS	SIS DATA	A:								
Point	Coordin	nates	Line	Left	Right	Soil	Soi	il Density	Cohesion	Phi
No.	Х	Y	No.	Point	Point	No.	NO.	. pcf	psf	Deg
1	0.0	480.0	1	1	2	1	1	125.0	470	36.0
2	122.0	525.0	2	2	3	1				
3	140.0	536.0	3	3	4	1				
4	176.0	537.0	4	4	5	1				
5	213.0	543.0	5	5	6	1				
6	245.0	545.0	6	6	7	1				
7	256.0	548.0	7	7	8	1				
8	276.0	548.0	8	8	9	1				
9	276.1	558.0	9	9	10	1				
10	296.0	558.0	10	10	11	1				
11	296.1	571.0	11	11	12	1				
12	312.0	571.0	12	12	13	1				
13	312.1	582.0	13	13	14	1				
14	406.0	650.0	14	14	15	1				
15	440.0	663.0	15	15	16	1				
16	490.0	670.0								
Seismi	.c coeff	icient,	horiz	zontal	= 0.32	20				

vertical = 0.000

Circle center at X= 174.0, Y= 934.0 FS= 1.095 at R= 400.0

X= 174	4.0 Y=	934.0	R= 40	0.0				
SLICE	X-LEFT	DX	TAN	TAN	COHESION	VERTICAL	RESISTING	DRIVING
			THETA	PHI		FORCE	TERM	TERM
1	139.2	0.8	-0.086	0.727	470	27	417	6
2	140.0	11.3	-0.071	0.727	470	1576	6808	391
3	151.3	11.3	-0.043	0.727	470	2933	7681	811
4	162.7	11.3	-0.014	0.727	470	3835	8190	1168
5	174.0	2.0	0.003	0.727	470	742	1477	239
6	176.0	12.3	0.020	0.727	470	5965	9997	2021
7	188.3	12.3	0.051	0.727	470	8366	11499	3084
8	200.7	12.3	0.082	0.727	470	10178	12551	4054
9	213.0	16.0	0.118	0.727	470	13295	16040	5751
10	229.0	16.0	0.160	0.727	470	10849	14105	5113
11	245.0	11.0	0.195	0.727	470	6980	9240	3513
12	256.0	20.0	0.236	0.727	470	7852	13417	4241
13	276.0	0.1	0.264	0.727	470	72	87	41
14	276.1	19.9	0.292	0.727	470	19516	20537	11400
15	296.0	0.1	0.320	0.727	470	143	131	86
16	296.1	15.9	0.344	0.727	470	30160	25303	18750
17	312.0	0.1	0.368	0.727	470	224	180	143
18	312.1	11.7	0.386	0.727	470	37252	27806	24151
19	323.8	11.7	0.423	0.727	470	42761	31021	28752
20	335.6	11.7	0.461	0.727	470	47624	33830	33158
21	347.3	11.7	0.501	0.727	470	51810	36231	37300
22	359.1	11.7	0.543	0.727	470	55289	38220	41104
23	370.8	11.7	0.588	0.727	470	58021	39785	44487
24	382.5	11.7	0.635	0.727	470	59963	40910	47360
25	394.3	11.7	0.686	0.727	470	61064	41573	49625
26	406.0	11.3	0.739	0.727	470	56421	38648	47148
27	417.3	11.3	0.796	0.727	470	50241	34988	43146
28	428.7	11.3	0.857	0.727	470	43109	30772	38007
29	440.0	16.2	0.941	0.727	470	42942	32798	39072
30	456.2	16.2	1.055	0.727	470	14933	15773	14081

#### SB-SLOPE

Simplified Bishop Slope Stability Analysis

PROJECT: G-2621-FG

LOCATION: SECTION Z-Z'

FILE: OHANIAN2 COMPLETE SLOPE CROSS SECTION

CIRCLE	×	Y	RADIUS	FS
1	135.0	1025.0	500.0	2.05



PROJECT DATA: Project: G-2621-FG Location: SECTION Z-Z' Filename: OHANIAN2 Description: PROPOSED RESIDENCES

ANAT.VO	TTAD 2TE	Δ.								
Deint	Condin		T 2	TAF	Dist	G 1 1	G ' ]		a 1	<b>D1</b> '
Point	Coordin	lates	Line	Leit	Right	SOIL	SOIL	Density	Conesion	Phi
No.	Х	Y	No.	Point	Point	No.	No.	pcf	psf	Deg
1	0.0	480.0	1	1	2	1	1	125.0	470	36.0
2	122.0	525.0	2	2	3	1				
3	140.0	536.0	3	3	4	1				
4	176.0	537.0	4	4	5	1				
5	213.0	543.0	5	5	6	1				
6	245.0	545.0	6	6	7	1				
7	256.0	548.0	7	7	8	1				
8	276.0	548.0	8	8	9	1				
9	276.1	558.0	9	9	10	1				
10	296.0	558.0	10	10	11	1				
11	296.1	571.0	11	11	12	1				
12	312.0	571.0	12	12	13	1				
13	312.1	582.0	13	13	14	1				
14	406.0	650.0	14	14	15	1				
15	440.0	663.0	15	15	16	1		1.41		
16	490.0	670.0								

Circle center at X= 135.0, Y=1025.0 FS= 2.052 at R= 500.0

V:	= 13:	5.0 I=	1025.0	R = 500	5.0				
SI	LICE	X-LEFT	DX	TAN	TAN	COHESION	VERTICAL	RESISTING	DRIVING
				THETA	PHI		FORCE	TERM	TERM
	1	122.3	12.7	-0.013	0.727	470	6323	10628	-81
	2	135.0	5.0	0.005	0.727	470	5912	6634	30
	3	140.0	18.0	0.028	0.727	470	24689	26149	691
	4	158.0	18.0	0.064	0.727	470	23948	25337	1533
	5	176.0	12.3	0.095	0.727	470	16545	17316	1561
	6	188.3	12.3	0.120	0.727	470	17588	17946	2093
	7	200.7	12.3	0.145	0.727	470	18151	18245	2608
	8	213.0	16.0	0.175	0.727	470	21963	22444	3778
	9	229.0	16.0	0.208	0.727	470	17834	19480	3639
	LO	245.0	11.0	0.237	0.727	470	10923	12426	2523
1	L1	256.0	20.0	0.272	0.727	470	13557	18197	3553
	L2	276.0	0.1	0.294	0.727	470	96	110	27
1	L3	276.1	19.9	0.317	0.727	470	23690	25055	7158
1	14	296.0	0.1	0.340	0.727	470	161	154	52
1	15	296.1	15.9	0.359	0.727	470	32753	29476	11075
1	6	312.0	0.1	0.379	0.727	470	239	208	85
1	_7	312.1	13.4	0.395	0.727	470	44922	36733	16516
]	-8	325.5	13.4	0.429	0.727	470	51936	41601	20488
]	_9	338.9	13.4	0.465	0.727	470	58172	45989	24509
2	20	352.3	13.4	0.501	0.727	470	63598	49885	28502
2	21	365.8	13.4	0.540	0.727	470	68179	53272	32384
2	22	379.2	13.4	0.580	0.727	470	71873	56128	36067
2	23	392.6	13.4	0.623	0.727	470	74633	58423	39455
-2	24	406.0	17.0	0.674	0.727	470	90752	71977	50741
2	25	423.0	17.0	0.737	0.727	470	79077	64467	46903
2	26	440.0	15.5	0.802	0.727	470	56447	48236	35317
2	27	455.5	15.5	0.871	0.727	470	35419	33484	23262
2	28	471.1	15.5	0.948	0.727	470	12192	16672	8386

#### SB-SLOPE

Simplified Bishop Slope Stability Analysis

PROJECT: G-2621-FG

LOCATION: SECTION Z-Z'

FILE: OHANIAN2 COMPLETE SLOPE CROSS SECTION

CIRCLE	×	Y	RADIUS	FS
1	135.0	1025.0	500.0	1.12



PROJECT DATA: Project: G-2621-FG Location: SECTION Z-Z' Filename: OHANIAN2 Description: PROPOSED RESIDENCES

ANALYS	SIS DATA	<i>H</i> :								
Point	Coordir	nates	Line	Left	Right	Soil	Soil	Density	Cohesion	Phi
No.	Х	Y	No.	Point	Point	No.	No.	pcf	psf	Deg
1	0.0	480.0	1	1	2	1	1	125.0	470	36.0
2	122.0	525.0	2	2	3	1				
3	140.0	536.0	3	3	4	1				
4	176.0	537.0	4	4	5	1				
5	213.0	543.0	5	5	6	1				
6	245.0	545.0	6	6	7	1				
7	256.0	548.0	7	7	8	1				
8	276.0	548.0	8	8	9	1				
9	276.1	558.0	9	9	10	1				
10	296.0	558.0	10	10	11	1				
11	296.1	571.0	11	11	12	1				
12	312.0	571.0	12	12	13	1				
13	312.1	582.0	13	13	14	1				
14	406.0	650.0	14	14	15	1				
15	440.0	663.0	15	15	16	1				
16	490.0	670.0								
Seismi	c coeff	icient,	horiz	zontal	= 0.32	20				
			TTAT	ctical	- 0 00	0.0				

Circle center at X= 135.0, Y=1025.0 FS= 1.125 at R= 500.0

X = 13	5.0 I=1	1025.0	R = 500	0.0				
SLICE	X-LEFT	DX	TAN	TAN	COHESION	VERTICAL	RESISTING	DRIVING
			THETA	PHI		FORCE	TERM	TERM
1	122.3	12.7	-0.013	0.727	470	6323	10668	1934
2	135.0	5.0	0.005	0.727	470	5912	6624	1904
3	140.0	18.0	0.028	0.727	470	24689	25939	8501
4	158.0	18.0	0.064	0.727	470	23948	24881	9098
5	176.0	12.3	0.095	0.727	470	16545	16865	6774
6	188.3	12.3	0.120	0.727	470	17588	17364	7617
7	200.7	12.3	0.145	0.727	470	18151	17539	8287
8	213.0	16.0	0.175	0.727	470	21963	21417	10623
9	229.0	16.0	0.208	0.727	470	17834	18436	9174
10	245.0	11.0	0.237	0.727	470	10923	11679	5896
11	256.0	20.0	0.272	0.727	470	13557	16970	7715
12	276.0	0.1	0.294	0.727	470	96	102	56
13	276.1	19.9	0.317	0.727	470	23690	23132	14311
14	296.0	0.1	0.340	0.727	470	161	142	100
15	296.1	15.9	0.359	0.727	470	32753	26968	20765
16	312.0	0.1	0.379	0.727	470	239	189	155
17	312.1	13.4	0.395	0.727	470	44922	33357	29497
18	325.5	13.4	0.429	0.727	470	51936	37521	35243
19	338.9	13.4	0.465	0.727	470	58172	41194	40744
20	352.3	13.4	0.501	0.727	470	63598	44373	45921
21	365.8	13.4	0.540	0.727	470	68179	47051	50694
22	379.2	13.4	0.580	0.727	470	71873	49217	54972
23	392.6	13.4	0.623	0.727	470	74633	50852	58661
24	406.0	17.0	0.674	0.727	470	90752	62111	73573
25	423.0	17.0	0.737	0.727	470	79077	55077	66330
26	440.0	15.5	0.802	0.727	470	56447	40800	48880
27	455.5	15.5	0.871	0.727	470	35419	28039	31600
28	471.1	15.5	0.948	0.727	470	12192	13813	11193



PROJECT DATA: Project: G-2621-FG Location: SECTION Z-Z' Filename: OHANIAN2 Description: PROPOSED RESIDENCES

ANALY	SIS DAT	A:								
Point	nt Coordinates		Line	Left	Right	Soil	Soil	Density	Cohesion	Phi
No.	X	Y	No.	Point	Point	No.	No.	pcf	psf	Deg
1	0.0	480.0	1	1	2	1	1	125.0	470	36.0
2	122.0	525.0	2	2	3	1				
3	140.0	536.0	3	3	4	1				
4	176.0	537.0	4	4	5	1				
5	213.0	543.0	5	5	6	1				
6	245.0	545.0	6	6	7	1				
7	256.0	548.0	7	7	8	1				
8	276.0	548.0	8	8	9	1				
9	276.1	558.0	9	9	10	1				
10	296.0	558.0	10	10	11	1				
11	296.1	571.0	11	11	12	1				
12	312.0	571.0	12	12	13	1				
13	312.1	582.0	13	13	14	1				
14	406.0	650.0	14	14	15	1				
15	440.0	663.0	15	15	16	1				
16	490.0	670.0								

Circle center at X= 140.0, Y= 890.0 FS= 2.305 at R= 395.0

V= 140	0.0 I =	090.0	K= 393	5.0				
SLICE	X-LEFT	DX	TAN	TAN	COHESION	VERTICAL	RESISTING	DRIVING
			THETA	PHI		FORCE	TERM	TERM
1	61.8	15.0	-0.182	0.727	470	7785	13720	-1393
2	76.9	15.0	-0.142	0.727	470	22795	24987	-3209
3	91.9	15.0	-0.103	0.727	470	36694	35048	-3768
4	107.0	15.0	-0.065	0.727	470	49498	44019	-3198
5	122.0	18.0	-0.023	0.727	470	79413	66653	-1810
6	140.0	18.0	0.023	0.727	470	92351	75037	2105
7	158.0	18.0	0.069	0.727	470	91626	73617	6265
8	176.0	18.5	0.115	0.727	470	94325	75011	10809
9	194.5	18.5	0.164	0.727	470	95296	75096	15384
10	213.0	16.0	0.210	0.727	470	80039	62941	16417
11	229.0	16.0	0.253	0.727	470	74631	58984	18331
12	245.0	11.0	0.291	0.727	470	49068	38942	13728
13	256.0	20.0	0.337	0.727	470	80540	64788	25700
14	276.0	0.1	0.367	0.727	470	423	338	146
15	276.1	19.9	0.398	0.727	470	86692	69181	32066
16	296.0	0.1	0.430	0.727	470	467	370	185
17	296.1	15.9	0.457	0.727	470	79930	62991	33204
18	312.0	0.1	0.484	0.727	470	526	414	229
19	312.1	15.7	0.512	0.727	470	96245	74758	43851
20	327.8	15.7	0.570	0.727	470	101854	79386	50444
21	343.4	15.7	0.633	0.727	470	105608	82965	56489
22	359.1	15.7	0.702	0.727	470	107342	85383	61672
23	374.7	15.7	0.778	0.727	470	106854	86484	65628
24	390.4	15.7	0.864	0.727	470	103884	86042	67923
25	406.0	17.0	0.967	0.727	470	99953	85950	69492
26	423.0	17.0	1.095	0.727	470	76519	70096	56498
27	440.0	25.8	1.303	0.727	470	48227	54893	38256



PROJECT DATA: Project: G-2621-FG Location: SECTION Z-Z' Filename: OHANIAN2 Description: PROPOSED RESIDENCES

ANALYS	SIS DATA	A:								
Point	Coordin	nates	Line	Left	Right	Soil	Soil	Density	Cohesion	Phi
No.	Х	Y	No.	Point	Point	No.	No.	pcf	psf	Deg
1	0.0	480.0	1	1	2	1	1	125.0	470	36.0
2	122.0	525.0	2	2	3	1				
3	140.0	536.0	3	3	4	1				
4	176.0	537.0	4	4	5	1				
5	213.0	543.0	5	5	6	1				
6	245.0	545.0	6	6	7	1				
7	256.0	548.0	7	7	8	1				
8	276.0	548.0	8	8	9	1				
9	276.1	558.0	9	9	10	1				
10	296.0	558.0	10	10	11	1				
11	296.1	571.0	11	11	12	1				
12	312.0	571.0	12	12	13	1				
13	312.1	582.0	13	13	14	1				
14	406.0	650.0	14	14	15	1				
15	440.0	663.0	15	15	16	1				
16	490.0	670.0								
Seismi	c coeff	licient	, hori:	zontal	= 0.32	20				

vertical = 0.000

Circle center at X= 140.0, Y= 890.0 FS= 1.202 at R= 395.0

X= 1	40.0 Y=	890.0	R= 39	5.0				
SLIC	E X-LEFT	DX	TAN	TAN	COHESION	VERTICAL	RESISTING	DRIVING
			THETA	PHI		FORCE	TERM	TERM
1	61.8	15.0	-0.182	0.727	470	7785	14530	1045
2	76.9	15.0	-0.142	0.727	470	22795	26112	3899
3	91.9	15.0	-0.103	0.727	470	36694	36165	7619
4	107.0	15.0	-0.065	0.727	470	49498	44878	12077
5	122.0	18.0	-0.023	0.727	470	79413	67099	22454
6	140.0	18.0	0.023	0.727	470	92351	74549	30106
7	158.0	18.0	0.069	0.727	470	91626	72215	33998
8	176.0	18.5	0.115	0.727	470	94325	72671	39227
9	194.5	18.5	0.164	0.727	470	95296	71861	43880
10	213.0	16.0	0.210	0.727	470	80039	59553	40182
11	229.0	16.0	0.253	0.727	470	74631	55234	40349
12	245.0	11.0	0.291	0.727	470	49068	36150	28092
13	256.0	20.0	0.337	0.727	470	80540	59543	49066
14	276.0	0.1	0.367	0.727	470	423	309	267
15	276.1	19.9	0.398	0.727	470	86692	62756	56607
16	296.0	0.1	0.430	0.727	470	467	334	315
17	296.1	15.9	0.457	0.727	470	79930	56467	55162
18	312.0	0.1	0.484	0.727	470	526	369	371
19	312.1	15.7	0.512	0.727	470	96245	66301	69342
20	327.8	15.7	0.570	0.727	470	101854	69646	76604
21	343.4	15.7	0.633	0.727	470	105608	71972	82725
22	359.1	15.7	0.702	0.727	470	107342	73206	87392
23	374.7	15.7	0.778	0.727	470	106854	73238	90239
24	390.4	15.7	0.864	0.727	470	103884	71909	90832
25	406.0	17.0	0.967	0.727	470	99953	70768	90567
26	423.0	17.0	1.095	0.727	470	76519	56733	71887
27	440.0	25.8	1.303	0.727	470	48227	43316	47347



PROJECT DATA: Project: G-2621-FG Location: SECTION Z-Z' Filename: OHANIAN2 Description: PROPOSED RESIDENCES

ANALYSIS DATA: Point Coordinates Line Left Right Soil Soil Density Cohesion Phi No. Х Y No. Point Point No. No. pcf psf Deq 0.0 480.0 2 1 125.0 36.0 122.0 525.0 140.0 536.0 5 6 176.0 537.0 543.0 213.0 245.0 545.0 б 256.0 548.0 276.0 548.0 8 276.1 558.0 296.0 558.0 10 10 296.1 571.0 11 312.0 571.0 12 312.1 582.0 13 13 406.0 650.0 14 14 440.0 663.0 15 15 490.0 670.0 

Circle center at X = .299.0, Y = .808.0FS= 1.889 at R= 220.0

X= 293	y = 10 $y = 10$	808.0	R = ZZ	J. U				
SLICE	X-LEFT	DX	TAN	TAN	COHESION	VERTICAL	RESISTING	DRIVING
			THETA	PHI		FORCE	TERM	TERM
1	322.1	7.6	0.123	0.727	470	2188	4979	267
2	329.7	7.6	0.159	0.727	470	6433	7882	1009
3	337.3	7.6	0.195	0.727	470	10416	10571	1995
4	345.0	7.6	0.232	0.727	470	14132	13056	3197
5	352.6	7.6	0.270	0.727	470	17574	15346	4586
6	360.2	7.6	0.309	0.727	470	20735	17447	6130
7	367.8	7.6	0.350	0.727	470	23606	19364	7798
8	375.5	7.6	0.392	0.727	470	26177	21098	9555
9	383.1	7.6	0.436	0.727	470	28434	22650	11366
10	390.7	7.6	0.482	0.727	470	30363	24017	13190
11	398.4	7.6	0.531	0.727	470	31945	25194	14986
12	406.0	8.5	0.586	0.727	470	35444	28137	17928
13	414.5	8.5	0.649	0.727	470	33319	26905	18141
14	423.0	8.5	0.718	0.727	470	30599	25298	17843
15	431.5	8.5	0.794	0.727	470	27226	23256	16929
16	440.0	9.3	0.884	0.727	470	23653	21451	15663
17	449.3	9.3	0.992	0.727	470	15097	15621	10634
18	458.5	9.3	1.122	0.727	470	5264	8585	3929



PROJECT DATA: Project: G-2621-FG Location: SECTION Z-Z' Filename: OHANIAN2 Description: PROPOSED RESIDENCES

ANALYS	SIS DATA	<i>A</i> :								
Point	Point Coordinates			Left	Right	Soil	Soil	Density	Cohesion	Phi
No.	Х	Y	No.	Point	Point	No.	No.	pcf	psf	Deg
1	0.0	480.0	1	1	2	1	1	125.0	470	36.0
2	122.0	525.0	2	2	3	1				
3	140.0	536.0	3	3	4	1				
4	176.0	537.0	4	4	5	1				
5	213.0	543.0	5	5	6	1				
6	245.0	545.0	6	6	7	1				
7	256.0	548.0	7	7	8	1				
8	276.0	548.0	8	8	9	1				
9	276.1	558.0	9	9	10	1				
10	296.0	558.0	10	10	11	1				
11	296.1	571.0	11	11	12	1				
12	312.0	571.0	12	12	13	1				
13	312.1	582.0	13	13	14	1				
14	406.0	650.0	14	14	15	1				
15	440.0	663.0	15	15	16	1				
16	490.0	670.0								
Seismi	.c coeff	licient,	horiz	zontal	= 0.32	20				

vertical = 0.000
Circle center at X= 299.0, Y= 808.0 FS= 1.068 at R= 220.0

X = Z 9	9.0 I=	808.0	R = ZZ	0.0				
SLICE	X-LEFT	DX	TAN	TAN	COHESION	VERTICAL	RESISTING	DRIVING
			THETA	PHI		FORCE	TERM	TERM
1	322.1	7.6	0.123	0.727	470	2188	4812	958
2	329.7	7.6	0.159	0.727	470	6433	7548	3010
3	337.3	7.6	0.195	0.727	470	10416	10033	5183
4	345.0	7.6	0.232	0.727	470	14132	12282	7449
5	352.6	7.6	0.270	0.727	470	17574	14310	9778
6	360.2	7.6	0.309	0.727	470	20735	16129	12140
7	367.8	7.6	0.350	0.727	470	23606	17746	14502
8	375.5	7.6	0.392	0.727	470	26177	19168	16830
9	383.1	7.6	0.436	0.727	470	28434	20399	19088
10	390.7	7.6	0.482	0.727	470	30363	21439	21237
11	398.4	7.6	0.531	0.727	470	31945	22288	23234
12	406.0	8.5	0.586	0.727	470	35444	24651	26850
13	414.5	8.5	0.649	0.727	470	33319	23324	26322
14	423.0	8.5	0.718	0.727	470	30599	21692	25155
15	431.5	8.5	0.794	0.727	470	27226	19712	23243
16	440.0	9.3	0.884	0.727	470	23653	17951	20981
17	449.3	9.3	0.992	0.727	470	15097	12886	13918
18	458.5	9.3	1.122	0.727	470	5264	6970	5032

# SB-SLOPE

Simplified Bishop Slope Stability Analysis

PROJECT: G-2621-FG

LOCATION: SECTION Z-Z'

FILE: OHANIAN2 COMPLETE SLOPE CROSS SECTION

CIRCLE	×	Y	RADIUS	FS
1	280.0	768.0	190.0	1.73



#### GEOSYSTEM SLOPE STABILITY PROGRAM SB-SLOPE

PROJECT DATA: Project: G-2621-FG Location: SECTION Z-Z' Filename: OHANIAN2 Description: PROPOSED RESIDENCES

ANALYSIS DATA: Line Left Right Soil Soil Density Cohesion Phi No. Point Point No. No. pcf psf Deg Point Coordinates X No. Y Deq 1 125.0 36.0 0.0 480.0 122.0 525.0 140.0 536.0 5 176.0 537.0 213.0 543.0 245.0 545.0 256.0 548.0 276.0 548.0 276.1 558.0 296.0 558.0 296.1 571.0 312.0 571.0 12 312.1 582.0 13 406.0 650.0 14 440.0 663.0 15 490.0 670.0

Circle center at X= 280.0, Y= 768.0 FS= 1.732 at R= 190.0

V= 790	J.0 I =	100.0	K = 190	0.0				
SLICE	X-LEFT	DX	TAN	TAN	COHESION	VERTICAL	RESISTING	DRIVING
			THETA	PHI		FORCE	TERM	TERM
1	312.1	0.0	0.171	0.727	470	1	6	0
2	312.1	6.7	0.190	0.727	470	2566	4729	479
3	318.8	6.7	0.228	0.727	470	5464	6667	1213
4	325.5	6.7	0.266	0.727	470	8148	8445	2096
5	332.2	6.7	0.306	0.727	470	10611	10067	3104
6	338.9	6.7	0.347	0.727	470	12847	11537	4212
7	345.6	6.7	0.390	0.727	470	14848	12859	5392
8	352.3	6.7	0.434	0.727	470	16603	14031	6616
9	359.1	6.7	0.481	0.727	470	18100	15053	7851
10	365.8	6.7	0.531	0.727	470	19325	15920	9065
11	372.5	6.7	0.584	0.727	470	20261	16624	10220
12	379.2	6.7	0.641	0.727	470	20888	17157	11274
13	385.9	6.7	0.703	0.727	470	21182	17502	12180
14	392.6	6.7	0.771	0.727	470	21111	17640	12885
15	399.3	6.7	0.846	0.727	470	20640	17542	13327
16	406.0	6.4	0.928	0.727	470	17862	15675	12147
17	412.4	6.4	1.018	0.727	470	14878	13797	10616
18	418.7	6.4	1.124	0.727	470	11399	11520	8515
19	425.1	6.4	1.249	0.727	470	7338	8733	5728
20	431.4	6.4	1.402	0.727	470	2575	5268	2096

# SB-SLOPE

Simplified Bishop Slope Stability Analysis

PROJECT: G-2621-FG

LOCATION: SECTION Z-Z'

FILE: OHANIAN2 COMPLETE SLOPE CROSS SECTION

CIRCLE	×	Y	RADIUS	FS
1	280.0	768.0	190.0	1.02



#### GEOSYSTEM SLOPE STABILITY PROGRAM SB-SLOPE

PROJECT DATA: Project: G-2621-FG Location: SECTION Z-Z' Filename: OHANIAN2 Description: PROPOSED RESIDENCES

ANALYS	SIS DATA	A :								
Point	Coordin	nates	Line	Left	Right	Soil	Soil	Density	Cohesion	Phi
No.	Х	Y	No.	Point	Point	No.	No.	pcf	psf	Deg
1	0.0	480.0	1	1	2	1	1	125.0	470	36.0
2	122.0	525.0	2	2	3	1				
3	140.0	536.0	3	3	4	1				
4	176.0	537.0	4	4	5	1				
5	213.0	543.0	5	5	6	1				
6	245.0	545.0	6	6	7	1				
7	256.0	548.0	7	7	8	1				
8	276.0	548.0	8	8	9	1				
9	276.1	558.0	9	9	10	1				
10	296.0	558.0	10	10	11	1				
11	296.1	571.0	11	11	12	1				
12	312.0	571.0	12	12	13	1				
13	312.1	582.0	13	13	14	1				
14	406.0	650.0	14	14	15	1				
15	440.0	663.0	15	15	16	1				
16	490.0	670.0								
Seismi	ic coeff	icient,	hori	zontal	= 0.32	20				

vertical = 0.000

Circle center at X= 280.0, Y= 768.0 FS= 1.025 at R= 190.0

X = 2	280.0 Y=	/68.0	R = 190	5.0				
SLIC	CE X-LEFT I	XC	TAN	TAN	COHESION	VERTICAL	RESISTING	DRIVING
			THETA	PHI		FORCE	TERM	TERM
The	following	slice	has a	normal	force=	- 0		
1	312.1	0.0	0.171	0.727	470	1	6	0
2	312.1	6.7	0.190	0.727	470	2566	4500	1279
3	318.8	6.7	0.228	0.727	470	5464	6289	2887
4	325.5	6.7	0.266	0.727	470	8148	7897	4548
5	332.2	6.7	0.306	0.727	470	10611	9334	6238
6	338.9	6.7	0.347	0.727	470	12847	10607	7930
7	345.6	6.7	0.390	0.727	470	14848	11722	9597
8	352.3	6.7	0.434	0.727	470	16603	12682	11211
9	359.1	6.7	0.481	0.727	470	18100	13489	12740
10	365.8	6.7	0.531	0.727	470	19325	14141	14150
11	372.5	6.7	0.584	0.727	470	20261	14636	15405
12	379.2	6.7	0.641	0.727	470	20888	14968	16462
13	385.9	6.7	0.703	0.727	470	21182	15125	17274
14	392.6	6.7	0.771	0.727	470	21111	15095	17788
15	399.3	6.7	0.846	0.727	470	20640	14858	17941
16	406.0	6.4	0.928	0.727	470	17862	13136	15999
17	412.4	6.4	1.018	0.727	470	14878	11435	13716
18	418.7	6.4	1.124	0.727	470	11399	9434	10802
19	425.1	6.4	1.249	0.727	470	7338	7059	7138
The	following	slice	has a	normal	force=	-1306		
20	431.4	6.4	1.402	0.727	470	2575	4196	2568

## SB-SLOPE

Simplified Bishop Slope Stability Analysis

PROJECT: G-2621-FG

LOCATION: SECTION Z-Z'

FILE: OHANIAN2 COMPLETE SLOPE CROSS SECTION

CIRCLE	×	Y	RADIUS	FS
1	289.0	770.0	222.0	1.74



### GEOSYSTEM SLOPE STABILITY PROGRAM SB-SLOPE

PROJECT DATA: Project: G-2621-FG Location: SECTION Z-Z' Filename: OHANIAN2 Description: PROPOSED RESIDENCES

ANALY	SIS DAT	A :								
Point	Coordi	nates	Line	Left	Right	Soil	Soil	Density	Cohesion	Phi
No.	Х	Y	No.	Point	Point	No.	No.	pcf	psf	Deg
1	0.0	480.0	1	1	2	1	1	125.0	470	36.0
2	122.0	525.0	2	2	3	1				
3	140.0	536.0	3	3	4	1				
4	176.0	537.0	4	4	5	1				
5	213.0	543.0	5	5	6	1				
6	245.0	545.0	6	6	7	1				
7	256.0	548.0	7	7	8	1				
8	276.0	548.0	8	8	9	1				
9	276.1	558.0	9	9	10	1				
10	296.0	558.0	10	10	11	1				
11	296.1	571.0	11	11	12	1				
12	312.0	571.0	12	12	13	1				
13	312.1	582.0	13	13	14	1				
14	406.0	650.0	14	14	15	1				
15	440.0	663.0	15	15	16	1				
16	490.0	670.0								

Circle center at X= 289.0, Y= 770.0 FS= 1.738 at R= 222.0

X = 783	9.0 I =	110.0	R = ZZ	2.0				
SLICE	X-LEFT	DX	TAN	TAN	COHESION	VERTICAL	RESISTING	DRIVING
			INEIA	PHI		FORCE	TERM	TERM
1	276.0	0.1	-0.058	0.727	470	58	89	-3
2	276.1	12.9	-0.029	0.727	470	15823	17782	-460
3	289.0	7.0	0.016	0.727	470	8702	9550	137
4	296.0	0.1	0.032	0.727	470	205	193	7
5	296.1	15.9	0.068	0.727	470	44412	38731	3013
6	312.0	0.1	0.104	0.727	470	341	284	35
7	312.1	11.7	0.132	0.727	470	53218	42238	6947
8	323.8	11.7	0.187	0.727	470	62949	48363	11547
9	335.6	11.7	0.243	0.727	470	71719	53830	16949
10	347.3	11.7	0.302	0.727	470	79495	58685	22991
11	359.1	11.7	0.364	0.727	470	86229	62960	29500
12	370.8	11.7	0.430	0.727	470	91863	66671	36287
13	382.5	11.7	0.501	0.727	470	96318	69817	43142
14	394.3	11.7	0.579	0.727	470	99493	72379	49829
15	406.0	11.3	0.663	0.727	470	95021	69863	52529
16	417.3	11.3	0.758	0.727	470	89752	67206	54202
17	428.7	11.3	0.867	0.727	470	82849	63645	54269
18	440.0	11.7	1.000	0.727	470	74425	59433	52628
19	451.7	11.7	1.170	0.727	.470	58123	49353	44184
20	463.5	11.7	1.398	0.727	470	38390	36246	31223
21	475.2	11.7	1.737	0.727	470	13770	18026	11933



#### GEOSYSTEM SLOPE STABILITY PROGRAM SB-SLOPE

PROJECT DATA: Project: G-2621-FG Location: SECTION Z-Z' Filename: OHANIAN2 Description: PROPOSED RESIDENCES

ANALYS	SIS DATA	<i>·</i>								
Point	Coordin	nates	Line	Left	Right	Soil	Soil	Density	Cohesion	Phi
No.	Х	Y	No.	Point	Point	No.	No.	pcf	psf	Deg
1	0.0	480.0	1	1	2	1	1	125.0	470	36.0
2	122.0	525.0	2	2	3	1				
3	140.0	536.0	3	3	4	1				
4	176.0	537.0	4	4	5	1				
5	213.0	543.0	5	5	6	1				
6	245.0	545.0	6	6	7	1				
7	256.0	548.0	7	7	8	1				
8	276.0	548.0	8	8	9	1				
9	276.1	558.0	9	9	10	1		,		
10	296.0	558.0	10	10	11	1				
11	296.1	571.0	11	11	12	1				
12	312.0	571.0	12	12	13	1				
13	312.1	582.0	13	13	14	1				
14	406.0	650.0	14	14	15	1				
15	440.0	663.0	15	15	16	1				
16	490.0	670.0								
Seismi	lc coeff	licient,	hori	zontal	= 0.32	20				

vertical = 0.000

Circle center at X= 289.0, Y= 770.0 FS= 1.009 at R= 222.0

V= 793	9.0 I=	110.0	R = ZZZ	2.0				
SLICE	X-LEFT	DX	TAN	TAN	COHESION	VERTICAL	RESISTING	DRIVING
			THETA	PHI		FORCE	TERM	TERM
1	276.0	0.1	-0.058	0.727	470	58	91	15
2	276.1	12.9	-0.029	0.727	470	15823	17942	4487
3	289.0	7.0	0.016	0.727	470	8702	9505	2859
4	296.0	0.1	0.032	0.727	470	205	192	70
5	296.1	15.9	0.068	0.727	470	44412	37974	16468
6	312.0	0.1	0.104	0.727	470	341	276	137
7	312.1	11.7	0.132	0.727	470	53218	40705	22434
8	323.8	11.7	0.187	0.727	470	62949	45963	29395
9	335.6	11.7	0.243	0.727	470	71719	50468	36714
10	347.3	11.7	0.302	0.727	470	79495	54290	44229
11	359.1	11.7	0.364	0.727	470	86229	57479	51766
12	370.8	11.7	0.430	0.727	470	91863	60064	59136
13	382.5	11.7	0.501	0.727	470	96318	62059	66130
14	394.3	11.7	0.579	0.727	470	99493	63457	72510
15	406.0	11.3	0.663	0.727	470	95021	60397	73262
16	417.3	11.3	0.758	0.727	470	89752	57263	72984
17	428.7	11.3	0.867	0.727	470	82849	53393	70797
18	440.0	11.7	1.000	0.727	470	74425	49004	66738
19	451.7	11.7	1.170	0.727	470	58123	39894	54600
20	463.5	11.7	1.398	0.727	470	38390	28625	37640
21	475.2	11.7	1.737	0.727	470	13770	13828	14036

TECHNOSOIL, INC. GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING / ENGINEERING GEOLOGY

341 West Arden Ave., Glendale, CA 91203 Tel: (818) 500-4995 Fax: (818) 500-4986 E-mail: technosoil@sbcglobal.net

December 16, 2014

Project: G-2621-FG

Mr. Andre Ohanian 10118 Fernglen Avenue # 3 Tujunga, CA 91042

Re: Proposed Residences Lots 115 through 124, Tract 4417, 3164, 3152, 3144, 3138, 3134, 3126, 3122, 3118, 3114, 3110 East Future Street Los Angeles, California Addendum No. 1 to Soil and Geology Investigation Report Dated July 30, 2014

Dear Mr. Ohanian:

This addendum report was prepared in response to the City of Los Angeles, Department of Building and Safety, Grading Division correction letter dated September 16, 2014 (a copy attached).

In response to the Item No. 1, the report dated July 30, 2014 by Technosoil, Inc., is intended to be a "stand-alone" report. The recommended retaining wall free board is presented on page 10 of the above referenced report. Recommendations for slab-on-grade are as follows:

### Slab-on-Grade and Pavements

Concrete slab-on-grade and pavements may be supported on bedrock. The existing fill and residual soils (colluvium) shall not be utilized to support slab-on-grade, pavements or additional fill unless removed and compacted to minimum 90 percent relative compaction as determined by the ASTM 1557 standard method.

## Proposed Residences Project: G–2621-FG

Concrete slab-on-grade shall be minimum 4 inches thick and shall be reinforced with # 4 deformed reinforcing bars spaced maximum 16 inches center to center each way . A moisture barrier consisting of a plastic membrane of at least 10 mils in thickness, protected by at least one inch of clean sand is recommended where slab moisture would be detrimental.

In response to the Item No. 2, it is noted that all proposed buildings shall comply with the code required minimum H/2, toe of slope setback with maximum 15 feet. Any portion of the roof overhang shall also meet the code required setback. All sections were revised to comply with the code required setback (see Sections A-A' through J-J', Plates A-1 through J-1).

In response to the Item No. 3, based on our site observations, the bedrock is slightly to highly fractured. The fractures are predominantly randomly oriented and steeply dipping.

As mentioned in our report dated July 30, 2014, all temporary cuts shall be observed by the undersigned geologist during grading. Any excavation exposing potential outdipping fractures/joints shall be required to be trimmed back to the fracture/joint angle or shored.

In response to the Item No. 4, interceptor terraces will be required on the proposed cut slopes where cuts higher than 25 feet are proposed.

Typical interceptor terraces are shown on sections where cuts exceed 25 feet in height. A grading plan showing the required interceptor terraces as per Los Angeles Building Code, Section 7013.1 shall be prepared by the grading engineer.



2

Proposed Residences Project: G-2621-FG

In order to accommodate the code required interceptor terraces, additional retaining walls may be required (see Sections D-D', E-E', H-H', I-I and J-J').

The number and height of retaining walls shall be in compliance with the zoning code that limits height and number of retaining walls. The grading and retaining wall plans shall comply with all applicable codes.

Where upper retaining wall surcharges the lower retaining wall, the retaining walls shall be designed as stacked walls and the recommended equivalent fluid weight shall be applied from the top of the upper retaining wall to the bottom of the lower retaining wall.

All other recommendations not superseded in this report shall be complied with.

Respectfully submitted,

TECHNOSOIL, INC.

Minassian, RCE #3381 dré M

AMM:sv

No. 33813

Mark Kruger, C**⊉**G #2345



TECHNOSOIL, INC.





















BOARD OF BUILDING AND SAFETY COMMISSIONERS

VAN AMBATIELOS

E. FELICIA BRANNON VICE-PRESIDENT

JOSELYN GEAGA-ROSENTHAL GEORGE HOVAGUIMIAN JAVIER NUNEZ

# CITY OF LOS ANGELES



ERIC GARCETTI MAYOR DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY 201 NORTH FIGUEROA STREET LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

RAYMOND S. CHAN, C.E., S.E. GENERAL MANAGER

> FRANK BUSH EXECUTIVE OFFICER

### **GEOLOGY AND SOILS REPORT CORRECTION LETTER**

September 16, 2014

LOG # 85343 SOILS/GEOLOGY FILE - 2

Andre Ohanian 10118 Fernglen Avenue, #3 Tujunga, CA 91042

TRACT:	4417
LOT(S):	124 / 123 / 122 / 121 / 120 / 119 / 118 / 117 / 116 /115
LOCATION:	3110/3114/3118/3122/3126/3134/3138/3144/3152/
	3164 East Future Street

CURRENT REFERENCE	REPORT
REPORT/LETTER(S)	No.
Geology/Soils Report	G-2621-FG
Oversized Documents	.,

DATE(S) OF <u>DOCUMENT</u> 3 07/30/2014

PREPARED BY Technosoil, Inc.

The Grading Division of the Department of Building and Safety has reviewed the referenced report dated July 30, 2014, providing recommendations for the proposed ten (10) new three level single family residences, with rear yard toe of ascending slope retaining wall.

A soils and geology report dated 07/26/1991 by Technosoil, Inc. for a proposed residence at 3110 Future Street, and a soils and geology report dated 09/25/2008 by Parmelee/Geology Inc. for a proposed 10 residence development at the subject site, were attached to the current report. A laboratory test report dated 04/23/2007 by C. Y. Geotech, Inc. was part of the 09/25/2008 Parmelee/Geology report. According to the Department records, these reports were not previously submitted for review.

The earth materials at the subsurface exploration locations consist of fill, residual soil, overlying Monterey Formation sandstone, siltstone, and shale. The consultants recommend to support the proposed structures on conventional and/or drilled-pile foundations bearing on competent bedrock.

The review of the referenced report dated July 30, 2014, can not be completed at this time and will be continued upon submittal of an addendum to the report which shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(Note: Numbers in parenthesis () refer to applicable sections of the 2014 City of LA Building Code. P/BC numbers refer the applicable Information Bulletin. Information Bulletins can be accessed on the internet at LADBS.ORG.)

ANTAL STATE TO ANTAL STATE OF THE ANTAL

3110/3114/3118/3122/3126/3134/3138/3144/3152/3164 East Future Street

- The consultants state that the design recommendations contained in the Parmelee/Geology and in their 1991 prior report, not superceded in their current report shall be complied with (see page 2 of the current report). For clarity purposes, provide a stand-alone report that includes all design recommendations for the proposed development. The report shall include recommendations for retaining wall freeboard, floor slabs, decking, etc.
- 2. Verify the Code required setback from the face of the ascending slope is satisfied at all the buildings locations. Revise the appropriate Sections and the Geologic Map, accordingly. Notes: No part of the proposed structure can be allowed to encroach into the Code required setback area. This includes overhanging roofs or eaves of the proposed residence. The setbacks depicted on Sections F-F', G-G', H-H', I-I' and J-J' do not meet Code because of the location of the proposed residence roof.
- 3. The consultants recommended in their 1991 report (see page 8) that temporary unsurcharged cuts in bedrock should be sloped back no steeper than 1/3:1 (h:v) due to the presence of joints. Clarify and justify with appropriate calculations that incorporates jointed bedrock, that a 12 foot high vertical cut with a 1.5:1 (h:v) slope above is safe (refer to page 8 of the current report).
- According to the cross sections in the report, cuts higher than 25 feet are anticipated. Revise the plans and cross sections, and recommendations to incorporate interceptor terraces in accordance to Section 7013.1 of the 2014 LABC.

The geologist and soils engineer shall prepare a report containing the corrections indicated in this letter. The report shall be in the form of an itemized response. It is recommended that once all correction items have been addressed in a response report, to contact the report review engineer and/or geologist to schedule a verification appointment to demonstrate compliance with all the corrections. Do not schedule an appointment until all corrections have been addressed. Bring three copies of the response report, including one unbound wet-signed original for microfilming in the event that the report is found to be acceptable.

JEFFREY T. WILSON Engineering Geologist I

JTW/JAA:jtw/jaa Log No. 85343 213-482-0480

Page 2

COSTA Geotechnical Engineer II

Part Piper

cc: Technosoil, Inc., Project Consultant LA District Office

BOARD OF **BUILDING AND SAFETY** COMMISSIONERS

> VAN AMBATIELOS PRESIDENT

E. FELICIA BRANNON VICE-PRESIDENT

JOSELYN GEAGA-ROSENTHAL GEORGE HOVAGUIMIAN JAVIER NUNEZ

CITY OF LOS ANGELI DIR-2016-5000-SPP-HCA-1A EXHIBIT G

CALIFORNIA



Geology and Soils Report Approval Letter

RAYMOND S. CHAN, C.E., S.E. GENERAL MANAGER

> FRANK BUSH EXECUTIVE OFFICER

## GEOLOGY AND SOILS REPORT APPROVAL LETTER

ERIC GARCETTI MAYOR

April 26, 2016

LOG # 85343-02 SOILS/GEOLOGY FILE - 2

Andre Ohanian 10118 Fernglen Avenue, #3 Tujunga, CA 91042

TRACT:	4417					
LOT(S):	124 / 12	3 / 122 / 121 /	120 / 119 / 118 / 11	7 / 116 /115		
LOCATION:	3110/3114/3118/3122/3126/3134/3138/3144/3152/3164 E. Futu					
	Street					
CURRENT REFERE	NCE	REPORT	DATE(S) OF			
<b>REPORT/LETTER(S</b>	)	<u>No.</u>	DOCUMENT	PREPARED BY		
Geology/Soils Report		15-475	03/21/2016	GeoTech Services		
Oversized Doc(s)		**	•••	**		
PREVIOUS REFERE	ENCE	REPORT	DATE(S) OF			

REPORT/LETTER(S)	<u>No.</u>	<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>PREPARED BY</u>
Dept. Correction Letter	85343-01	01/22/2015	LADBS - Grading
Geology/Soils Report	G-2621-FG	12/16/2014	Technosoil, Inc.
Dept. Correction Letter	85343	09/16/2014	LADBS - Grading
Geology/Soils Report	G-2621-FG	07/30/2014	Technosoil, Inc.
(For 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138,	3152, 3164 Futur	re St):	
Geology/Soils Report	PG 2218	09/25/2008	Parmelee Geology, Inc
Soils Laboratory Report	CYG-07-4896	04/23/2007	C.Y. Geotech, Inc.

(For 3110 Future St): Geology/Soils Report 07/26/1991 Technosoil, Inc. G-8989-G

The Grading Division of the Department of Building and Safety has reviewed the referenced reports dated March 21, 2016, December 16, 2014, and July 30, 2014 providing recommendations for the proposed ten (10) new three level single family residences, with rear yard toe of ascending slope retaining wall, and slope interceptor terraces where required by Code (where slopes exceed 25 feet in height).

The referenced report dated March 21, 2016 includes a change of consultant pursuant to Section 91.7008 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code.

The Department of Building and Safety accepts notification of transferring the responsibility for grading geotechnical supervision and recognizes GeoTech Services, as the new geotechnical consultant provided all the recommendations in the previous and current reports and conditions in the Department's Approval letters are complied with.

The earth materials at the subsurface exploration locations consist of fill and residual soil overlying Monterey Formation sandstone, siltstone, and shale. The consultants recommend to support the proposed structures on conventional and/or drilled-pile foundations bearing on competent bedrock.

The referenced reports dated March 21, 2016, December 16, 2014, and July 30, 2014, are acceptable, provided the following conditions are complied with during site development:

(Note: Numbers in parenthesis () refer to applicable sections of the 2014 City of LA Building Code. P/BC numbers refer the applicable Information Bulletin. Information Bulletins can be accessed on the internet at LADBS.ORG.)

- 1. Conformance with the Zoning Code Section 12.21.C8, which limits the heights and number of retaining walls, will be determined during structural plan check.
- 2. Final plans shall be verified so that the location of all interceptor terraces on cut slopes where cuts are 25 feet high or higher are clearly depicted as per LA Building Code Section 7013.1.
- 3. The geologist and soils engineer shall review and approve the detailed plans prior to issuance of any permits. This approval shall be by signature on the plans which clearly indicates that the geologist and soils engineer have reviewed the plans prepared by the design engineer and that the plans include the recommendations contained in their reports. (7006.1)
- 4. All recommendations of the report(s) which are in addition to or more restrictive than the conditions contained herein shall be incorporated into the plans.
- 5. A copy of the subject and appropriate referenced reports and this approval letter shall be attached to the District Office and field set of plans. Submit one copy of the above reports to the Building Department Plan Checker prior to issuance of the permit. (7006.1)
- 6. A grading permit shall be obtained for all structural fill and retaining wall backfill. (106.1.2)
- 7. All man-made fill shall be compacted to a minimum 90 percent of the maximum dry density of the fill material per the latest version of ASTM D 1557. Where cohesionless soil having less than 15 percent finer than 0.005 millimeters is used for fill, it shall be compacted to a minimum of 95 percent relative compaction based on maximum dry density (D1556). Placement of gravel in lieu of compacted fill is allowed only if complying with Section 91.7011.3 of the Code. (7011.3)
- 8. Existing uncertified fill shall not be used for support of footings, concrete slabs or new fill. (1809.2)
- 9. Drainage in conformance with the provisions of the Code shall be maintained during and subsequent to construction. (7013.12)

- Grading shall be scheduled for completion prior to the start of the rainy season, or detailed temporary erosion control plans shall be filed in a manner satisfactory to the Grading Division of the Department and the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering, B-Permit Section, for any grading work in excess of 200 cu yd. (7007.1) 201 N. Figueroa Street 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, LA (213) 482-7045
- 11. All loose foundation excavation material shall be removed prior to commencement of framing. Slopes disturbed by construction activities shall be restored. (7005.3)
- 12. The applicant is advised that the approval of this report does not waive the requirements for excavations contained in the State Construction Safety Orders enforced by the State Division of Industrial Safety. (3301.1)
- 13. The soils engineer shall review and approve the shoring plans prior to issuance of the permit. (3307.3.2)
- 14. Unsurcharged temporary excavations over 12 feet and up to 20 feet exposing favorably bedding conditions (i.e., facing south, east, and west) shall be trimmed back at a gradient not exceeding 1.5(H):1(V), as recommended on page 8 of the 07/30/2014 report.
- 15. Shoring for cuts facing north where steep out dipping bedding planes will be exposed, shall be designed for 64 pcf, as recommended.
- 16. Unsurcharged temporary excavations exposing soil shall be trimmed back at a gradient not exceeding 1(H):1(V), as recommended.
- 17. Shoring for cuts exposing favorably bedding conditions shall be designed for a minimum EFP of 25 PCF; all surcharge loads shall be included into the design, as recommended. Total lateral load on shoring piles shall be determined by multiplying the recommended EFP by the pile spacing.
- 18. A shoring monitoring program shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the soils engineer.
- 19. All foundations shall derive entire support from competent bedrock, as recommended and approved by the geologist and soils engineer by inspection.
- 20. Foundations adjacent to a descending slope steeper than 3:1 (H:V) in gradient shall be a minimum distance of one-third the vertical height of the slope but need not exceed 40 feet measured horizontally from the footing bottom to the face of the slope (1808.7.2)
- 21. Buildings adjacent to ascending slopes steeper than 3:1 (H:V) in gradient shall be set back from the toe of the slope a level distance equal to one-half the vertical height of the slope, but need not exceed 15 feet (1808.7.1)
- 22. Pile caisson and/or isolated foundation ties are required by Code Sections 1809.13 and/or 1810.3.13. Exceptions and modification to this requirement are provided in Information Bulletin P/BC 2011-30.

### Page 4 3110 / 3114 / 3118 / 3122 / 3126 / 3134 / 3138 / 3144 / 3152 / 3164 E. Future Street

- 23. Pile and/or caisson shafts shall be designed for a lateral load of 1000 pounds per linear foot of shaft exposed to fill, soil and weathered bedrock. (P/BC 2011-50)
- 24. When water over 3 inches in depth is present in drilled pile holes, a concrete mix with a strength of 1000 p.s.i. over the design p.s.i. shall be tremied from the bottom up; an admixture that reduces the problem of segregation of paste/aggregates and dilution of paste shall be included. (1808.8.3)
- 25. Slabs placed on approved compacted fill or competent bedrock shall be at least 4 inches thick and shall be reinforced with <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>-inch diameter (#4) reinforcing bars spaced maximum of 16 inches on center each way. Vapor barriers with a minimum 10 mil thickness shall be utilized as recommended.
- 26. The seismic design shall be based on a Site Class C as recommended. All other seismic design parameters shall be reviewed by LADBS building plan check.
- 27. Retaining walls shall be designed for the lateral earth pressures specified in the section titled "Retaining Walls" starting on page 9 of the 07/30/2014 report. Note: Where two separate stacked retaining walls (the upper wall surcharges the lower wall) are proposed, the lower of the 2 walls shall be designed for the combined height of the 2 walls. All surcharge loads shall be included into the design.
- 28. Retaining walls higher than 6 feet shall be designed for lateral earth pressure due to earthquake motions as specified on Table 1.1 attached to the 03/21/2016 report (1803.5.12).
- 29. Retaining walls at the base of ascending slopes shall be provided with a minimum freeboard of 18 inches, as recommended.
- 30. The recommended equivalent fluid pressure (EFP) for the proposed retaining wall shall apply from the top of the freeboard to the bottom of the wall footing.
- 31. All retaining walls shall be provided with a standard surface backdrain system and all drainage shall be conducted to the street in an acceptable manner and in a non-erosive device. (7013.11)
- 32. With the exception of retaining walls designed for hydrostatic pressure, all retaining walls shall be provided with a subdrain system to prevent possible hydrostatic pressure behind the wall. Prior to issuance of any permit, the retaining wall subdrain system recommended in the soil report shall be incorporated into the foundation plan which shall be reviewed and approved by the soils engineer of record. (1805.4)
- 33. Installation of the subdrain system shall be inspected and approved by the soils engineer of record and the City grading/building inspector. (108.9)
- 34. Prefabricated drainage composites (Miradrain) (Geotextiles) may be only used in addition to traditionally accepted methods of draining retained earth.
- 35. Where the ground water table is lowered and maintained at an elevation not less than 6 inches below the bottom of the lowest floor, or where hydrostatic pressures will not occur,

the floor and basement walls shall be damp-proofed. Where a hydrostatic pressure condition exists, and the design does not include a ground-water control system, basement walls and floors shall be waterproofed. (1803.5.4, 1805.1.3, 1805.2, 1805.3)

- 36. All roof and pad drainage shall be conducted to the street in an acceptable manner; water shall not be dispersed on to descending slopes without specific approval from the Grading Division and the consulting geologist and soils engineer. (7013.10)
- 37. All concentrated drainage shall be conducted in an approved device and disposed of in a manner approved by the LADBS. (7013.10)
- 38. Sprinkler plans for irrigation shall be submitted and approved by the Mechanical Plan Check Section (7012.3.1).
- 39. Any recommendations prepared by the geologist and/or the soils engineer for correction of geological hazards found during grading shall be submitted to the Grading Division of the Department for approval prior to utilization in the field. (7008.3)
- 40. The geologist and soils engineer shall inspect all excavations to determine that conditions anticipated in the report have been encountered and to provide recommendations for the correction of hazards found during grading. (7008 & 1705.6)
- 41. All friction pile or caisson drilling and installation shall be performed under the inspection and approval of the geologist and soils engineer. The geologist shall indicate the distance that friction piles or caissons penetrate into competent bedrock in a written field memorandum. (1803.5.5, 1704.9)
- 42. Prior to the pouring of concrete, a representative of the consulting soils engineer shall inspect and approve the footing excavations. He shall post a notice on the job site for the LADBS Building Inspector and the Contractor stating that the work so inspected meets the conditions of the report, but that no concrete shall be poured until the City Building Inspector has also inspected and approved the footing excavations. A written certification to this effect shall be filed with the Grading Division of the Department upon completion of the work. (108.9 & 7008.2)
- 43. Prior to excavation, an initial inspection shall be called with LADBS Inspector at which time sequence of construction, shoring, pile installation, protection fences and dust and traffic control will be scheduled. (108.9.1)
- 44. Installation of shoring and/or pile installation shall be performed under the inspection and approval of the soils engineer and deputy grading inspector. (1705.6)
- 45. Prior to the placing of compacted fill, a representative of the soils engineer shall inspect and approve the bottom excavations. He shall post a notice on the job site for the City Grading Inspector and the Contractor stating that the soil inspected meets the conditions of the report, but that no fill shall be placed until the LADBS Grading Inspector has also inspected and approved the bottom excavations. A written certification to this effect shall be included in the final compaction report filed with the Grading Division of the Department. All fill shall be placed under the inspection and approval of the soils engineer. A compaction report

together with the approved soil report and Department approval letter shall be submitted to the Grading Division of the Department upon completion of the compaction. In addition, an Engineer's Certificate of Compliance with the legal description as indicated in the grading permit and the permit number shall be included. (7011.3)

No slab shall be poured until the compaction report is submitted and approved by the 46. Grading Division of the Department.

Wilson JEFFREY T. WILSON

Engineering Geologist I

Log No. 85343-02 213-482-0480

J. ADOLFO ACOSTA Geotechnical Engineer II

Technosoil, Inc., Project Consultant cc: LA District Office

DEPARTMENT OF **CITY PLANNING** 

COMMISSION OFFICE (213) 978-1300

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

SAMANTHA MILLMAN PRESIDENT

MONIQUE LAWSHE VICE-PRESIDENT

MARIA CABILDO CAROLINE CHOE ILISSA GOLD HELEN LEUNG KAREN MACK JACOB NOONAN ELIZABETH ZAMORA





KAREN BASS MAYOR

# EXHIBIT H

MND and Appendices

01 (213) 910-1211

525

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP DIRECTOR

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP DEPUTY DIRECTOR

# **INITIAL STUDY MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

**CITY OF LOS ANGELES** FUTURE STREET SINGLE-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152, AND 3164 FUTURE STREET



**REPORT PREPARED FOR:** 

**CITY OF LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING** 

**200 NORTH SPRING STREET** ROOM 621 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012



**REPORT PREPARED BY:** 

CEQAOLOGY **URBAN/ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING 122A EAST FOOTHILL BOULEVARD** Box #417

## ARCADIA, CALIFORNIA 91006



**REPORT DATED:** DECEMBER 14, 2023

# THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
1 – INTRODUCTION	7
1.1 - INTRODUCTION TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT	7
1.2 – Purpose of the Initial Study	8
1.3 – Initial Study's Organization	11
2- PROJECT DESCRIPTION	12
2.1 – Project Overview	12
2.2 – Project Location	12
2.3 - Environmental Setting	12
2.4 – Project Description	15
3- Environmental Checklist Form	20
3.1 – Environmental Checklist Form	20
3.2 – Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	21
3.3 – Initial Study Checklist	24
4- Environmental Analysis	34
4.1 – Aesthetics	35
4.2 – Agriculture and Forestry Resources	39
4.3 – Air Quality	41
4.4 – Biological Resources	52
4.5 – Cultural Resources	59
4.6 - Energy	62
4.7 - Geology/Soils	64
4.8 – Greenhouse Gas Emissions	70
4.9 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials	74
4.10 - Hydrology/Water Quality	79
4.11 – Land Use/Planning	83
4.12 – Mineral Resources	86
4.13 – NOISE	87
4.14 - Population/Housing	92
4.15 – Public Services	94
4.16 - RECREATION	98
4.17 - TRANSPORTATION	99
4.18 – Tribal Cultural Resources	102
4.19 – Utilities/Service Systems	105
4.20 - WILDFIRE	108
4.21 – Mandatory Findings of Significance	112
5- Conclusions	115
5.1 – Findings	115
5.2 – Preparers	116
5.3 – References	116

## APPENDIX - PROVIDED UNDER A SEPARATE COVER

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

# SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

# 1.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was signed into law in 1970. The California Environmental Quality Act is a statute that requires state and local agencies to identify potential significant effects a "project" may have on the environment and any feasible mitigation that may be implemented to avoid or mitigate those impacts. A "project" is defined in Section 21065, Chapter 2.5, Division 13 of the California Public Resources Code as an activity which may cause either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment, and consists of any of the following: an activity directly undertaken by any public agency; an activity undertaken by a person which is supported, in whole or in part, through contracts, grants, subsidies, loans, or other forms of assistance from one or more public agencies; or, an activity that involves the issuance to a person of a lease, permit, license, certificate, or other entitlement for use by one or more public agencies. A "significant effect on the environment" is defined in Section 21068 Chapter 2.5, Division 13 of the California Public Resources Code as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment. Furthermore, the government agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project which may have a significant effect upon the environment is defined as the "lead agency" in Section 21067, Chapter 2.5, Division 13 of the California Public Resources Code.

As stated in Section 15002 of Article 1, Chapter 3, Division 6, Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, the basic purposes of CEQA are to:

- (1) Inform governmental decision makers and the public about the potential, significant environmental effects of proposed activities;
- (2) Identify the ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced;
- (3) Prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governmental agency finds the changes to be feasible; and,
- (4) Disclose to the public the reasons why a governmental agency approved the project in the manner the agency chose if significant environmental effects are involved.

CEQA applies in situations where a governmental agency can use its judgment in deciding whether and how to carry out or approve a project ("whether" denotes whether or not a project is subject to CEQA). A project subject to such judgmental controls is called a "discretionary project." Where the law requires a governmental agency to act on a project in a set way without allowing the agency to use its own judgment, the project is called "ministerial," and CEQA does not apply.<sup>1</sup> Once an application for a project is deemed complete, a lead agency must first determine whether

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Title 14 - Natural Resources, Division 6, Chapter 3, Article 1, Section 15002(i).

an activity is subject to CEQA before conducting an initial study. An activity is not subject to CEQA if: the activity does not involve the exercise of discretionary powers by a public agency; the activity will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment; or the activity is not a project as defined in Section 15378.

# **1.2 PURPOSE OF THE INITIAL STUDY**

Following preliminary review, the Lead Agency shall conduct an Initial Study to determine if the project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the Lead Agency can determine that an Environmental Impact Report will clearly be required for the project, an Initial Study is not required but may still be desirable. The Lead Agency shall prepare or have prepared a Negative Declaration if the initial study shows there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole of the record before the agency, that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment. The Lead Agency shall prepare or have prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration if the initial study identifies potentially significant effects, but (1) revisions in the project plans or proposals made by, or agreed to by the applicant would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur and (2) there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole of the record before the agency, that the project, as revised, may have a significant effect on the environment. As indicated in Section 15063(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the purposes of an Initial Study are to:

- (1) Provide the Lead Agency with information to use as the basis for deciding whether to prepare an EIR or a Negative Declaration.
- (2) Enable an applicant or Lead Agency to modify a project, mitigating adverse impacts before an EIR is prepared, thereby enabling the project to qualify for a Negative Declaration.
- (3) Assist in the preparation of an EIR, if one is required, by: focusing the EIR on the effects determined to be significant; identifying the effects determined not to be significant; explaining the reasons for determining that potentially significant effects would not be significant; and, identifying whether a program EIR, tiering, or another appropriate process can be used for analysis of the project's environmental effects.
- (4) Facilitate environmental assessment early in the design of a project;
- (5) Provide documentation of the factual basis for the finding in a Negative Declaration that a project will not have a significant effect on the environment;
- (6) Eliminate unnecessary EIRs; and,
- (7) Determine whether a previously prepared EIR could be used with the project.

As indicated in Section 15063(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines, an Initial Study shall contain in brief form:

- (1) A description of the project including the location of the project;
- (2) An identification of the environmental setting;
- (3) An identification of environmental effects by use of a checklist, matrix, or other method, provided that entries on a checklist or other form are briefly explained to indicate that there is some evidence to support the entries. The brief explanation may be either through a narrative or a reference to another information source such as an attached map, photographs, or an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. A reference to another document should include, where appropriate, a citation to the page or pages where the information is found.
- (4) A discussion of the ways to mitigate the significant effects identified, if any;
- (5) An examination of whether the project would be consistent with existing zoning, plans, and other applicable land use controls; and,
- (6) The name of the person or persons who prepared or participated in the Initial Study.

The Lead Agency authorized the preparation of this Initial Study.<sup>2</sup> This report was prepared in accordance with Section 21000 (et seq) - Division 13 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15000 (et seq), Article 1, Chapter 3, Division 6, Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations. It is important to note that CEQA is not a process that determines whether or not a project should be approved, and no recommendations can be made as to whether or not a lead agency should approve or deny a project application. Although this Initial Study was prepared with consultant support, the analysis, conclusions, and findings made as part of its preparation fully represent the independent judgment and analysis of the Lead Agency. The Lead Agency determined, as part of this Initial Study's preparation, that a Mitigated Negative Declaration is the appropriate environmental document for the proposed project's review pursuant to CEQA. This *Initial Study* and the *Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration* will be forwarded to responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and the public for review and comment. A 30-day public review period will be provided.

On March 23, 2023, the Lead Agency published Negative Declaration ENV-2016-4999-ND (ND) and on September 25, 2023, issued an Errata to address minor technical corrections. This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration supersedes all previous documents and publications.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> (CEQA Guidelines) § 15050.

Questions and/or comments should be submitted to the following contact person:

Nashya Sadono-Jensen, City Planning Associate City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning 200 North Spring Street, Room 621 Los Angeles, CA 90012 (213) 978-1363 <u>nashya.sadono-jensen@lacity.org</u>

# **1.3 INITIAL STUDY'S ORGANIZATION**

The following annotated outline summarizes the contents of this Initial Study:

- *Section 1- Introduction,* provides the procedural context surrounding this Initial Study's preparation and insight into its composition.
- Section 2 Project Description, provides an overview of the existing environment as it relates to the project site and describes the proposed project's physical and operational characteristics.
- Section 3 Environmental Checklist Form, includes an analysis of potential impacts associated with the proposed project's construction and the subsequent operation.
- Section 4 Environmental Analysis, includes an analysis of potential impacts associated with the proposed project's construction and the subsequent operation.
- Section 5 Conclusions, identifies the sources and preparers of the ND.

# SECTION 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

# 2.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW

The project involves the immediate development of two single-family homes on two separate parcels and future development of 8 additional single-family homes on separate parcels at a later date. The project Applicant owns a total of 10 parcels along Future Street. Two of those parcels will be developed immediately. The Applicant intends to develop the eight remaining parcels at a later date. The project is described in greater detail in Section 2.4.

# **2.2 PROJECT LOCATION**

The project site is located within the Mount Washington community of the City of Los Angeles. The community of Mount Washington is bound on the north by the community of Eagle Rock; on the east by the community of Highland Park; on the south by the community of Cypress Park; and on the west by the communities of Cypress Park and Glassell Park. The community of Mount Washington is situated within the San Rafael Hills. The project site occupies frontage along the north side of Future Street. The project site consists of the following legal addresses: 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152 and 3164 Future Street. The corresponding Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) are 5454-006-015, 5454-006-047, 5454-006-017, 5454-006-018, 5454-006-019, 5454-006-048, 5454-006-022, 5454-006-024, 5454-006-024, and 5454-006-025.

Major roadways in the vicinity of the project site include Division Street, located 0.26 miles northwest of the sites; York Boulevard, located 2.05 miles to the northeast; Figueroa Street, located 1.22 miles to the southeast; and San Fernando Road, located 0.39 miles to the southwest.<sup>3</sup> Regional access to the project site is provided by ramp connections to the Arroyo Seco Parkway (SR-110), located 1.50 miles to the southeast along Avenue 43, and the Glendale Freeway (SR-2), located 1.12 miles to the northwest along San Fernando Road. A map depicting the location of the Mount Washington community is presented in Exhibit 2-1. Meanwhile, a local map showing the location of the project site is provided in Exhibit 2-2.

# **2.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The project site is located within an undeveloped portion of an existing single-family neighborhood. Surrounding land uses in the vicinity of the project site include the following:

• *North of Project Site*. Single-family residential abuts the northernmost parcel (3164 Future Street) to the north. Burnell Drive is located 260 feet north of the project site.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Google Maps. Site accessed October 11, 2021.

#### INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION • CITY OF LOS ANGELES

FUTURE STREET SINGLE-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT • 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152 and 3164 FUTURE STREET



EXHIBIT 2-1 REGIONAL MAP Source: Quantum GIS

#### INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION • CITY OF LOS ANGELES

FUTURE STREET SINGLE-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT • 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152 and 3164 FUTURE STREET



EXHIBIT 2-2 LOCAL MAP SOURCE: QUANTUM GIS

- *South of Project Site*. Future Street extends along the south side of the project site. Single-family residential occupies frontage along the south side of Future Street, opposite the project site.
- *East of Project Site*. Parcels to the east of the 10 parcels owned by the Applicant (project site) are vacant and undeveloped.
- *West of Project Site.* Future Street extends along the west side of the project site. Single-family residential occupies frontage along the west side of Future Street, opposite the project site.

The project site is currently vacant and undeveloped. The parcels slope downward from east to west and north to south. Ground cover consists of dirt and sparse patches of weeds and grass. Vegetation present within the properties consist of California black walnut trees, Chinese elm trees, and laurel sumac, among others.<sup>4</sup> An aerial photograph showing the project site and the surroundings is shown in Exhibit 2-3.

# **2.4 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

## **2.4.1 PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS**

The proposed project will consist of the following elements:<sup>5</sup>

• Project Site. The parcel located at 3152 Future Street has a total land area of 6,470.2 square feet, or 0.15 acres. This parcel has a lot width (north to south) of 40 feet and a maximum lot depth (east to west) of 167 feet. The parcel located at 3164 Future Street has a total land area of 6,626.1 square feet, or 0.15 acres. This parcel has a lot width (north to south) of 40 feet and a maximum lot depth (east to west) of 171 feet. The parcel located at 3110 Future Street has a total land area of 5,909 square feet, or 0.13 acres. This parcel has a maximum lot width (east to west) of 62 feet and a maximum lot depth (north to south) of 147 feet. The parcel located at 3114 Future Street has a total land area of 5,776 square feet, or 0.13 acres. This parcel has a maximum lot width (east to west) of 55 feet and a maximum lot depth (north to south) of 131 feet. The parcel located at 3118 Future Street has a total land area of 5,605 square feet, or 0.13 acres. This parcel has a maximum lot width (east to west) of 45 feet and a maximum lot depth (north to south) of 150 feet. Additionally, the parcel located at 3122 Future Street has a total land area of 7,057 square feet, or 0.16 acres. This parcel has a maximum lot width (east to west) of 45 feet and a maximum lot depth (north to south) of 185 feet. The parcel located at 3126 Future Street has a total land area of 7,904 square feet, or 0.18 acres. This parcel has a maximum lot width (east to west) of 40 feet and a maximum lot depth (north to south) of 204 feet. The parcel located at 3134 Future Street has a total land area of 5,832 square feet, or 0.13 acres. This parcel has a maximum lot width (east to west) of 50 feet

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Ceqaology. *Site Survey*. Survey was conducted on October 11, 2021.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> ArchiBuild. *Mount Washington – Future Street, 3152 and 3164 Future Street Site Plans.* Plans dated May 26, 2021.

and a maximum lot depth (north to south) of 125 feet. Meanwhile, the parcel located at 3138 Future Street has a total land area of 5,288 square feet, or 0.13 acres. This parcel has a maximum lot width (east to west) of 44 feet and a maximum lot depth (north to south) of 124 feet. The parcel located at 3144 Future Street has a total land area of 6,995 square feet, or 0.16 acres. This parcel has a maximum lot width (north to south) of 128 feet and a maximum lot depth (north to south) of 120 feet.

As previously indicated, the project Applicant owns a total of 10 parcels along Future Street. Two of those parcels will be developed immediately, while the eight remaining parcels will be developed at a later date.

- *3152 Future Street (Proposed Single-Family Home).* The three-level development proposed for 3152 Future Street will have a total floor area of 2,502.09 square feet. This unit will be of modern architecture and will include a 423.68 square foot two-car garage. In addition, this unit will have a height of 37 feet 7 inches. Finally, the unit will have a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.39 to 1.0.
- *3164 Future Street (Proposed Single-Family Home).* The three-level development proposed for 3164 Future Street will have a total floor area of 2,508.34 square feet. This unit will be of modern architecture and will feature a 446.59 square foot two-car garage. Additionally, this unit will have a height of 41 feet 8 inches. Lastly, the unit will have a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.38 to 1.0.
- Landscaping. Protected Trees are defined in the latest version of the City's Tree Ordinance, Los Angeles City Ordinance 186873. The Mount Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan also contains protections for "Significant Trees". The Mount Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan defines a Significant Tree as: "Any tree which measures 12 inches or more in diameter at four and one-half feet above the average natural grade at the base of the tree and/or is more than 35 feet in height". According to the Protected Tree Report dated October 30, 2021, by Bardez Landscaping Services, Inc, the project will require the removal of a total of 16 Protected and Significant tree species. A total of two Protected Trees will be removed and a total of 14 Significant Trees will be removed. These trees are located at 3134 and 3144 Future Street. The Applicant will replace each Protected Tree according to a 4:1 ratio pursuant to the latest version of the City's Protected Tree Ordinance, Los Angeles City Ordinance 186873. As indicated previously, the project would also require the removal of 14 Significant Trees from 3122, 3126, 3138, 3152, and 3164 Future Street. These Significant Trees are required to be replaced at a 1:1 ratio; therefore, a total of 14 new trees will be planted to compensate for the removal of the aforementioned Significant Trees. Thus, a total of 22 new trees will be planted.
- *Parking and Access.* Access to the units will be provided by driveway connections installed along the east side of Future Street. Parking will be provided by two-car garages and driveway space.

The project plans are shown in Exhibit 2-4.



# EXHIBIT 2-3 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH SOURCE: CRMLS

#### INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION • CITY OF LOS ANGELES FUTURE STREET SINGLE-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT • 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152 AND 3164 FUTURE STREET



3152 FUTURE STREET PLAN



**3164 FUTURE STREET PLAN** 

EXHIBIT 2-4 SITE PLAN SOURCE: ARCHIBUILD

## **2.4.2 CONSTRUCTION CHARACTERISTICS**

The construction of the proposed two single-family homes (Units 1 and 2) will occur in two separate phases, with each phase requiring up to 12 months to complete. Total construction is anticipated to last for up to 24 months.

- *Site Preparation (Units 1 and 2).* The site preparation phase will involve the clearance of the project site. This phase will last for one month for each unit. Up to one excavator, one skid steer loader, and a single haul truck may be present during this phase.
- *Grading (Units 1 and 2).* The grading phase will last for one month for each unit. Up to one excavator, six haul trucks, and two skid loaders may be present during this phase.
- *Shoring/Piling (Units 1 and 2).* The shoring phase will involve the installation of piles, foundation support, and retaining walls. This phase will last for one month for each unit. Up to one drill rig, one crane, one excavator, two forklifts, one concrete saw, and one skid steer loader may be present during this phase.
- *Building Construction (Units 1 and 2).* This phase will involve the construction of the buildings. This phase will last for six months for each unit. Typical equipment used during this phase includes scaffolding equipment, forklifts, saws, backhoes, and skid steer loaders.
- *Finishing and Paving (Units 1 and 2).* This phase will involve the planting of landscaping, the application of architectural coatings, and the installation of various amenities. This phase will last for three months for each unit. Typical equipment used during this phase includes air compressors, backhoes, and rollers.

## 2.4.3 DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS

A Discretionary Action is an action taken by a government agency (for this project, the government agency is the City of Los Angeles) that calls for an exercise of judgment in deciding whether to approve or disapprove a project. The project Applicant is required to file for a Project Permit Compliance Review by the Department of City Planning. In addition, the project will require the removal of two California black walnut trees present on-site. The remaining California black walnut trees will remain. Compliance with proposed mitigation measures and additional regulatory compliance would also be required.

# SECTION 3 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

## **3.1 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

- 1. Project title: Future Street Single-Family Development.
- **2. Lead agency name and address:** City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning. 200 North Spring Street, Room 621, Los Angeles, CA 90012.
- 3. Contact person and phone number: Nashya Sadono-Jensen. (213) 978-1363.
- **4. Project location:** 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152 and 3164 Future Street, Los Angeles, CA 90065.
- **5. Project sponsor's name and address:** Mr. Andre Ohanian, Highrise Incorporated. 10955 South Penrose Street, Sun Valley, CA 91352.
- 6. General plan designations: Low Residential
- 7. Zoning: R1-1-HCR (One Family)
- 8. Council District: CD-1, Eunisses Hernandez
- 9. Environmental Case Number: ENV-2016-4999-MND
- 10. Community Plan Area: Northeast Los Angeles
- 11. Description of project: The project involves the immediate development of two single-family homes on two separate parcels located at 3152 and 3164 Future Street and future development of eight (8) additional single-family homes on separate parcels at a later date. The project Applicant owns a total of 10 parcels located along Future Street. The Applicant plans to develop two of the parcels immediately and the eight remaining parcels at a later date.
- **12. Surrounding land use and setting:** The surrounding land uses consist of single-family homes.
- 13. Other public agencies whose approval is required: The project would require various ministerial approvals such as demolition permits, building permits, grading permits, occupancy permits, tree removal permits, and a permit to connect to the City and County sewer lines for each parcel developed. The project would also be required to submit a Notice of Intent to comply with the General Construction Activity NPDES Permit to the State Water Resources Control Board for each parcel developed. In addition, the project would be required to undergo a Project Permit Compliance Review by the Department of City

Planning for each parcel developed. Lighting would be required to conform to the following Regulatory Compliance Measures:

- *Chapter 9, Article 3, Sec. 93.0117.* No exterior light source may cause more than two foot-candles (21.5 lx) of lighting intensity or generate direct glare onto exterior glazed windows or glass doors; elevated habitable porch, deck, or balcony; or any ground surface intended for uses such as recreation, barbecue or lawn areas or any other property containing a residential unit or units.
- *Chapter 1, Article 2, Sec. 12.21 A5(k).* All lights used to illuminate a parking area shall be designed, located, and arranged to reflect the light away from any streets and any adjacent premises.
- *Chapter 1, Article 7, Sec. 17.08C.* Plans for the street lighting system shall be submitted to and approved by the Bureau of Street Lighting.
- 14. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resource Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?: No.

**Note:** Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to protect confidentiality.

# **3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

The environmental factors checked on the follow page could be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated," as indicated by the checklist provided herein in Section 3.3 of the attached Initial Study.

## INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION • CITY OF LOS ANGELES

FUTURE STREET SINGLE-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT • 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152 AND 3164 FUTURE

Street

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

## DETERMINATION

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 in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
I find that 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 the 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.

Nashya Sadono-Jensen Signature:

12/11/23

Date:

## **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as onsite, 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 or Mitigated Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "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 Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may 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 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 within the document where the statement is substantiated.

- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source 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 whatever format selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

# **3.3 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

The findings of this Initial Study are summarized in Table 3-1 provided on the following pages. It is important to note that the IS/MND utilizes the most current version of CEQA Guidelines Appendix G checklist.

#### INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION • CITY OF LOS ANGELES

FUTURE STREET SINGLE-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT • 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152 AND 3164 FUTURE

STREET

Table 3-1 Initial Study Checklist

Description of Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
----------------------	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-----------

**SECTION 4.1 AESTHETICS** *Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:* 

<b>4.1.A.</b> Have a substantial adverse effect on a highway vista?		x
<b>4.1.B.</b> Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?	x	
<b>4.1.C.</b> In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a 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?	x	
<b>4.1.D.</b> Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	x	

#### **SECTION 4.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES** *Would the project:*

<b>4.2.A.</b> Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	x
<b>3.2.B.</b> Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?	X
<b>4.2.C.</b> Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code §4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	x
<b>4.2.D.</b> Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use?	X
<b>4.2.E.</b> Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non- agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	x

SECTION 4.3 AIR QUALITY Would the project:

<b>4.3.A.</b> Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		X	

STREET

Table 3-1 Initial Study Checklist

Description of Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>4.3.B.</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?			x	
<b>4.3.C.</b> Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
<b>4.3.D.</b> Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people			x	
SECTION 4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the proje	ct:			
<b>4.4.A.</b> Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			x	
<b>4.4.B.</b> Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
<b>4.4.C.</b> 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?				x
<b>4.4.D.</b> Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident, or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		x		
<b>4.4.E.</b> Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			x	
<b>4.4.F.</b> Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				x
SECTION 4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project				

<b>4.5.A.</b> Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?			x	
---	--	--	---	--

STREET

Table 3-1 Initial Study Checklist

Description of Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>4.5.B.</b> Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?			x	
<b>4.5.C.</b> Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?			x	
<b>SECTION 4.6 ENERGY</b> Would the project:				
<b>4.6.A.</b> Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			x	
<b>4.6.B.</b> Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X	
SECTION 4.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:		·	·	
<b>4.7.A.</b> Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 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. Strong seismic ground-shaking? Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? Landslides?			x	
<b>4.7.B.</b> Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
<b>4.7.C</b> 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?			x	
<b>4.7.D.</b> 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?			x	
<b>4.7.E.</b> Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				x
<b>4.7.F.</b> Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X

**SECTION 4.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS** *Would the project:* 

STREET

Table 3-1 Initial Study Checklist

Description of Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>4.8.A.</b> Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			x	
<b>4.8.B.</b> Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases?			x	
SECTION 4.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	Vould the project	t:	·	
<b>4.9.A.</b> Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			x	
<b>4.9.B.</b> Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			x	
<b>4.9.C.</b> Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			x	
<b>4.9.D.</b> Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
<b>4.9.E.</b> 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?				X
<b>4.9.F.</b> Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			x	
<b>4.9.G.</b> Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wild land fire?			x	

#### SECTION 4.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:

<b>4.10.A.</b> Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION • CITY OF LOS ANGELES

FUTURE STREET SINGLE-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT • 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152 AND 3164 FUTURE

STREET

Table 3-1 Initial Study Checklist

Description of Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>4.10.B.</b> Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			x	
<b>4.10.C.</b> Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner, which would: result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or, impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
<b>4.10.D.</b> In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
<b>4.10.E.</b> Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			x	
SECTION 4.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING Would the pr	oject:			
<b>4.11.A.</b> <i>Physically divide an established community</i> ?				X
<b>4.11.B.</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?			x	
SECTION 4.12 MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project				
<b>4.12.A.</b> Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?				X
<b>4.12.B.</b> Result in the loss of availability of a locally- important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				x
SECTION 4.13 NOISE Would the project:				
<b>4.13.A.</b> Generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			x	
<b>4.13.B.</b> Generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?			X	

STREET

Table 3-1 Initial Study Checklist

Description of Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>4.13.C.</b> 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?				X
SECTION 4.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the	project:			
<b>4.14.A.</b> 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)?			x	
<b>4.14.B.</b> <i>Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</i>				X
SECTION 4.15 PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:				
<b>4.15.A.</b> 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: Fire protection services; Police protection; Schools; Parks; other Governmental facilities?			x	
SECTION 4.16 RECREATION. Would the project				
<b>4.16.A.</b> Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			x	
<b>4.16.B.</b> Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				x
SECTION 4.17 TRANSPORTATION Would the project:				
<b>4.17.A.</b> Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?			X	
<b>4.17.B.</b> Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3 subdivision (b)?			x	

STREET

Table 3-1 Initial Study Checklist

	<u> </u>			
Description of Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>4.17.C.</b> Substantially increases hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment))?				x
<b>4.17.D.</b> Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	

SECTION 4.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

<b>4.18.A.</b> Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is: Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or 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 Resource Code Section 5024.1 In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe5020.1(k)?		X	
--	--	---	--

#### **SECTION 4.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** *Would the project:*

<b>4.19.A.</b> Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, or wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities or relocation of which could cause significant environmental impacts?	x	
<b>4.19.B.</b> Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and the reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	x	
<b>4.19.C.</b> Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments	x	
<b>4.19.D.</b> 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?	X	

STREET

Table 3-1 Initial Study Checklist

Description of Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>4.19.E.</b> Comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

**SECTION 4.20 WILDFIRE** If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

<b>4.20.A.</b> Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	x
<b>4.20.B.</b> Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	x
<b>4.20.C.</b> 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?	x
<b>4.20.D.</b> Expose people or structures to significant risks, including down slope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	x

#### SECTION 4.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<b>4.21.A.</b> Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	X		
<b>4.21.B.</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)?		X	
<b>4.21.C.</b> Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		x	

# THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

# **SECTION 4 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

This section of the Initial Study prepared for the proposed project analyzes the potential environmental impacts that may result from the proposed project's implementation. The issue areas evaluated in this Initial Study include the following:

- Aesthetics (Section 4.1);
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources (Section 4.2);
- Air Quality (Section 4.3);
- Biological Resources (Section 4.4);
- Cultural Resources (Section 4.5);
- Energy (Section 4.6);
- Geology and Soils (Section 4.7);
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Section 4.8);
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Section 4.9);
- Hydrology and Water Quality (Section 4.10);
- Land Use and Planning (Section 4.11);

- Mineral Resources (Section 4.12);
- Noise (Section 4.13);
- Population and Housing (Section 4.14);
- Public Services (Section 4.15);
- Recreation (Section 4.16);
- Transportation (Section 4.17);
- Tribal Cultural Resources (Section 4.18);
- Utilities and Service Systems (Section 4.19);
- Wildfire (Section 4.20); and,
- Mandatory Findings of Significance (Section 4.21).

The analysis considers both the short-term (construction-related) and long-term (operational) impacts associated with the proposed project's implementation, and where appropriate, the cumulative impacts. To each question, there are four possible responses:

- *No Impact.* The proposed project will not result in any adverse environmental impacts.
- *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed project may have the potential for affecting the environment, although these impacts will be below levels or thresholds that the lead agency or other responsible agencies consider to be significant.
- Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation. The proposed project may have the potential to generate a significant impact on the environment. However, the level of impact may be reduced to levels that are less than significant with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.
- *Potentially Significant Impact.* The proposed project may result in environmental impacts that are significant. This finding will require the preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR).

# **4.1 AESTHETICS**

### 4.1.1 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

A. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? • No Impact.

The project site is located within the San Rafael Hills. Scenic views of the Santa Monica Mountains and City are available facing south from the project site. These viewsheds are also available facing south and east on Future Street. There are no scenic views facing north or west on Future Street. In addition, there are no scenic views facing north or west from the project site. Private views from the residential units located along the south side of Kilbourne Street will remain unobstructed with the implementation of the proposed project since these existing units are located at a higher elevation. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed project will occur.

B. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway? • Less than Significant Impact.

Based on the City of Los Angeles General Plan as well as State scenic highway designations, the project site is not located within or along a designated scenic corridor or roadway. The project site is currently vacant and undeveloped. Nevertheless, the project site contains multiple "Protected Trees" and "Significant Trees" as defined by the City. Protected Trees are defined in the latest version of the City's Protected Tree Ordinance, Los Angeles City Ordinance 186873, as any of the following Southern California indigenous tree species, which measure four inches or more in cumulative diameter, four and one-half feet above the ground level at the base of the tree, or any of the following Southern California indigenous shrub pieces, which measure four inches or more in cumulative diameter, four and one-half feet above the ground level at the base of the trees or more in cumulative diameter, four and one-half feet above the ground level at the base of the shrub:

#### Protected Trees:

- a. Oak tree including Valley Oak (Quercus lobata) and California Live Oak (Quercus agrifolia), or any other tree of the oak genus indigenous to Southern California but excluding the Scrub Oak (Quercus berberidifolia).
- b. Southern California Black Walnut (Juglans californica)
- c. Western Sycamore (Platanus racemosa)
- d. California Bay (Umellularia californica)

#### Protected Shrubs:

- a. Mexican Elderberry (Sambucus Mexicana)
- b. Toyon (Heteromeles arbutifolia)

The Mount Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan also contains protections for "Significant Trees". The Mount Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan defines a significant tree as: "Any tree which measures 12 inches or more in diameter at four and one-half feet above the average natural grade at the base of the tree and/or is more than 35 feet in height". According to the Protected Tree Report dated October 30, 2021, by Bardez Landscaping Services, Inc, the project will require the removal of a total of 16 Protected and Significant tree species. A total of two Protected Trees will be removed and a total of 14 Significant trees will be removed. The two Protected trees are located at 3134 and 3144 Future Street. The remaining 14 Significant trees are dispersed throughout the 10 lots. The Applicant will replace each Protected Tree according to a 4:1 ratio pursuant to the latest version of the City's Protected Tree Ordinance, Los Angeles City Ordinance 186873. Therefore, a total of eight new trees will be planted on the two parcels (3134 and 3144 Future Street) where the Protected trees are removed from. As indicated previously, the project would also require the removal of 14 Significant Trees from 3122, 3126, 3138, 3152, and 3164 Future Street. These Significant Trees are required to be replaced at a 1:1 ratio; therefore, a total of 14 new trees will be planted to compensate for the removal of the aforementioned Significant Trees. It is important to note, that the project site does not contain any scenic rock outcroppings. Additionally, the project site is vacant and undeveloped and there are no structures present that would be listed in the State or National historic register (refer to Section 4.5). Lastly, no State scenic highways that traverse through or near the Project Site and, therefore, no State scenic highways will be impacted by the Proposed Project. As a result, the potential impacts are expected to be less than significant.

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

The project site, and Mount Washington/Glassell Park community, are governed by the Northeast LA Community Plan and the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan. The Specific Plan states that the Mount Washington and Glassell Park community is characterized by distinctive hills and canyons; mature and native vegetation and wildlife habitats; natural open space and panoramic vistas; and pedestrian walking trails opportunities, all worthy of preservation. The Northeast LA Community Plan contains various goals and policies guiding development intensity/density and for maintaining the area's natural scenic quality and views. The following policies related to development guidelines and scenic quality are provided from the Northeast LA Community Plan:

• Policy 1-5.4 - Require that any proposed development be designed to enhance and be compatible with adjacent development. The project consists of single-family homes

designed to incorporate the property's natural slope and contour lines. The homes will be of comparable size and scale as the adjacent single-family homes. In addition, the project's density will be consistent with the Northeast LA Community Plan and City zoning code as the project involves the construction of one dwelling unit per parcel.

- Policy 1-5.2 Ensure the availability of paved streets, adequate sewers, drainage facilities, fire protection services and facilities, and other emergency services and public utilities to support development in hillside areas. Future Street is paved and contains water and sewer lines. In addition, Future Street is an adequate width to accommodate emergency vehicles.
- Policy 1-5.3 Consider the steepness of the topography and the geologic stability in any proposal for development within the Plan area. The project will include retaining walls and new vegetation to increase the stability of the project site. Furthermore, the project will be required to adhere to the design recommendations proposed by the geotechnical engineer.
- Policy 1-5.4 Require that any proposed development be designed to enhance and be compatible with adjacent development. The project consists of two immediate and eight planned single-family homes each on one of the 10 individual parcels. The development adjacent to the Project Site consists of single-family homes each on their own individual parcels. Thus, the project will be of comparable density to the surrounding development and will also be consistent with the City's zoning code.

The project is consistent with the abovementioned policies listed in the Northeast LA Community Plan and the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan. As a result, the project's impacts to the surrounding area's scenic quality are anticipated to be less than significant.

D. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? • Less than Significant Impact.

Exterior lighting that is not properly treated will often produce unwanted excess light that propagates into adjacent properties. This nuisance lighting is referred to as light trespass. All lighting must be installed according to the following regulatory compliance measures outlined in the City's Municipal Code:

• *Chapter 9, Article 3, Sec. 93.0117.* No exterior light source may cause more than two foot-candles (21.5 lx) of lighting intensity or generate direct glare onto exterior glazed windows or glass doors; elevated habitable porch, deck, or balcony; or any ground

surface intended for uses such as recreation, barbecue or lawn areas or any other property containing a residential unit or units.

- *Chapter 1, Article 2, Sec. 12.21 A5(k).* All lights used to illuminate a parking area shall be designed, located, and arranged to reflect the light away from any streets and any adjacent premises.
- *Chapter 1, Article 7, Sec. 17.08C.* Plans for the street lighting system shall be submitted to and approved by the Bureau of Street Lighting.

Adherence to the aforementioned mandatory regulatory compliance measures will ensure potential impacts are kept to levels that are less than significant.

Glare is a phenomenon that is described as visual discomfort and/or the impairment of vision of objects resulting from changes in levels of brightness. Glare may be produced directly from bright light or through the reflection of light on certain surfaces. The exterior façade surfaces will consist of non-reflective materials, such as concrete, masonry, and stucco components. As a result, the glare-related impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

## **4.1.2 MITIGATION MEASURES**

The preceding analysis determined that less than significant impacts regarding aesthetics will result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Given the required compliance with Regulatory Compliance Measures associated with cumulative development in and around the Project Area and the design of the Proposed Project, cumulative impacts to scenic vistas, visual character of the neighborhood, light and glare would be less than significant. Additionally, the incremental effect of the Proposed Project on scenic vistas, visual character of the neighborhood, light and glare would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts to aesthetic resources would be less than significant.

## **4.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES**

### **4.2.1** ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.

Would the project:

A. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? • No Impact.

According to the California Department of Conservation, the community that the Mount Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan encompasses does not contain any areas of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.<sup>6</sup> Since the implementation of the proposed project will not involve the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to urban uses, no impacts will occur.

B. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract? • No Impact.

As indicated previously, the project site is zoned R1-1-HCR, One Family residential. The project site is zoned for single-family development. Nevertheless, the area's zoning allows for the "keeping of equines, poultry, rabbits and chinchillas in conjunction with the residential use of the lot, provided that such animal keeping is not for commercial purposes."<sup>7</sup> The project site is vacant and undeveloped and there are no existing agricultural activities taking place on-site. In addition, according to the California Department of Conservation Division of Land Resource Protection, the project site is not subject to a Williamson Act Contract.<sup>8</sup> As a result, no impacts on existing or future Williamson Act Contracts or land zoned for agricultural uses will result from the proposed project's implementation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping, and Monitoring Program. *Important Farmland in California 2010*. <u>ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/p</u> <u>df/statewide/2010/fmmp2010\_08\_11.pdf</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Article 2, Section 12.08.3(a). of the City of Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> California Department of Conservation. *State of California Williamson Act Contract Land.* <u>ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/WA/2012%20Statewide%20Map/WA\_2012\_8x11.pdf</u>

C. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code §4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? ● No Impact.

The project site is located in the midst of an existing residential neighborhood and the project site is currently vacant and undeveloped. Additionally, the project site and adjacent properties are zoned for single-family residential. According to the City's municipal code, forest land has a zoning designation of OS (*Open Space*). Since the project site is not zoned for forest land, timberland, or for timberland production, no impacts will occur.

D. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use? • No Impact.

The project site is located in the midst of an existing residential neighborhood. According to the City's municipal code, forest land has a zoning designation of OS (*Open Space*). As previously mentioned, the project site has a zoning designation of R1-1-HCR (*One Family*) and does not contain any forest uses. As a result, no impacts on forest land or timber resources will result from the proposed project's implementation.

E. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? • No Impact.

The proposed project will not involve the disruption or damage of the existing environment that would result in a loss of farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use because the project site is not located in close proximity to farmland or forest land. As a result, no impacts will result from the implementation of the proposed project.

## **4.2.2 MITIGATION MEASURES**

The preceding analysis determined that no impacts to agriculture and forestry resources will result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Given that the Proposed Project would not impact agriculture and forestry resources, the incremental impact of the Proposed Project would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts to agriculture and forestry resources would be less than significant.
# 4.3 AIR QUALITY

## 4.3.1 Environmental and Regulatory Setting

The project site is situated within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD maintains a set of air quality significance thresholds for various criteria air pollutants described below and on the following pages:

- Nitrogen Dioxide ( $NO_2$ ) is a compound composed of one nitrogen atom and two oxygen • atoms. Nitrogen dioxide appears as a reddish-brown gas with a pungent, acrid odor or as a yellowish-brown liquid when cooled or compressed.<sup>9</sup> NO<sub>2</sub> is primarily emitted by the combustion of hydrocarbons and hydrocarbon-based fuel. Various sources of  $NO_2$  include cars, trucks and buses, power plants, and off-road equipment.  $NO_2$  is used as the indicator for the larger group of nitrogen oxides. Breathing air with a high concentration of NO<sub>2</sub> can irritate airways in the human respiratory system. Such exposures over short periods can aggravate respiratory diseases, particularly asthma, leading to respiratory symptoms (such as coughing, wheezing or difficulty breathing), hospital admissions, and visits to emergency rooms. Longer exposures to elevated concentrations of  $NO_2$  may contribute to the development of asthma and potentially increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. People with asthma, as well as children and the elderly are generally at greater risk for the health effects of NO<sub>2</sub>. NO<sub>2</sub> along with other  $NO_{x}$  (nitrous oxides) reacts with other chemicals in the air to form both particulate matter and ozone. Both of these compounds are harmful when inhaled due to effects on the respiratory system.<sup>10</sup>
- Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) are gaseous organic compounds that have a high vapor pressure at room temperature, thus contributing to their volatility or instability. VOCs can be naturally occurring or man-made. Man-made VOCs are emitted from a variety of solid or liquid sources including paint thinners; paints and lacquers; cleaning supplies; wood preservatives; aerosol sprays; pesticides; building materials and furnishings; office equipment such as copiers and printers; correction fluids and carbonless copy paper; graphics and craft materials including glues and adhesives; permanent markers; and photographic solutions. In addition, paints, varnishes, and wax all contain organic solvents, as do many cleaning, disinfecting, cosmetic, degreasing, and hobby products. Petroleum based fuels and other hydrocarbon products also contain VOCs. Exposure to VOCs may result in eye, nose, and throat irritation; headaches, loss of coordination and nausea; damage to the liver, kidneys, and central nervous system; fatigue; dizziness; allergic skin reactions; and certain types

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> PubChem. Nitrogen Dioxide (Compound). https://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/compound/Nitrogen-dioxide.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> PubChem. Nitrogen Dioxide (Compound). <u>https://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/compound/Nitrogen-dioxide</u>. AND. United States Environmental Protection Agency. Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) Pollution. <u>https://www.epa.gov/no2-pollution/basic-information-about-no2#What%20is%20NO2</u>.

of cancer. The nature and severity of the symptoms depend on the length and extent of exposure to such compounds.  $^{11}$ 

- *Particulate Matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>)* consists of a mixture of solid particles and liquid • droplets present in the air. Examples of visible particulate matter include dust, dirt, smoke, smog, or soot. Particulate matter can be emitted directly from construction sites, unpaved roads, or fields in the form of fugitive dust, or from smokestacks or fire in the form of smoke or soot. Particulate Matter can also be generated indirectly through complex chemical reactions occurring in the atmosphere between compounds such as sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides, which are pollutants generated by power plants, industrial land uses, or vehicles powered by internal combustion engines. Particulate Matter includes PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. PM<sub>10</sub> consists of inhalable particles with diameters of 10 micrometers or smaller, while  $PM_{2.5}$  consists of inhalable particles with diameters of 2.5 micrometers or smaller (roughly 30 times smaller in diameter than an average strand of human hair).<sup>12</sup> Particulate Matter often results in serious environmental and health effects. Exposure to particulates may result in premature death in people with heart or lung disease; nonfatal heart attacks; irregular heartbeat; aggravated asthma; decreased lung function; and increased respiratory symptoms including coughing and difficulty breathing. Environmental damages and effects include the formation of smog and acid rain; the acidification of lakes and streams; the depletion of soil nutrients; the reduction of biodiversity; and the damaging of forests and agricultural crops.<sup>13</sup>
- Sulfur Dioxide and other Sulfur Oxides (SO<sub>2</sub> and SO<sub>x</sub>) are compounds composed of a single sulfur atom and two oxygen atoms, though some sulfur oxide compounds contain three oxygen atoms. Sulfur dioxide is present as a colorless gas with a strong and pungent suffocating odor and an acidic taste. Sulfur dioxide may be generated by and applied in man-made sources or may be emitted naturally. Sulfur dioxide is a major pollutant produced by smelters, electric power plants, and the combustion of fossil fuels. In addition, sulfur dioxide is a major commercial chemical that is used to make sulfuric acid. Sulfur dioxide is also used in paper production; food production and farming; wastewater treatment; oil and metal refining; was formerly a refrigerant; and is also used as a fungicide. Natural sources of sulfur dioxide include biological decay, sea spray, and volcanic activity. Sulfur dioxide that is released into the atmosphere may react with rain droplets forming acid rain. Furthermore, sulfur dioxide can also

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> United States Environmental Protection Agency. *Indoor Air Quality – Volatile Organic Compounds' Impact on Indoor Air Quality*. <u>https://www.epa.gov/indoor-air-quality-iaq/volatile-organic-compounds-impact-indoor-air-quality</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> United States Environmental Protection Agency. *Particulate Matter (PM) Pollution – Particulate Matter (PM) Basics*. <u>https://www.epa.gov/pm-pollution/particulate-matter-pm-basics#PM</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> United States Environmental Protection Agency. *Particulate Matter (PM) Pollution – Health and Environmental Effects of Particulate Matter (PM)*. <u>https://www.epa.gov/pm-pollution/health-and-environmental-effects-particulate-matter-pm</u>.

react with other chemicals present in the atmosphere, thus forming smog. Exposure to sulfur dioxide can cause eye and throat irritation, while exposure to higher concentrations of sulfur dioxide may result in chest pain; difficulty breathing; loss of taste or smell; impaired lung function; or death.<sup>14</sup>

• *Carbon Monoxide (CO)* is a colorless, odorless, tasteless, poisonous gas comprised of a single carbon and a single oxygen atom. Carbon monoxide is generated through the combustion of hydrocarbon products such as oil, coal, or gas. Carbon monoxide is also generated during pulp and paper production, steel production, and from typical warehouse operations. Exposure to carbon monoxide may result in headaches; dizziness; fatigue; and nausea, while prolonged exposure may result in vomiting, muscle weakness, confusion, and loss of consciousness. Permanent damage to organs such as the heart or brain may result due to a lack of oxygen.<sup>15</sup>

#### **REGULATORY SETTING**

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the agency responsible for attaining state and federal clean air standards in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). Air pollution within the SCAB tends to stagnate due to natural barriers, such as mountains like the Transverse Range. The California Legislature created the SCAQMD in 1977 by merging the air pollution control districts of the four counties sharing the South Coast Air Basin. This basin includes portions of Los Angeles, Riverside and San Bernardino counties and all of Orange County. Within Riverside County, the AQMD also has jurisdiction over the Salton Sea Air Basin and a portion of the Mojave Desert Air Basin. Thus, the South Coast Air Basin covers an area of 6,745 square miles with a population of 14.6 million, while the larger South Coast district boundary includes 10,743 square miles and a population of 15 million.<sup>16</sup>

#### THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The SCAQMD has established the following thresholds of significance for the aforementioned criteria pollutants:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> PubChem. *Sulfur Dioxide (Compound)*. <u>https://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/compound/Sulfur-dioxide#section=Overview</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Occupational Safety and Health Administration. *OSHA Factsheet - Carbon Monoxide Poisoning*. <u>https://www.osha.gov/OshDoc/data\_General\_Facts/carbonmonoxide-factsheet.pdf</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> South Coast Air Quality Management District. *Map of Jurisdiction*. <u>http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/default-document-library/map-of-jurisdiction.pdf</u>.

	Mass Daily Thresholds					
Criteria Pollutant	Construction	Operational				
NO <sub>x</sub>	100 lbs/day	55 lbs/day				
VOC	75 lbs/day	55 lbs/day				
PM <sub>10</sub>	150 lbs/day	150 lbs/day				
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	55 lbs/day	55 lbs/day				
SO <sub>x</sub>	150 lbs/day	150 lbs/day				
СО	550 lbs/day	550 lbs/day				

Table 4-1 SCAQMD Thresholds of Significance

#### **4.3.2** ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Would the project:

A. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? • Less than Significant Impact.

The South Coast Air Quality Management District certified the Final 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) in March 2017. The AQMP was prepared in response to Federal Clean Air Act (CAA), which requires areas not attaining the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) to develop and implement an emission reduction strategy that will bring the area into attainment in a timely manner. Thus, the AQMP functions as a regional blueprint for achieving the federal air quality standards and healthful air. As indicated previously, the SCAQMD is responsible for clean air in the SCAB, an area that includes Orange County and the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside and San Bernardino counties. While air quality has dramatically improved over the years, the Basin still exceeds federal public health standards for both ozone and particulate matter (PM) and experiences some of the worst air pollution in the nation.<sup>17</sup>

Specific criteria for determining a project's conformity with the AQMP is defined in Section 12.3 of the SCAQMD's 1993 CEQA Air Quality Handbook. The Air Quality Handbook refers to the following criteria as a means to determine a project's conformity with the AQMP:

• *Consistency Criteria* 1 refers to a proposed project's potential for resulting in an increase in the frequency or severity of an existing air quality violation or its potential for contributing to the continuation of an existing air quality violation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> South Coast Air Quality Management District. *Final 2016 Air Quality Management Plan*. Plan dated March 2017.

• *Consistency Criteria 2* refers to a proposed project's potential for exceeding the assumptions included in the AQMP or other regional growth projections relevant to the AQMP's implementation.

In terms of Criteria 1, the proposed project's long-term (operational) airborne emissions will be below levels that the SCAQMD considers to be a significant impact (refer to the analysis included in the next section where the long-term stationary and mobile emissions for the proposed project are summarized in Table 3). In addition, the project's operational emissions will be well within the emissions projections identified in the most recent AQMP. As shown in Table 3-5 of the Final 2016 AQMP, the future 2031 daily operational emissions of the entire SCAB *with* the estimated population, employment, and VMT growth projections are estimated to be: 345 tons per day of VOCs; 214 tons per day of NOx; 1,188 tons per day of CO; 18 tons per day of SOx; and 65 tons per day of PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The project's operational emissions will be well within the emissions projections estimated in the AQMP.

In addition, the project will not significantly affect any regional population, housing, and employment projections prepared for the City Los Angeles. Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified in the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) prepared by SCAG are considered consistent with the SCAQMD's Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) growth projections, since the RTP/SCS forms the basis of the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP.

The proposed project will not conflict with the regional population forecast and distribution in the 2016 AQMP. According to the 2016 AQMP, the Basin had a population of 16.4 million in 2012 and is projected to have a population of 17.6 million by the year 2023 (these numbers are derived from the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS prepared by SCAG).

City-specific growth forecasts are provided by SCAG as part of their 2020 initiative, Connect SoCal. According to the Growth Forecast Appendix prepared by SCAG for the 2020-2045 Connect SoCal plan, the City of Los Angeles is projected to add a total of 837,500 residents through the year 2045.<sup>18</sup> The proposed project's potential growth is anticipated to be 26 persons, which is based on the ratio of 2.62 persons per household identified by the United States Census Bureau (2.62 persons per unit X 10 units).<sup>19</sup> The number of residents that will be added is well within SCAG's growth forecast of 837,500 residents for the City. In addition, the project is in conformance with SCAG's regional sustainable development policies that promote infill development. As a result, impacts related to the implementation of the AQMP are anticipated to be less than significant.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> Southern California Association of Governments. *Current Context – Demographics and Growth Forecast (which is part of their 2020 initiative Connect SoCal)*. Report prepared on September 3, 2020.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> United States Census Bureau. *QuickFacts – Los Angeles city, California*. https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/losangelescitycalifornia.

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? • Less than Significant Impact.

#### **Construction Emissions**

The analysis of daily construction emissions was prepared utilizing the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod V.2020.4.0) developed for the SCAQMD (refer to **Appendix A** – **CalEEMod Worksheets**). The assumptions regarding the construction phases and the length of construction followed those identified previously in the project description. Construction emissions were determined for the two units that are currently proposed. These emissions are shown in Table 4-2. Construction emissions for the project as a whole (all 10 units) are presented in the in Table 4-4. As shown in Table 4-2, daily construction emissions are not anticipated to exceed the SCAQMD's significance thresholds.

Estimated Daily Construction Emissions									
Construction Phase	ROG	NO <sub>2</sub>	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	<b>PM</b> <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>			
3152 Future Street									
Site Preparation (on-site)	0.27	2.70	4.64		0.12	0.11			
Site Preparation (off-site)	0.01	0.01	0.19		0.05	0.01			
Total Site Preparation	0.28	2.71	4.83	-	0.17	0.12			
Grading (on-site)	0.27	2.70	4.64		0.12	0.11			
Grading (off-site)	0.01	0.01	0.19		0.05	0.01			
Total Grading	0.28	2.71	4.83		0.17	0.12			
Shoring/Piling (on-site)	0.79	8.09	8.86	0.01	0.36	0.33			
Shoring/Piling (off-site)			0.03		0.01				
Total Shoring/Piling 2021	0.79	8.09	8.89	0.01	0.37	0.33			
Building Construction (on-site)	0.85	8.07	10.69	0.01	0.42	0.40			
Building Construction (off-site)			0.03		0.01				
Total Shoring and Building Construction	0.85	8.07	10.72	0.01	0.43	0.40			
Paving (on-site)	0.25	2.71	3.24		0.13	0.12			
Paving (off-site)	0.02	0.02	0.31		0.09	0.02			
Total Paving	0.27	2.73	3.55		0.22	0.14			
Architectural Coatings (on-site)	1.22	1.40	1.81		0.08	0.08			
Architectural Coatings (off-site)									
Total Architectural Coatings	1.22	1.40	1.81		0.08	0.08			
3164 Fi	uture Stre	et							
Site Preparation (on-site)	0.25	2.41	4.65		0.10	0.09			
Site Preparation (off-site)	0.01	0.01	0.18		0.05	0.01			
Total Site Preparation	0.26	2.42	4.83		0.15	0.10			

Table 4-2 Estimated Daily Construction Emissions

#### INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION • CITY OF LOS ANGELES

FUTURE STREET SINGLE-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT • 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152 AND 3164 FUTURE

STREET

Estimated Daily Construction Emissions								
Construction Phase	ROG	NO <sub>2</sub>	СО	SO <sub>2</sub>	<b>PM</b> 10	<b>PM</b> <sub>2.5</sub>		
Grading (on-site)	0.25	2.41	4.65		0.10	0.09		
Grading (off-site)	0.01	0.01	0.18		0.05	0.01		
Total Grading	0.26	2.42	4.83		0.15	0.10		
Shoring/Piling (on-site)	0.74	7.30	8.82	0.01	0.32	0.29		
Shoring/Piling (off-site)			0.03		0.01			
Total Shoring/Piling	0.74	7.30	8.85	0.01	0.33	0.29		
Building Construction (on-site) 2022	0.73	6.94	10.06	0.01	0.33	0.31		
Building Construction (off-site) 2022			0.03		0.01			
Total Shoring and Building Construction 2022	0.73	6.94	10.09	0.01	0.34	0.31		
Paving (on-site)	0.24	2.54	3.23		0.11	0.10		
Paving (off-site)	0.02	0.01	0.28	-	0.09	0.02		
Total Paving	0.26	2.55	3.51		0.20	0.12		
Architectural Coatings (on-site)	1.26	1.30	1.81		0.07	0.07		
Architectural Coatings (off-site)								
Total Architectural Coatings	1.26	1.30	1.81	-	0.07	0.07		
Maximum Daily Emissions	1.26	8.09	10.73	0.01	0.43	0.40		
Daily Thresholds	75	100	550	150	150	55		
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No		

Table 4-2 Estimated Daily Construction Emissions

Source: CalEEMod

#### **Operational Emissions**

Long-term operational emissions refer to those emissions that will occur following the construction and subsequent occupation of the proposed project. Operational emissions will occur throughout the project's operational lifetime. According to the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), operational emissions are categorized into three different types of emissions: area, energy, and mobile. Area emissions refers to those type of emissions that consist of VOCs, such as architectural coatings; landscape equipment and fuel; cleaning supplies; and wood-burning stoves. Energy emissions quantify the proposed project's indirect emissions related to the consumption and generation of energy, while mobile emissions estimate the proposed project's emissions from on-road mobile sources. The analysis of long-term operational impacts also used the CalEEMod computer model (worksheets are presented in **Appendix A – CalEEMod Worksheets**). As indicated in Table 4-3, the projected long-term operational emissions will be below thresholds considered to be a significant impact.

Estimated Operational Emissions in Ibs/day							
Emission Source	ROG	NO <sub>2</sub>	CO	SO2	<b>PM</b> 10	<b>PM</b> <sub>2.5</sub>	
Area-wide (lbs/day)	0.08		0.16	0.08			
Energy (lbs/day)		0.01					
Mobile (lbs/day)	0.05	0.05	0.58	0.05	0.13	0.03	
Total (lbs/day)	0.14	0.07	0.75	0.14	0.14	0.03	
Daily Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55	
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No	

Table 4-3

Source: CalEEMod

As indicated in Table 4-3, the projected long-term emissions are below thresholds considered to represent a significant impact. As a result, the potential impacts with regards to operational emissions will be less than significant.

As described in the Project Description, the Applicant owns a total of 10 parcels and intends to develop single-family homes on the remaining eight parcels along Future Street at a later, undetermined date.

Project Site	Status
3110 Future St	Potential Future Single-Family Home
3114 Future St	Potential Future Single-Family Home
3118 Future St	Potential Future Single-Family Home
3122 Future St	Potential Future Single-Family Home
3126 Future St	Potential Future Single-Family Home
3134 Future St	Potential Future Single-Family Home
3138 Future St	Potential Future Single-Family Home
3144 Future St	Potential Future Single-Family Home
3152 Future St	Single-Family Home Under Review
3164 Future St	Single-Family Home Under Review

The following impact analysis considered the two immediately proposed single-family units as well as the eight planned single-family units. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4-4 shown below.

Estimated Cumulative Emissions in lbs/day							
Emission Source	ROG	NO2	СО	SO2	<b>PM</b> 10	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	
Total Construction (lbs/day)	3.23	33.12	29.02	0.04	20.07	11.48	
Daily Thresholds	75	100	550	150	150	55	
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Total Operational (Ibs/day)	0.69	0.34	3.57		0.70	0.19	
Daily Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55	
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No	

Table 4-4 Estimated Cumulative Emissions in Ibs/day

As shown in Table 4-4, the project's cumulative emissions are not anticipated to exceed construction thresholds for PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Watering the project site three times per day was incorporated into the CalEEMod as a SCAQMD standard condition for all parcels. The project Applicant will also be required to implement other SCAQMD standard conditions outlined in SCAQMD Rule 403 for all parcels. These additional SCAQMD standard conditions are required for all development projects undertaken within the SCAB. Meanwhile, the project's cumulative operational impacts will be below the thresholds of significance.

#### **Cumulative Emissions**

In order to determine a project's cumulative emissions, a list of related projects within a certain area must be identified. These related projects are then incorporated into a single CalEEMod run along with the proposed project. With the implementation of the above-described standard conditions imposed on the Proposed Project and applicable Regulatory Compliance Measures, the Proposed Project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. As a result, impacts will be less than significant. *C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?* • Less than Significant Impact.

Sensitive receptors refer to a group of people in the population who are particularly susceptible to health effects due to exposure to an air contaminant (individuals with pre-existing conditions, children, and elderly persons). The following are land uses (sensitive sites) where sensitive receptors are typically located: schools; playgrounds and childcare centers; long-term health care facilities; rehabilitation centers; convalescent centers; hospitals; retirement homes; residences; and libraries.<sup>20</sup> The project site is located in the midst of an existing single-family residential neighborhood and is surrounded on all sides by sensitive receptors.

A Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs) analysis was conducted for the construction phase of the proposed project since the project site is located in the midst of an existing residential

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> South Coast Air Quality Management District. Chapter 2 - Air Quality Issues Regarding Land Use. <u>http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/planning/air-quality-guidance/chapter-2---air-quality-issues-regarding-land-use.pdf</u>.

neighborhood. The use of LSTs is voluntary and to be implemented at the discretion of local public agencies acting as a lead agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). LSTs would only apply to projects that must undergo an environmental analysis pursuant to CEQA or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and are five acres or less (the project site totals less than five acres). LSTs are only applicable to the following criteria pollutants: oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter less than 10 microns in aerodynamic diameter ( $PM_{10}$ ), and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>).<sup>21</sup> The LST analysis for construction emissions is presented in Table 4-5.

Located within Source Receptor Area 2							
Criteria Pollutant	Construction Emissions (lbs/day)	Distance to Nearest Sensitive Receptor	Thresholds of Significance	Exceedance?			
NO <sub>x</sub>	8.09	25 meters	103 lbs/day	No			
CO	10.73	25 meters	562 lbs/day	No			
<b>PM</b> 10	0.43	25 meters	4 lbs/day	No			
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	0.40	25 meters	3 lbs/day	No			

Table 4-5

As shown in Table 4-5, the proposed project will not exceed LSTs for the abovementioned criteria pollutants. Adherence to mandatory Rule 403 regulations will ensure potential impacts remain at levels that are less than significant.

D. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people? • Less than Significant Impact.

Odors and dust are air pollutants that can have negative health impacts. While almost any source may emit objectionable odors, some land uses will be more likely to produce odors or dust because of their operation.<sup>22</sup> Odors are typically generated during the project's construction phase, and depending on the land use, as a result of daily operations. The types of facilities or operations that are prone to generate odors, dust, and other air pollutants include: agriculture (farming and livestock); chemical plants; composting activities; dairies; fiberglass molding; landfills; refineries; rail yards; waste water treatment plants; and materials recovery facilities (MRFs).<sup>23</sup> Odors may also be generated during a project's construction phase through the consumption of diesel fuels, the installation of asphalt pavement, and the application of architectural coatings. Fugitive dust is also typically generated during a project's

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> South Coast Air Quality Management District. *Localized Significance Thresholds*. https://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-acompliance/cega/air-guality-analysis-handbook/localized-significancethresholds.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> South Coast Air Quality Management District. Chapter 2 - Air Quality Issues Regarding Land Use. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/planning/air-quality-guidance/chapter-2---air-quality-issues-regardingland-use.pdf.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> Ibid.

construction phase by increased wind or disturbance from construction vehicles and equipment.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) requires fleets of off-road diesel equipment to limit idling to five minutes, unless idling is necessary to perform a task. In addition, measures established by the SCAQMD to reduce the generation of fugitive dust are identified in SCAQMD Rule 403. These measures are standard conditions that are mandatory for projects constructed within the SCAB and are presented in Air Quality Subsection C. Finally, regulations restricting the VOC content of various coatings are included in SCAQMD Rule 1113. For example, according to SCAQMD Rule 1113, exterior building coatings and roof coatings are restricted to a VOC content of 50 grams of VOCs per liter. The project Applicant will be required to adhere to all three of the aforementioned regulations during the project's construction. As a result, the project's construction phase will result in less than significant impacts with respect to the generation of odors and fugitive dust.

Once occupied, the proposed project will not result in the generation of objectionable odors since the proposed project is residential in nature and will not be involved in any of the previously mentioned odor generating activities. As a result, the potential construction and operational impacts will be less than significant.

#### **4.3.2 MITIGATION MEASURES**

The preceding analysis determined that less than significant impacts to air quality will result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Given the Proposed Project will be consistent with the AQMP, would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant, will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, will not result in odor or fugitive dust emissions adversely affecting a substantial number of people and requires compliance with Regulatory Compliance Measures associated with cumulative development in and around the Project Area, cumulative impacts to air quality would be less than significant. Additionally, the incremental effect of the Proposed Project on air quality would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts to air quality would be less than significant.

# **4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

## 4.4.1 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Would the project:

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

A Biological Report was prepared for the proposed project by Environmental Intelligence (refer to **Appendix B** – **Biological Report**). The Biological Report includes a habitat assessment, a database search, and literature review. The habitat assessment was conducted on July 2, 2018. Two non-sensitive vegetation communities and two land cover types were identified during the habitat assessment. In addition, no ephemeral, intermittent, or perennial water resources were identified within the project site during the habitat assessment or during a desktop review of the National Hydrology Dataset.<sup>24</sup> Ground cover present on-site consists of non-sensitive plants including wild oats grass, red brome, and black mustard. Trees and shrubs present on-site consist of California black walnut, coast prickly pear, San Pedro cactus, tree tobacco, Chinese elm, and California buckwheat. It is important to note, the California black walnut is classified as a "Protected Tree" under Chapter IV (Public Welfare), Article 6 (Preservation of Protected Trees) of the City of Los Angeles municipal code, which serves to protect Southern California native tree species. The Mount Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan also contains protections for "Significant Trees". The Mount Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan defines a Significant Tree as:

"Any tree which measures 12 inches or more in diameter at four and one-half feet above the average natural grade at the base of the tree and/or is more than 35 feet in height."

According to the Protected Tree Report dated October 30, 2021 by Bardez Landscaping Services, Inc, the project will require the removal of a total of 16 Protected and Significant tree species. The Protected Tree Report is provided in **Appendix C** – **Protected Tree Report**. A total of two Protected Trees are being removed. These trees are located at 3134 and 3144 Future Street. The Applicant will replace each Protected Tree according to a 4:1 ratio pursuant to Los Angeles City Ordinance 186873. Therefore, a total of eight new trees will be planted on the two parcels (3134 and 3144 Future Street) where the Protected trees are removed from. As indicated previously, the project would also require the removal of 14 Significant Trees from 3122, 3126, 3138, 3152, and 3164 Future Street. These Significant Trees are required to be replaced at a 1:1 ratio; therefore, a total of 14 new trees will be planted to compensate for the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> Environmental Intelligence, LLC. *3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152, and 3164 Future Street Biological Report.* Report dated September 10, 2020.

removal of the aforementioned Significant Trees.

Two special status wildlife species, the Southern California legless lizard and the American peregrine falcon, have a low potential for occurrence based on the lack of suitable habitat. The Southern California legless lizard is typically found in chaparral, pine-oak woodlands, desert scrub, sandy washes, stream terraces, and beach sand dune environments. The potential for encountering the aforementioned species is low given the site's distance from Elyria Canyon Park and its history of landscaping and vegetation management. The American peregrine falcon prefers cliffs for nesting and open spaces for foraging. This species will sometimes nest in man-made structures such as towers or buildings. The project site does not contain any cliffs or structures, though mature trees are located throughout the area. As a result, the project Applicant will be required to adhere to the below described MM-BIO-1 identified in the Biological Report regarding migratory and nesting birds. MM-BIO-1 ensures compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918. Therefore, the project's impacts are considered to be less than significant.

B. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? • Less than Significant Impact.

Riparian habitat consists of land located along watercourses and bodies of water, such as floodplains and streambanks.<sup>25</sup> Riparian habitat is characterized by unique soil and/or vegetation that is influenced by the presence of water.<sup>26</sup> The project site is currently occupied by sloping grasslands interspersed with California black walnut trees. There are no natural watercourses or bodies of water located within the project site. The field survey that was conducted for this project indicated that there is no riparian habitat present on-site or within the adjacent properties. This conclusion is also supported by a review of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory, Wetlands Mapper.<sup>27</sup> As a result, no impacts on natural or riparian habitats will result from the proposed project's implementation.

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? • No Impact.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> United States Department of Agriculture - Natural Resources Conservation Service. *Riparian Areas Environmental Uniqueness, Functions, and Values.* <u>https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/technical/?cid=nrcs143\_014199#what.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. *Wetlands Mapper*. <u>http://www.fws.gov/Wetlands/data/Mapper.html</u>

According to a review of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory, Wetlands Mapper, the project site is devoid of wetlands.<sup>28</sup> Wetlands are defined as areas that contain a predominance of hydric soils, are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration required to support hydrophytic (water-loving) vegetation, and feature an abundance of hydrophytic vegetation.<sup>29</sup> Nevertheless, there is a wetland present within Elyria Canyon Park.<sup>30</sup> This wetland is classified as a Riverine, which includes all inland non-tidal wetlands (wetlands that are not influenced by tidal forces) and deep water habitats contained within a channel.<sup>31</sup> The nearest river to the project site is the Los Angeles River, which is located 0.58 miles to the southwest of the project site. The development of the proposed project will occur within the boundaries of the project site. Therefore, the project's construction will not result in any removal, filling, or hydrological interruption of protected wetland areas. Thus, no impacts to protected wetlands will occur.

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 With Mitigation.

The Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning defines a wildlife corridor as:

"Areas of open space of sufficient width to permit larger, more mobile species (such as foxes, bobcats, and coyotes) to pass between larger areas of open space, or to disperse from one major open space region to another are referred to as "wildlife corridors." Such areas generally are several hundred feet wide, unobstructed, and usually possess cover, food, and water."<sup>32</sup>

The project site does not meet the abovementioned definition as it is located in the midst of an existing residential neighborhood. An example of a wildlife corridor would be the Los Angeles River. Furthermore, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service is responsible for enforcing the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 makes it illegal to take, possess, import, export, transport, barter, offer for sale, or purchase any migratory bird, or the parts, nests, or eggs of such bird except under the terms of a valid Federal permit.<sup>33</sup> According to the Biological Report, migratory birds, including raptors, may

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> Ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> United States Department of Agriculture – Natural Resources Conservation Service. Wetlands. https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/national/water/wetlands/

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Wetlands Mapper. <u>http://www.fws.gov/Wetlands/data/Mapper.html</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> Ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning. *Significant Ecological Areas.* <u>http://planning.lacounty.gov/sea/local\_and\_site\_specific\_habitat\_linkages\_and\_wildlife\_corridors</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. *Migratory Bird Treaty Act*. <u>https://www.fws.gov/birds/policies-and-regulations/laws-legislations/migratory-bird-treaty-act.php</u>

nest at or within close proximity to the project site. Nesting birds may be found in native habitats, developed areas containing structures, ornamental plantings, and ruderal areas. Trees and shrubs on-site and adjacent to the project site provide suitable nesting habitat for many bird species. One inactive house finch nest was identified during the habitat survey.

Project construction may include vegetation removal that could result in direct loss of nests, eggs, and/or fledglings. Indirect impacts could occur from construction noise and human presence during nesting season and cause disruption of foraging or nest abandonment. The degree of sensitivity to disturbances varies by species and is influenced by the nesting stage (e.g., nest building, incubation, feeding chicks). The below MM-BIO-1 would reduce impacts to nesting birds and would ensure compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and Section 3503 of the California Fish and Game Code. Prior to the start of tree/shrub removal and grading activities associated with the proposed project, implementation of the following mitigation measure is recommended:

Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-1: Highrise Incorporated, or its successor, must retain a qualified biologist (with at least two years of avian experience and knowledge of local bird species) to conduct a directed clearance survey to locate any active bird nests prior to any tree/shrub removal or grading/construction activities during the bird or raptor breeding season (general breeding and nesting bird season is February 1 through September 1; raptor nesting season is January 1 through June 30). This survey shall be conducted no more than three (3) days prior to the start of ground disturbing activities. If the qualified biologist determines there are active nests, a construction buffer will be implemented to avoid impacts to the nest. The qualified biologist shall determine the appropriate standard buffer distance for nests based on the sensitivity levels of specific avian species. The determination of the standard buffer widths shall be site- and species-specific, data-driven, and shall not be based on generalized assumptions regarding all nesting birds. If warranted, the qualified biologist will identify feasible measures to avoid any potential adverse effects on nesting birds.

Less than significant impacts to migratory or nesting birds are anticipated to occur with implementation of the abovementioned mitigation measure. Therefore, adherence to the abovementioned mitigation measure will ensure potentially significant impacts remain at levels that are less than significant.

*E.* Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? • Less than Significant Impact.

Chapter IV (Public Welfare), Article 6 (Preservation of Protected Trees) of the City of Los Angeles municipal code serves to protect Southern California native tree species.<sup>34</sup> The City's municipal

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> City of Los Angeles Municipal Code. *Chapter 4 (Public Welfare), Article 6 Preservation of Protected Trees.* Site accessed May 29, 2018.

code states:

"'Protected tree' means any of the following Southern California native tree species which measures four inches or more in cumulative diameter, four- and one-half feet above the ground level at the base of the tree:

- Oak tree including valley oak (*Quercus lobata*) and California live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), or any other tree of the oak genus indigenous to California but excluding the scrub oak (*Quercus dumosa*).
- Southern California black walnut (Juglans californica var. californica).
- Western sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*).
- California bay laurel (Umbellularia californica).
- Mexican Elderberry (Sambucus mexicana).
- Toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*).

This definition shall not include any tree grown or held for sale by a licensed nursery, or trees planted or grown as a part of a tree planting program."

The Mount Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan also contains protections for "Significant Trees". The Mount Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan defines a Significant Tree as:

"Any tree which measures 12 inches or more in diameter at four and one-half feet above the average natural grade at the base of the tree and/or is more than 35 feet in height."

A Protected Tree Report was prepared on October 30, 2021, by Bardez Landscape Services Inc., and is attached as Appendix C.

According to the Protected Tree Report, the project will require the removal of a total of 16 Protected and Significant tree species. The Protected Tree Report is provided in **Appendix C** – **Protected Tree Report**. The Tree Report recommends a total of two Protected Trees be removed. These trees are located at 3134 and 3144 Future Street. The Applicant will replace each Protected Tree according to a 4:1 ratio pursuant to Los Angeles City Ordinance 186873. Therefore, a total of eight new trees will be planted on the two parcels (3134 and 3144 Future Street) where the Protected trees are removed from. The project Applicant will be required to comply with the Tree Preservation Plan guidelines within the Protected Tree Report, which was reviewed by UFD. UFD ensures compliance with the Protected Tree Ordinance, which is a regulatory compliance measure. As such, the impact to any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance are less than significant.

*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 will not impact an adopted or approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan because the proposed project is located in the midst of an urban area. The closest riparian and wetland area to the project site is located within Elyria Canyon Park, which is not located within the vicinity of the project site. The project site is not governed by a Natural Community Conservation Plan.<sup>35</sup> Moreover, the closest Significant Ecological Area (SEA) to the project site is the Verdugo Mountains Significant Ecological Area (SEA #40), located approximately 5.50 miles northwest from the project site. The construction and operation of the proposed project will not affect the Verdugo Mountains SEA.

The Los Angeles River is currently the focus of a revitalization effort lead by the City of Los Angeles. The City of Los Angeles intends to focus on the 32-mile portion of the river that flows from Owensmouth Avenue, located in the San Fernando Valley, to the northern border of the City of Vernon.<sup>36</sup> The project site is located 0.58 miles northeast of the Los Angeles River and the project's construction and subsequent operation will not affect efforts to revitalize the Los Angeles River. Therefore, no impacts will occur.

## 4.4.2 MITIGATION MEASURES

The preceding analysis determined that the following Mitigation Measure will be required in order to protect and limit potential impacts to nesting and migratory birds. Compliance with the following Mitigation Measure will ensure impacts are less than significant:

Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-1: Highrise Incorporated, or its successor, must retain a qualified biologist (with at least two years of avian experience and knowledge of local bird species) to conduct a directed clearance survey to locate any active bird nests prior to any tree/shrub removal or grading/construction activities during the bird or raptor breeding season (general breeding and nesting bird season is February 1 through September 1; raptor nesting season is January 1 through June 30). This survey shall be conducted no more than three (3) days prior to the start of ground disturbing activities. If the qualified biologist determines there are active nests, a construction buffer will be implemented to avoid impacts to the nest. The qualified biologist shall determine the appropriate standard buffer distance for nests based on the sensitivity levels of specific avian species. The determination of the standard buffer widths shall be site- and species-specific, data-driven, and shall not be based on generalized assumptions regarding all nesting birds. If

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> California Department of Fish and Wildlife. California Regional Conservation Plans. <u>https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=68626&inline</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> City of Los Angeles. Notice of Preparation/Notice of Intent for The EIR/Environmental Impact Statement for the Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan. March 30, 2006.

warranted, the qualified biologist will identify feasible measures to avoid any potential adverse effects on nesting birds.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Given the Proposed Project required compliance with MM-BIO-1 and associated Regulatory Compliance Measures and other development in and around the Project Area's required compliance with related Regulatory Compliance Measures, cumulative impacts to biological resources would be less than significant. Additionally, the incremental effect of the Proposed Project on biological resources would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts to biological resources would be less than significant.

# **4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES**

## **4.5.1** ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Would the project:

A. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5? • Less than Significant Impact.

Historic structures and sites are defined by local, State, and Federal criteria. A site or structure may be historically significant if it is locally protected through a local general plan or historic preservation ordinance. A site or structure may be historically significant according to State or Federal criteria even if the locality does not recognize such significance. The State, through the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), maintains an inventory of those sites and structures that are considered to be historically significant. Finally, the U.S. Department of Interior has established specific Federal guidelines and criteria that indicate the manner in which a site, structure, or district is to be defined as having historic significance and in the determination of its eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. To be considered eligible for the National Register, a property's significance may be determined if the property is associated with events, activities, or developments that were important in the past, with the lives of people who were important in the past, or represents significant architectural, landscape, or engineering elements.

State historic preservation regulations include the statutes and guidelines contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the Public Resources Code (PRC). A historical resource includes, but is not limited to, any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript, which is historically or archaeologically significant. The State regulations that govern historic resources and structures include Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5024.1 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.5(a) and 15064.5(b). In addition, California law protects Native American burials, skeletal remains, and associated grave goods regardless of the antiquity and provides for the sensitive treatment and disposition of those remains. CEQA, as codified at PRC Sections 21000 et seq., is the principal statute governing the environmental review of projects in the State.

The project site is barren and undeveloped. A search through the California Office of Historic Preservation, California Historical Resources database indicated that the project site does not contain any historic structures listed in the National or California Registrar.<sup>37</sup> In addition, the City of Los Angeles maintains a Historic-Cultural Monument List, which includes 1,104 City designated historic resources. The project site is not identified on the list of City designated

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup> California Office of Historic Preservation. *California Historical Resources*. <u>http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/</u> ListedResources/?view=county&criteria=30

historic resources.<sup>38</sup> In addition, a Cultural Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) search was conducted for the Project. The results are presented in **Appendix D** – **CHRIS Letter**. According to the letter, there are no documented cultural or historic resources located within the project area. Since the project will not affect any local, state, or federally designated historic structure, impacts will be less than significant.

B. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? • Less than Significant Impact.

The First Peoples of Los Angeles, including the Gabrielino-Tongva tribe, have been indigenous to the Los Angeles Basin for over 7,000 years. The Gabrielino village of Yangna was situated around where the old Pueblo de Los Angeles was established. The location was selected due to the presence of the nearby Los Angeles River, as village sites tended to be situated adjacent to watercourses. In addition, trade routes were located where existing railroad tracks presently traverse. The project site is located on a slope and is underlain with bedrock.

A Sacred Lands File Search was conducted for the project by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). According to the letter, the search yielded positive results and the project team was advised to contact the local tribes for consultation (the Sacred Lands File Letter is provided in **Appendix F** – **Sacred Lands File Request Results**). Requests for consultation were mailed to six tribal representatives on August 29, 2018, as detailed in Section 4.18 Tribal Cultural Resources below. No requests for consultation were received. In the event that there is inadvertent discovery of any potential archeological resources, the Project shall follow all federal, state and local regulations for archeological resources. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.

In the unlikely event that remains are uncovered by construction crews, all construction activities shall be halted, and the City of Los Angeles Police Department will be contacted (the Department will then contact the County Coroner). Title 14; Chapter 3; Article 5; Section 15064.5 of CEQA and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(b) will apply in terms of the identification of significant archaeological resources and their salvage. Adherence to the abovementioned regulatory compliance measure will reduce potential impacts to levels that are less than significant.

C. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? • Less than Significant Impact.

There are no dedicated cemeteries located on-site or within the surrounding properties. The closest cemetery to the project site is Forest Lawn Memorial Park, located 1.58 miles to the northwest in the City of Glendale.<sup>39</sup> In addition, construction of the project will be restricted

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup> City of Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources. *Historic-Cultural Monument List.* <u>http://preservation.lacity.org/sites/default/files/HCMDatabase%23021916.pdf</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> Google Earth. Site accessed October 25, 2021.

to the designated project site and will not interfere or affect the aforementioned cemetery. Furthermore, the regulatory compliance measure mentioned in the previous subsection will minimize potential impacts during construction should crews encounter suspected human remains. As a result, the potential impacts are considered to be less than significant.

#### 4.5.2 MITIGATION MEASURES

The preceding analysis determined that less than significant impacts to cultural resources will result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Given that the Project Site is currently void of any development and the Proposed Project and other development in and around the Project Area are required to comply with all applicable Regulatory Compliance Measures, cumulative impacts to cultural historic and archeological resources would be less than significant. Additionally, the incremental effect of the Proposed Project on cultural historic and archeological resources would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts to cultural historic and archeological resources would be less than significant.

# 4.6 ENERGY

#### **4.6.1** ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Would the project:

A. Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? • Less than Significant Impact.

Energy consumed during the project's construction would be related to the use of on-site generators utilized to power safety lights, portable offices, and electric equipment. In addition, the construction equipment will require the consumption of diesel fuel. Energy consumption during the project's occupation includes the use of electricity and natural gas. The project's operational energy consumption was quantified using the CalEEMod. According to the model, the project (which also includes the eight additional planned units to be developed at a later date) will consume approximately 298,274 kBTU of natural gas and 81,687 kilowatts of electricity annually. The proposed project will be constructed in accordance with the City's Building Code and with Part 6 and Part 11 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. Therefore, energy efficient fixtures and appliances will be incorporated into the project. As a result, less than significant impacts will occur.

B. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? • Less than Significant Impact.

As indicated previously, the proposed project will be constructed in accordance with the City's Building Code and Green Building Code requirements and with Part 6 and Part 11 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. Those sections of the California Code of Regulations mandate the use of energy efficient fixtures and appliances. As a result, the potential impacts are considered to be less than significant.

#### **4.6.2 MITIGATION MEASURES**

The preceding analysis determined that less than significant impacts to energy will result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Given that the Proposed Project and other development in and around the Project Area are required to comply with all applicable Regulatory Compliance Measures, including those related to energy efficiency and conservation, cumulative impacts to energy resources would be less than significant. Additionally, the incremental effect of the Proposed Project on energy resources would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts to energy Initial Study and MITIGATED Negative Declaration • City of Los Angeles Future Street Single-Family Development • 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152 and 3164 Future Street

resources would be less than significant.

# 4.7 GEOLOGY/SOILS

#### 4.7.1 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Would the project:

A. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 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. Strong seismic ground-shaking? Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? Landslides? • Less than Significant Impact.

The City of Los Angeles is located in a seismically active region. Earthquakes from several active and potentially active faults in the Southern California region could affect the proposed project site. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Zoning Act was passed in 1972 as a response to the damage sustained in the 1971 San Fernando Earthquake. The Alguist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act's main purpose is to prevent the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults. A list of cities and counties subject to the Alguist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones is available on the California Department of Conservation's website. According to the State Department of Conservation, the City of Los Angeles is on the list. The Hollywood Fault is the closest Alquist-Priolo fault trace to the site. This fault trace is located 1.20 miles northwest of the project site (refer to Exhibit 4-1). The potential impacts from fault rupture are considered no greater for the project site than for the surrounding areas. Surface ruptures are visible instances of horizontal or vertical displacement, or a combination of the two. The potential effects from fault and surface ruptures will be minimized by adhering to the design recommendations identified in the Geology and Soils Report that was prepared for the Applicant. Additionally, the Proposed Project would further be required to comply with all applicable Regulatory Compliance Measures relating to the development of solid and sound seismic structures. The intensity of ground shaking depends on the intensity of the earthquake, the duration of shaking, soil conditions, type of building, and distance from the epicenter or fault. The proposed project will be constructed in compliance with the 2019 Building Code, which contains standards for building design to minimize the impacts from ground shaking. As a result, the potential impacts relating to ground shaking would also be less than significant.

Other potential seismic issues include ground failure, liquefaction, and lateral spreading. Ground failure is the loss in stability of the ground and includes landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading. The project site slopes downwards in a southerly and westerly direction. Nevertheless, the project will include piles driven into the bedrock to increase the building's stability. Retaining walls will also be provided to further minimize ground failure.



Furthermore, the project site is not located within a liquefaction or landslide risk zone.<sup>40</sup>

EXHIBIT 4-1 <sup>40</sup> California Department of Conservation https://mansiconservation.campv/cqs/EQZApp/ SelSMIC HAZARDS MAP Section 4 • Environmental ANALYSIS According to the United States Geological Survey, liquefaction is the process by which watersaturated sediment temporarily loses strength and acts as a fluid. Essentially, liquefaction is the process by which the ground soil loses strength due to an increase in water pressure following seismic activity.

Lateral spreading is a phenomenon that is characterized by the horizontal, or lateral, movement of the ground. Lateral spreading could be liquefaction induced or the result of excess moisture within the underlying soils. Liquefaction induced lateral spreading will not affect the proposed development since the project site is not located within an area that may be subject to liquefaction. Therefore, lateral spreading caused by liquefaction would not affect the project. As a result, the impacts from ground failure, liquefaction, and lateral spreading are anticipated to be less than significant.

#### B. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? • Less than Significant Impact.

The United States Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Web Soil Survey was consulted to determine the nature of the soils that underlie the project site. According to the USDA Web Soil Survey, the project site is underlain by Counterfeit-Nacimiento, warm urban land association soils.<sup>41</sup> The Counterfeit soils consists of clay, clay loam, and sandy loam and are derived from weathered sedimentary rock.<sup>42</sup> In fact, clay comprises between 20 to 55 percent of the material present in the Counterfeit soils. These soils are well drained with medium to high runoff characteristics; however, construction activities and the placement of "permanent vegetative cover" will reduce the soil's erosion risk.<sup>43</sup> Meanwhile, the Nacimiento soils consist of loam, clay loam or silty clay loam, and bedrock. These soils are well drained and possess a high runoff potential.<sup>44</sup>

The Applicant will remove all soils that are unsuitable for development and will replace the underlying soils with clean, recompacted fill. In addition, the Applicant will install retaining walls to improve slope stabilization. Once operational, the project site would be paved over and landscaped, which would minimize soil erosion.

The project's construction will not result in soil erosion. The project Applicant will be required to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) pursuant to Federal NPDES regulations since the project would connect to the City's MS4. The SWPPP is required to apply for an NPDES Construction General Permit (CGP). The SWPPP will contain construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will restrict the discharge of sediment into the streets and

44 Ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup> United States Department of Agriculture. *Web Soil Survey*. https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>42</sup> Ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup> United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. *Report and General Soil Map, Los Angeles County, California.* Revised 1969. *And* United States Department of Agriculture. *Web Soil Survey.* <u>https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx</u>

local storm drains. In addition, the project's contractors must adhere to any construction BMPs identified by the City. As a result, the impacts will be less than significant.

C Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? • Less than Significant Impact.

The project will include the installation of retaining walls as well as the removal of all unsuitable and unstable soils. Once complete, the project will include new vegetation and hardscape surfaces, as well as LID BMPs that would capture stormwater runoff and anchor the underlying soils. These design features will minimize potential issues regarding soil stability such as landslides or collapse.

Lateral spreading is a phenomenon that is characterized by the horizontal, or lateral, movement of the ground. Lateral spreading could be liquefaction induced or can be the result of excess moisture within the underlying soils. Liquefaction induced lateral spreading will not affect the proposed project because the project site is not located within a liquefaction zone. Lateral spreading resulting from an influx of groundwater is slim. The likelihood of lateral spreading will be further reduced since the project's implementation will not require grading and excavation that would extend to depths required to encounter groundwater. In addition, the project will not result in the direct extraction of groundwater located below ground surface (BGS) since the project will continue to be connected to the City's water system.

The soils that underlie the project site may be prone to subsidence due to their shrink swell characteristics. Subsidence occurs via soil shrinkage and is triggered by a significant reduction in an underlying groundwater table, thus causing the earth on top to sink.<sup>45</sup> The Applicant is proposing to remove and replace unstable soils. The soils that are susceptible to subsidence and shrinking/swelling (those that consist of clay) will be removed and replaced with fill that is suitable for development.

Lastly, the project will not expose future employees and patrons to collapsible soils since the Applicant is proposing to remove the underlying soils. Collapsible soils are geologically young, unconsolidated, low-density, loose, dry soils commonly present in arid to semi-arid regions. These soils generally occur within the top 10 to 15 feet of wind deposited sands or silts (loess), alluvial fans, colluvial soils, stream banks or residual mudflow soils.<sup>46</sup> Collapsible soils tend to collapse and compact when saturated with water or subject to excess loading. As a result, the potential impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>45</sup> Subsidence Support. *What Causes House Subsidence*? <u>http://www.subsidencesupport.co.uk/what-causes-subsidence.htm</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup> County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works. *Policy on Foundations on Collapsible Soils*. <u>Microsoft Word - 1004 - 2011 RCM R401.4 A3 - Foundation on Collapsible Soils 2-13-12.doc (lacounty.gov)</u>

D. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? • Less than Significant Impact.

The soils that underlie the project site are prone to shrinking and swelling. Shrinking and swelling is influenced by the amount of clay present in the underlying soils. If soils consist of expansive clay, damage to foundations and structures may occur.<sup>47</sup> As stated previously, Counterfeit-Nacimiento soils contain clay and clay loam materials. Therefore, the project Applicant will be required to adhere to the recommendations made by the geotechnical engineer, which includes the removal of all unstable or unsuitable soils. As a result, the potential impacts are considered to be less than significant.

E. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? • No Impact.

The project will connect to the sewer lines located along Future Street. No septic tanks will be installed. As a result, no impacts will occur.

*F.* Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? • No Impact.

No paleontological resources or geologic features are anticipated to be encountered during the project's construction phase due to the recent age (Holocene) of the soil. The soils that underlie the project site consist of alluvial soils and bedrock. The alluvial deposits are typically quaternary-aged (from two million years ago to the present day) and span the two most recent geologic epochs, the Pleistocene and the Holocene.<sup>48</sup> As a result, no impacts to paleontological resources is anticipated to occur and no mitigation is required.

## 4.7.2 MITIGATION MEASURES

The preceding analysis determined that less than significant impacts regarding geology/soils will result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>47</sup> Natural Resources Conservation Service Arizona. Soil Properties Shrink/Swell Potential. <u>http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detailfull/az/soils/?cid=nrcs144p2\_065083</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>48</sup> United States Geological Survey. What is the Quaternary? <u>http://geomaps.wr.usgs.gov/sfgeo/quaternary/stories/what\_is.html</u>.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Given that the Proposed Project and other development in and around the Project Area are required to comply with all applicable Regulatory Compliance Measures, including those related to sound seismic structures, solid development, soil stability, and paleontological resources, cumulative impacts to geological and paleontological resources would be less than significant. Additionally, the incremental effect of the Proposed Project on geological and paleontological resources would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts to geological and paleontological resources would be less than significant.

# **4.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

## 4.8.1 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Would the project:

A. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? • Less than Significant Impact.

#### **Construction and Operational Emissions**

The project's construction and operational GHG emissions were calculated using CalEEMod. The GHG emissions estimates reflect what two single-family dwelling units of the same location and description would generate once fully occupied. Construction and operational emissions for the project as a whole (including the two immediately developed units and eight other planned units to be developed at a later date) are shown in Table 4-8. The type of activities that may be undertaken once the initial two units are occupied have been predicted and accounted for in the model for the selected land use type. The results are presented in Table 4-7 and can be found in Appendix A - CalEEMod Worksheets.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions inventory						
Courses	GHG Emissions (tons/year)					
Source	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH₄	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub> E		
Long-Term - Area Emissions	0.03			0.03		
Long-Term - Energy Emissions	7.89			7.92		
Long-Term - Mobile Emissions	20.91			21.22		
Long-Term - Waste Emissions	0.49	0.02		1.23		
Long-Term - Water Emissions	0.74			0.85		
Long-Term - Total Emissions	30.09	0.03		31.28		
Total Construction Emissions	149.74	0.03		150.66		
Construction Emissions Amortized Over 30 Years		-	-	5 MTCO₂E		
Total Operational Emissions with Amortized Construction Emissions				36.28 MTCO₂E		
Significance Threshold				3,000 MTCO₂E		

Table 4-7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory

As shown in Table 4-7, the  $CO_2E$  total for the project is 31.28 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E per year, which is below the thresholds of 3,000 and 10,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E per year. The project's construction would result in an annual generation of 150.66 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E per year. When amortized over a 30-year period, these emissions decrease to 5 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E per year. These amortized construction emissions were added to the project's operational emissions to calculate the project's true GHG

emissions. As shown in the table, the project's total operational emissions would be 36.28 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E per year, which is still below the thresholds identified for residential land uses.

It is important to note that the project is an "infill" development, which is seen as an important strategy in combating the release of GHG emissions. Infill development provides a regional benefit in terms of a reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) since the project is consistent with the regional and State sustainable growth objectives identified in the State's Strategic Growth Council (SGC).<sup>49</sup> Infill development reduces VMT by recycling existing undeveloped or underutilized properties located in established urban areas. When development is located in a more rural setting, such as further east in the desert areas, employees, patrons, visitors, and residents may have to travel farther since rural development is often located a significant distance from employment, entertainment, and population centers. Consequently, this distance is reduced when development is located in urban areas since employment, entertainment, and population centers tend to be set in more established communities. As a result, the potential impacts will be less than significant.

#### Cumulative Emissions

The project's cumulative GHG emissions were estimated by incorporating the development of all 10 parcels, including two immediately proposed parcels and the additional eight parcels, into the model. As indicated previously, the Applicant intends to develop the remaining eight parcels with single-family units at a later, undetermined date. The results of the cumulative emissions analysis are presented in Table 4-8 and can be found in **Appendix A – CalEEMod Worksheets**.

culturative dicellibuse das Emissions inventory							
<b>C</b>	GHG Emissions (tons/year)						
Source	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH₄	N₂O	CO <sub>2</sub> E			
Long-Term - Area Emissions	0.16			0.17			
Long-Term - Energy Emissions	39.48			39.64			
Long-Term - Mobile Emissions	98.47			99.91			
Long-Term - Waste Emissions	2.41	0.14		5.97			
Long-Term - Water Emissions	3.72	0.01		4.28			
Long-Term - Total Emissions	144.27	0.16		149.99			
Total Construction Emissions	347.85	0.09		350.40			
Construction Emissions Amortized Over 30 Years		·	-	11.68 MTCO₂E			
Total Operational Emissions with Amortized Construction Emissions				161.67 MTCO₂E			

Table 4-8Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>49</sup> California Strategic Growth Council. <u>http://www.sqc.ca.gov/Initiatives/infill-development.html</u>. Promoting and enabling sustainable infill development is a principal objective of the SGC because of its consistency with the State Planning Priorities and because infill furthers many of the goals of all of the Council's member agencies.

#### INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION • CITY OF LOS ANGELES FUTURE STREET SINGLE-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT • 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152 AND 3164 FUTURE

STREET

Significance Threshold	3,000 MTCO₂E

As shown in Table 4-8, the project's cumulative  $CO_2E$  total is 149.99 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E per year, which is below the thresholds of 3,000 and 10,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E per year. The project's construction would result in an annual generation of 350.40 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E per year. When amortized over a 30year period, these emissions decrease to 11.68 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E per year. These amortized construction emissions were added to the project's operational emissions to calculate the project's true GHG emissions. As shown in the table, the project's total cumulative operational emissions would be 161.67 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E per year, which is still below the thresholds identified for residential land uses.

The quantitative analysis provided above is presented for informational purposes. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3) allows a lead agency to make a finding of less than significance for GHG emissions if a project complies with regulatory programs to reduce GHG emissions. Because there is no applicable adopted or accepted numerical threshold of significance for GHG emissions, the methodology for evaluating the project's impacts related to GHG emissions focuses on its consistency with statewide, regional, and local plans adopted for the purpose of reducing and/or mitigating GHG emissions. This evaluation of consistency with such plans is the sole basis for determining the significance of the project's GHG-related impacts on the environment.

For informational purposes, the analysis also calculates the amount of GHG emissions that would be attributable to the project using recommended air quality models, as described below. The primary purpose of quantifying the project's GHG emissions is to satisfy State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(a), which calls for a good-faith effort to describe and calculate emissions. The significance of the project's GHG emissions impacts is not based on the amount of GHG emissions resulting from the project. As a result, the potential impacts would be less than significant.

B. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases? • Less than Significant Impact.

Assembly Bill 32 (AB-32), also known as the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, was enacted by the State in an attempt to drastically reduce GHG emissions. AB-32 requires California to reduce its GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 – a reduction of approximately 15 percent below emissions expected under a "business as usual" scenario. Additionally, Governor Edmund G. Brown signed into law Executive Order (E.O.) B-30-15 on April 29, 2015, the Country's most ambitious policy for reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Executive Order B-30-15 calls for a 40 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions below 1990 levels by

#### 2030.50

Other State regulations governing GHG emissions include Part 6 and Part 11 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. On January 12, 2010, the State Building Standards Commission adopted updates to the California Green Building Standards Code (Code) which became effective on January 1, 2011. The California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 24, Part 11: California Green Building Standards (Title 24) became effective to aid efforts to reduce GHG emissions associated with energy consumption. Title 24 requires new buildings to reduce water consumption, employ building commissioning to increase building system efficiencies, divert construction waste from landfills, and install low pollutant-emitting finish materials. Additionally, the 2016 version address additional items such as clean air vehicles, increased requirements for electric vehicles charging infrastructure, organic waste, and water efficiency and conservation. The 2019 version of the standards became effective as of January 1, 2020. The California Green Building Standards Code does not prevent a local jurisdiction from adopting a more stringent code as State law provides methods for local enhancements. Since the project will be in conformance with Part 6 and Part 11 regulations, the potential impacts are considered to be less than significant.

The City of Los Angeles completed and released its Green New Deal in 2019 with the goal of attaining carbon neutrality throughout the City. The proposed project will include sustainable design features pursuant to the California Green Building Code. Compliance with the California Green Building Code will be confirmed with the City's Building Official. As a result, the potential impacts would be less than significant.

#### **4.8.2 MITIGATION MEASURES**

The preceding analysis determined that less than significant impacts regarding greenhouse gas emissions will result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Given the Proposed Project complies with the applicable GHG plans, policies, and regulations and compliance with related Regulatory Compliance Measures, the incremental effect of the Proposed Project on GHG emissions would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>50</sup> Office of Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr. New California Goal Aims to Reduce Emissions 40 Percent Below 1990 Levels by 2030. <u>http://gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=18938</u>.

# 4.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

## 4.9.1 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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 project's construction will require the use of diesel fuel to power the construction equipment. The diesel fuel will be properly sealed in tanks and would be transported to the site by truck. Other hazardous materials that will be used on-site during the project's construction phase include, but are not limited to, solvents, architectural coatings, and equipment lubricants.

The project site is a currently a vacant undeveloped lot with no prior uses on site. The project site is not listed on the California Department of Toxic Substances Control's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - Site Cleanup (Cortese List).<sup>51</sup> In addition, the project site was not identified on any Leaking Underground Storage Tank database (LUST).<sup>52</sup> A search through the California Department of Toxic Substances Control's EnviroStor database indicated that the project site was not included on any Federal or State clean up or Superfund lists.<sup>53</sup> The EPA's multi-system search was consulted to determine whether the project site is identified on any Federal Brownfield list; Federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) List; Federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Treatment, Storage, and Disposal (TSD) Facilities List; and/or Federal RCRA Generators List. The project site was not included on any of the aforementioned lists.<sup>54</sup> Therefore, the project's implementation is not anticipated to create significant hazards involving the transport and removal of residual contamination.

Due to the nature of the proposed project (single-family), no hazardous materials beyond what is typically used in a household setting for routine cleaning and maintenance would be used once the project is occupied. As a result, any potential construction and operational impacts

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>51</sup> California Department of Toxic Substances Control. *Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List)*. <u>http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese\_List.cfm</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>52</sup> California State Water Resources Control Board. GeoTracker. <u>https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=losangeles</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>53</sup> California Department of Toxic Substances Control. *Envirostor*. <u>https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress= Los Angeles</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>54</sup> United States Environmental Protection Agency. Envirofacts – Multisystem Search. <u>https://enviro.epa.gov/enviro/efsystemquery.multisystem?fac\_search=primary\_name&fac\_value=&fac\_search\_type=Beginning+With&postal\_code=&location\_address=Poplar&add\_search\_type=Containing&city\_name= losangeles &county\_name=Los+Angeles&state\_code=CA&TribalLand=0&TribeType=selectTribeALL&selectTribe=noselect&tribe distance1=onLand&sic\_type=Equal+to&sic\_code\_to=&naics\_type=Equal+to&naics\_to=&chem\_name=&chem\_search =Beginning+With&cas\_num=&page\_no=1&output\_sql\_switch=FALSE&report=1&database\_type=Multisystem.</u>

will be less than significant, and no mitigation 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? • Less than Significant Impact.

The project's construction would require the use of diesel fuel to power the construction equipment. The diesel fuel would be properly sealed in tanks and would be transported to the site by truck. Other hazardous materials that would be used on-site during the project's construction phase include, but are not limited to, solvents, architectural coatings, and equipment lubricants.

As indicated in the previous subsection, the project site is currently a vacant undeveloped lot with no prior uses on site. The project site is not located on the California Department of Toxic Substances Control's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - Site Cleanup (Cortese List). In addition, the project site is not identified on any Leaking Underground Storage Tank database (LUST). A search through the California Department of Toxic Substances Control's EnviroStor database indicated that the project site was not included on any Federal or State clean up or Superfund lists. The EPA's multi-system search was consulted to determine whether the project site is identified on any Federal Brownfield list; Federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) List; Federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Treatment, Storage, and Disposal (TSD) Facilities List; and/or Federal RCRA Generators List. The project site was not on any of the aforementioned lists. Therefore, the project's implementation is not anticipated to create significant hazards involving the transport and removal of residual contamination.

Furthermore, the project's operation will not require the use of hazardous materials beyond what is typically used in a household setting for routine cleaning and maintenance. As a result, any potential construction and operational impacts will be less than significant.

C. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? • Less than Significant Impact.

There are no schools located within one-quarter of a mile from the project site. Nevertheless, the project's construction will require the use of diesel fuel to power the construction equipment. The diesel fuel will be properly sealed in tanks and will be transported to the site by truck. Other hazardous materials that will be used on-site during the project's construction phase include, but are not limited to, solvents, architectural coatings, and equipment lubricants. The transport of these materials is regulated by the Department of Transportation under the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, which the project's contractors must comply with.

Because of the nature of the proposed use (single-family), no hazardous materials beyond what is typically used in a household setting for routine cleaning and maintenance would be used once the project is occupied. As a result, any potential construction and operational impacts will be less than significant.

D. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? • No Impact.

Government Code section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency to develop at least annually an updated Cortese List, or list of Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites. The Cortese List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies, and developers to comply with California Environmental Quality Act requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. Government Code section 65962.5 was originally enacted in 1985, and per subsection (g), the effective date of the changes called for under the amendments to this section was January 1, 1992. While Government Code Section 65962.5 references the preparation of a "list," many changes have occurred related to web-based information access since 1992 and this information is now largely available on the internet sites of the responsible organizations. The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is responsible for a portion of the information contained in the Cortese List, though other State and local government agencies are required to provide additional hazardous material release information for the Cortese List.<sup>55</sup>

The Cortese List in its current form consists of several databases including: the list of Hazardous Waste and Substances sites from DTSC's EnviroStor database (pursuant to subsection 65962.5.A); the list of Leaking Underground Storage Tank Sites from the State Water Board's GeoTracker database (pursuant to subsection 65962.5.B); the list of solid waste disposal sites identified by the Water Board (pursuant to subsection 65962.5.C); the list of active Cease and Desist Orders and Abatement Orders that do not concern the discharge of wastes that are hazardous materials; and the list of hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action pursuant to Section 25187.5 of the Health and Safety Code.<sup>56</sup> A search through the aforementioned databases indicated that the project site is not identified on any Cortese list. As a result, no impacts will occur.

E. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? • No Impact.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>55</sup> California Department of Toxic Substances Control. *DTSC's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List*. <u>https://dtsc.ca.gov/dtscs-cortese-list/</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>56</sup> California Environmental Protection Agency. *Cortese List Data Resources*. <u>https://calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/</u>.
The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and therefore is not subject to airport-related hazards. The closest airport to the project site is the Hollywood Burbank Airport, located 9.80 miles to the northwest in the City of Burbank. The project site is not located within the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) for the Hollywood Burbank Airport and the proposed project will not penetrate the airport's slope. The proposed project will not introduce any new building or structure that will interfere with the approach and takeoff of aircraft utilizing the aforementioned airport. Additionally, given the proposed project's proximity to the nearest airport, the proposed project will not result in a safety or noise hazard related to aircraft or airport operations at a public use airport to people residing in the project site and no impacts would occur.

*F.* Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? • Less than Significant Impact.

At no time will the proposed project cause Future Street or any of the surrounding streets to be completely closed to traffic. The proposed project will be required to comply with the Hillside Development Construction Traffic Management Plan developed for the proposed project, which requires that the project and adjacent areas be kept clear and unobstructed during all phases of construction. All construction staging areas will be located within the project site. As a result, the proposed project would not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, any impacts to emergency response or evacuation plans from the proposed project's will be less than significant.

*G.* Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wild land fire? • Less than Significant Impact.

According to the City's ZIMAS database, the project site is located within a very high fire hazard severity zone (VHFHSZ).<sup>57</sup> However, as a condition of the Hillside Development Construction Traffic Management Plan (HDCTMP) developed for the proposed project, the project (including all future residents) must comply with LAMC Section 57.322.1.1, which includes required adherence to specific Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) brush clearance regulations to reduce the ready fuel supply from brush vegetation in the event of a wildfire breaks out and to augment the spread, intensity, and damage caused by potential wildfires in the Project Area. Therefore, the proposed project's operation will help to reduce the intensity of wildfires in the project vicinity by eliminating a common fuel source. The HDCTMP also requires that grading and hauling activities be discontinued during periods of high winds and Red Flag days as determined by LAFD. The Owner and General Contractor must also cooperate with Fire Station 44 (the closest LAFD Station) to ensure that the Project ensures fire safety and minimized hazards during construction. This will ensure the proposed project does not increase the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>57</sup> ZIMAS. The City's ZIMAS program indicates that the site is located within a very high fire hazard severity zone.

likelihood or severity of wildfires in the area. The proposed project's future residents may be exposed to criteria pollutant emissions generated by wildland fires due to the project site's proximity to the San Gabriel Mountains and Santa Monica Mountains. However, the potential impacts would not be exclusive to the project site since criteria pollutant emissions from wildland fires may affect the entire City as well as the surrounding cities and unincorporated county areas. As a result, the potential impacts to people and structures from wildfires as a result of the proposed project will be less than significant.

# **4.9.2 MITIGATION MEASURES**

The preceding analysis determined that less than significant impacts regarding hazards and hazardous materials will result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The Proposed Project and other development in and around the Project Area are required to develop their own Hillside Development Construction Traffic Management Plans and comply with all applicable Regulatory Compliance Measures, including those related to hazardous material, airports, emergency access, and hazards to schools. As a result, cumulative impacts from hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant. Additionally, the incremental effect of the Proposed Project on hazards and hazardous materials would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts from hazards and hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant.

# 4.10 HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY

## 4.10.1 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Would the project:

A. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? • Less than Significant Impact.

Sections 64.70.01 and 64.72 of Article 4.4 of Chapter VI of the Los Angeles Municipal Code were expanded in 2012 by imposing rainwater Low Impact Development (LID) strategies on projects that require building permits. These LID requirements are required in addition to the preparation of the mandatory Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The LID report identifies set *Low Impact Development* standards and practices for stormwater pollution mitigation and provides documentation to demonstrate compliance with the municipal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit on the plans and permit application submitted to the City.

The project's construction and operation will not significantly impact water quality. The Applicant will be installing temporary drainage and erosion control measures during the project's construction. In addition, the project Applicant will be required to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) pursuant to federal NPDES regulations since the project would connect to the City's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4). The SWPPP is required to apply for an NPDES Construction General Permit (CGP). The SWPPP will contain construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will restrict the discharge of sediment into the streets and local storm drains. In addition, the project's contractors must adhere to any construction BMPs identified by the City. As a result, the potential construction impacts will be less than significant.

Once occupied, the project will improve water quality over the present conditions. Currently, stormwater runoff, sediment, and waste discharges off-site into Future Street. The project will include various LID Best Management Practices (BMPs) such as planter boxes, permeable pavement, and new drainage pipes. Runoff will be filtered as it percolates through the soil located in the planter boxes. This filtered runoff will then be conveyed off-site through new drainage pipes that will be provided. As a result, any potential operational impacts will be less than significant.

B. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? • Less than Significant Impact.

The grading and trenching that would be undertaken to accommodate the building footings, retaining walls, utility lines, and other underground infrastructure such as stormwater

appurtenances will not extend to depths required to encounter groundwater. The project site is underlain with bedrock. Therefore, no direct construction related impacts to groundwater supplies, or groundwater recharge activities would occur. The proposed project will be connected to the City's water lines and would not result in a direct decrease in underlying groundwater supplies during its operation, as the Project will need to observe all water conservation measures required by law. As a result, the construction and operational impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

C. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner, which would: result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or, impede or redirect flood flows? • Less than Significant Impact.

The project site is covered over in pervious surfaces. Runoff either percolates into the ground or is conveyed downslope and discharges off-site into Future Street. The project site's drainage characteristics will be altered upon completion of the proposed project since the project will add new impervious surfaces throughout the project site. Following the installation of LID BMPs, residual runoff will either percolate into the ground or will be discharged off site into the local storm drains. As indicated previously, the project site is located 0.58 miles northeast of the channelized Los Angeles River. Construction activities will be restricted to the designated project site and the implementation of the proposed project will not alter the course of the Los Angeles River or add impervious surface in a manner that would result in runoff that would result in on or off-site flooding. Furthermore, Future Street is paved, and any runoff discharged off-site will not result in erosion or siltation.

As indicated previously, the project Applicant will be required to install various stormwater controls identified in the mandatory LID report. These BMPs will either promote the percolation of excess runoff into the ground or will facilitate the control discharge of excess runoff into the local storm drains. Therefore, the risk of off-site erosion and/or siltation will be minimal given the reduced water runoff and the lack of pervious surfaces outside of the project site. Thus, the project's implementation will not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems; or provide additional sources of polluted runoff. As a result, the potential impacts would be less than significant.

D. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? • No Impact.

According to ZIMAS, the project site is located outside of a flood zone. Additionally, the project site is situated outside of a dam inundation zone. The project site is also located outside of a

tsunami risk zone. Furthermore, the project site would not be subject to flooding as a result of a seiche occurring in the Los Angeles River. A seiche is referred to as a standing wave oscillating in an enclosed or semi-enclosed body of water.<sup>58</sup> The project site is located at a higher elevation than the Los Angeles River and is located 0.58 miles away. Since the project site is located outside of any flood zone, tsunami risk zone, or seiche zone, the proposed project is unlikely to be inundated and no impacts are anticipated to occur.

*E.* Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? • Less than Significant Impact.

On September 16, 2014, Governor Edmund G. Brown signed into law the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), which is comprised of three bills: AB-1739, SB-1168, and SB-1319. The SGMA requires governments and water agencies of high and medium priority basins to halt overdraft and bring groundwater basins into balanced levels of pumping and recharge. Under SGMA, these basins should reach sustainability within 20 years of implementing their sustainability plans.<sup>59</sup> The community of Mount Washington is not located within a high or medium priority basin.<sup>60</sup> Therefore, the project site is not subject to a groundwater management plan. As stated throughout this section, the project Applicant will be required to prepare a SUSMP and LID plan in order to comply with the City's Municipal Code as well as with the provisions established under the federal Clean Water Act. The inclusion of the recommended BMPs will ensure impacts to water quality remain at levels that are considered to be less than significant.

# 4.10.2 MITIGATION MEASURES

The preceding analysis determined that less than significant impacts to hydrology/water quality will result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

# CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The Proposed Project and other development in and around the Project Area are required to comply with applicable Regulatory Compliance Measures relating to water quality and hydrological resources. As a result, cumulative impacts to water quality and hydrological resources would be less than significant. Additionally, the incremental effect of the Proposed Project on water quality and hydrological resources would not be cumulatively considerable.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>58</sup> United States National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. What is a seiche? <u>https://oceanservice.noaa.gov/facts/seiche.html</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>59</sup> California State Water Resources Control Board. SGMA Groundwater Management. https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Groundwater-Management/SGMA-Groundwater-Management

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>60</sup> California State Water Resources Control Board. California Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Unmanaged Areas. <u>https://gispublic.waterboards.ca.gov/portal/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=33be434cc60740d095f296c5d 2432897</u>.

Therefore, cumulative impacts to water quality and hydrological resources would be less than significant.

STREET

# 4.11 LAND USE/PLANNING

# 4.11.1 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Would the project:

A. Physically divide an established community? • No Impact.

The project site is located in the midst of an existing residential neighborhood. Furthermore, this issue is specifically concerned with the expansion of an inconsistent land use into an established community assuming that an "established community" refers to a residential neighborhood. The proposed residential use will continue to be confined within the project site's boundaries. The project's implementation would not affect the adjacent residential development, as this development is also zoned for single-family use. As a result, the project will not lead to any division of an existing established neighborhood and no impacts would occur.

B. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? Less than Significant Impact.

The project site is presently zoned R1-1-HCR (One Family). The site's land use designation in the Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan is Low Residential. It is important to note that the land uses that are proposed are permitted by the underlying zone. Development standards for R1 zoned properties are provided in Section 12.08 - "R1" One Family Zone of the City of Los Angeles zoning ordinance. The project's conformity with the R1 zone development standards is presented in Table 4-9 below.

Project's Conformity with RT Zone Development Standards				
Category	Requirement	Provided	In Compliance?	
Side Yard Set Back	6 feet	7 feet for 3152 and 3164 Future Street	Yes	
Rear Yard Set Back	15 feet	111 feet, 3 inches for 3152 Future Street	Yes	
		111 feet, 7 inches for 3164 Future Street		
Lot Width	50 feet	40 feet for 3152 and 3164 Future Street	No	
Lot Size	5,000 feet	6,470.2 square feet for 3152 Future Street	Vee	
		6,626.1 square feet for 3164 Future Street	162	

Table 4-9 Dualast's Caufaunait

As shown in Table 4-9, the project's two immediate planned units conforms to the R1 development standards. The other eight planned units to be developed at a later date must also conform to the R1 development standards. The project site is located within the Mount Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan area, which features separate development standards. The project's conformity with the development standards identified in the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan are provided in Table 4-10 shown below.

Category	Requirement	Provided	In Compliance?			
Front Yard Set Back	Average of adjacent properties within 200 feet	6 feet, 2 inches	Yes			
Building Height	45 feet	37 feet, 7 inches for 3152 Future Street 41 feet, 8 inches for 3164 Future Street	Yes			
Floor Area Ratio	0.47 to 1.0 for 3152 Future Street 0.47 to 1.0 for 3164 Future Street	0.39 to 1.0 for 3152 Future Street 0.38 to 1.0 for 3164 Future Street	Yes			

Table 4-10					
Project's Conformity with Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific					
Plan Development Standards					

As shown in the table, the project's two immediate planned units conforms to all of the development standards listed above. No zone change, general plan amendment, or conditional use permit is required to accommodate the proposed project. The other eight planned units to be developed at a later date must also conform to the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan development standards.

# 4.11.2 MITIGATION MEASURES

The preceding analysis determined that less than significant impacts regarding land use/planning will result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The Proposed Project and other development around the Project Area are expected to be singlefamily homes, consistent with the surrounding area. As a result, no established community will be divided and the Proposed Project and other development in and around the Project Area are expected to be consistent with the applicable land use plans and policies for the area. As a result, cumulative impacts to land use and planning efforts would be less than significant. Additionally, the incremental effect of the Proposed Project on land use and planning efforts would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts to land use and planning efforts would be less than significant.

# 4.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

# 4.12.1 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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? • No Impact.

The project site is not located in a Significant Mineral Aggregate Resource Area (SMARA), nor is it located in an area with active mineral extraction activities. As indicated previously, the project site is currently vacant and undeveloped. There are no existing resource extraction activities occurring within the project site. A review of the California Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources well finder indicates that there are no oil wells located within the 10 parcels.<sup>61</sup> As a result, no impacts to mineral resources will occur.

B. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? • No Impact.

As indicated previously, there are no mineral, oil, or energy extraction and/or generation activities located within the project site. Moreover, the project site is not located within any SMARA identified by the California State Department of Conservation. Lastly, no rare minerals or building materials will be used in the project's construction. Therefore, no impacts will result from the implementation of the proposed project.

# 4.12.2 MITIGATION MEASURES

The preceding analysis determined that no impacts to mineral resources will result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The Proposed Project is not expected to have any impact on mineral resources. As a result, there would not be a cumulative impact to mineral resources from the Proposed Project and the incremental effect of the Proposed Project on mineral resources would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, there would be no cumulative impacts to mineral resources.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>61</sup> California State Department of Conservation. *Well Finder*. <u>https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/doggr/wellfinder/#/-118.09624/34.01145/16</u>.

# **4.13 NOISE**

### 4.13.1 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Would the project:

A. Generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? • Less than Significant Impact.

#### **Characteristics of Noise and Sound**

Sound can be described as mechanical energy propagated as audible pressure waves (vibrations) through liquid or gaseous (such as air) mediums to a noise receiver (like a human ear). Noise can be described as loud, unexpected, or unwanted sound. Sound is characterized by two properties: frequency, or pitch and amplitude, or loudness. Frequency is the measure of the speed of vibration and is expressed in terms of cycles per second, or Hertz (Hz). Amplitude is a measure of the size of the vibration and is expressed logarithmically using decibels (dB). Since decibels are logarithmic units, sound pressure levels cannot be added or subtracted using ordinary arithmetic. For example, a doubling of sound energy corresponds to a 3.0 decibel increase.<sup>62</sup> Typical noise levels for everyday activities and equipment is presented below.

Common Outdoor Activities	Noise Level (dBA)	Common Indoor Activities
	- 110 -	Rock band
Jet fly-over at 1000 feet		
	- 100 -	
Gas lawn mower at 3 feet		
	- 90 -	
Diesel truck at 50 feet at 50 mph		Food blender at 3 feet
	- 80 -	Garbage disposal at 3 feet
Noisy urban area, daytime		
Gas lawn mower, 100 feet	- 70 -	Vacuum cleaner at 10 feet
Commercial area		Normal speech at 3 feet
Heavy traffic at 300 feet	- 60 -	
		Large business office
Quiet urban daytime	- 50	Dishwasher next room
Quiet urban nighttime	- 40	Theater, large conference room (background)
Oujet suburban nighttime		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	- 30 -	Library
Oujet rural nighttime		Bedroom at night, concert hall (background)
	- 20 -	
		Broadcast/recording studio
	- 10	
owest threshold of human hearing	- 0 -	Lowest threshold of human hearing

Typical A-Weighted Noise Levels

Source: Caltrans 2013.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>62</sup> California Department of Transportation. Noise Study Report Annotated Online. Report dated April 2015.

Human hearing is limited to a specific frequency range and most individuals are sensitive to the frequency range of 1,000-8,000 Hz. Thus, in order to replicate the capacity of human hearing, sound is typically measured using the A-weighted setting and is expressed in dBA. The A-weighting network approximates the frequency response of the average young ear when listening to most ordinary sounds.<sup>63</sup>

Noise attenuates with distance. The rate of attenuation varies based on the source. There are two types of noise sources: point sources and line sources. A point source is a source that radiates sound spherically, while a line source consists of multiple point sources moving in one direction.<sup>64</sup> Examples of point sources include construction equipment and drive-thru speaker boxes. An example of a line source would be a continuous stream of traffic travelling along a roadway. Noise emanating from point sources attenuates at a rate of 6.0 dB for every doubling of the distance, while noise emanating from a line source attenuates at a rate of 3.0 dB for every doubling of the distance.<sup>65</sup> Furthermore, the type of ground cover will also contribute to a reduction of noise levels. Noise that is propagated over pervious or soft surfaces such as grass attenuates an additional 1.5 dB per doubling of the distance.<sup>66</sup>

## **Construction Noise**

The project's implementation will require grading, excavation, piling, and ground clearance. The project's construction noise levels were estimated using the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Roadway Construction Noise Model Version 1.1. The pieces and number of equipment that will be utilized were taken from the CalEEMod worksheets prepared for this project. The distance used between the construction activity and the nearest sensitive receptors varied depending on the individual equipment. The results of the construction noise analysis are presented in Table 4-11 shown below. In addition, the construction noise worksheets can be found in **Appendix E – Construction Noise Worksheets**.

Value	ValueSite PreparationGradingShoring/PilingBuilding ConstructionPavingArchitectural Coatings							
Maximum	84.4 dBA	88.8 dBA	89.4 dBA	88.8 dBA	89.4 dBA	76.8 dBA		
Average	83.8 dBA	88.6 dBA	88.3 dBA	85.8 dBA	86.8 dBA	72.9 dBA		

Table 4-11Estimated Noise Levels for Each Phase of Construction

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>63</sup> California Department of Transportation. Noise Study Report Annotated Online.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>64</sup> United States Department of Transportation – Federal Highway Administration. FHWA Highway Construction Noise Handbook. Final Report Dated August 2006.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.

As indicated in the table, the project's construction will result in average ambient noise levels of up to 88.6 dBA. Furthermore, no impact generating devices will be used during the project's construction, which would minimize the amount of vibration the nearby single-family units would be exposed to. It is important to note that the model reflects a worst-case scenario in terms of equipment used and the project's average construction noise levels may be lower than the estimate generated by the model. The model assumes all the equipment that will be used during the project's construction will be used on-site simultaneously. Not all of the equipment will be operating at once. In addition, certain phases such as the site preparation phase will only utilize certain equipment such as backhoes, loaders, and bulldozers for a limited duration. Nevertheless, the contractors will be required to comply with the City's noise control ordinance, which prohibits construction between the hours of 9:00 PM and 7:00 AM on weekdays and 6:00 PM and 8:00 AM on Saturdays. No work is permitted on Sundays or national holidays.<sup>67</sup> The project site is also within the Hillside Construction Regulation (HCR) Supplemental Use District (Ordinance 187,900 effective July 24, 2023), which provides extra protections against construction related impacts of single-family residential developments in the hillside areas. The contractors will be required to comply with the HCR construction activity requirements. The Hillside Development Construction Traffic Management Plan (HDCTMP) developed for the proposed project includes specific mandatory provisions requiring compliance with LAMC Sections 41.40 and 62.21, limiting hours of exterior noise-generating construction to Monday through Friday from 7:00 AM to 9:00 PM and Saturday from 8:00AM to 6:00 PM and prohibiting construction on Sundays and national holidays without a separate permit. The HDCTMP further limits management, supervisory, administrative and inspection activities to the same times to the extent feasible unless approved by the appropriate agency. Furthermore, Section 112.05 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code states the following regarding the exceedance of the 75 dBA construction threshold:

"Said noise limitations shall not apply where compliance therewith is technically infeasible. The burden of proving that compliance is technically infeasible shall be upon the person or persons charged with a violation of this section. Technical infeasibility shall mean that said noise limitations cannot be complied with despite the use of mufflers, shields, sound barriers and/or other noise reduction device or techniques during the operation of the equipment."

The construction equipment that will be used will be equipped with the latest sound suppressing devices, such as mufflers and engine shields. The use of sound suppressing equipment typically results in an average reduction of 9 dBA. For example, a typical excavator will produce noise levels of around 80.5 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. In the quietest configuration, with improved exhaust and intake muffling, fan disengaged, and three sound panels around the engine, the overall level was reduced to 71.5 dBA at a distance of 50 feet.<sup>68</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>67</sup> City of Los Angeles Municipal Code. Chapter V - Public Welfare, Section 41.40 Noise Control Due to Construction, Excavation Work - When Prohibited. Site accessed May 25, 2021.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>68</sup> Laborers' Health and Safety Fund of North America. *Controlling Noise on Construction Sites*. <u>https://www.lhsfna.org/LHSFNA/assets/File/bpguide%202014.pdf</u>.

The use of sound barriers may not be feasible due to the sloping nature of the site. In addition, Future Street only has sufficient width to accommodate construction equipment. The use of temporary sound barriers may impede operation and movement of the construction equipment due to the constraints present regarding roadway width. Nevertheless, the impacts from construction will be less than significant due to the small size of the site, the temporary nature of construction, and adherence to the mandatory construction hours.

## **Operational Noise**

Operational noise will be minimal and will be generated by a variety of sources including landscaping equipment, vehicles, and future residents. Noise levels within the exterior portions of single-family dwellings typically average 44.1 dBA.<sup>69</sup> Therefore, no noise impacts will result from the occupation of the proposed project and the project's overall noise impacts will be less than significant.

B. Generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels? • Less than Significant Impact.

The shoring phase will require the use of drill rigs in order to accommodate the subterranean parking and structural piles. According to the Federal Highway Administration, drill rigs are not classified as impact devices. In addition, Future Street is in adequate condition, which is important since deteriorating pavement tends to exacerbate vibration.

Once occupied, the proposed project will generate a net increase of 99 daily trips per day along Future Street, which is classified as a local street. Thus, the increase in the number of daily trips will not be significant enough to result in a doubling of traffic volumes (a doubling of traffic volumes results in an increase of 3.0 dBA). As a result, the potential construction and operational impacts from ground-borne noise and vibration are expected to be less than significant.

C. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or- an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? • No Impact.

The project site is not located within two miles of a public or private airport. Therefore, the proposed project will not expose people residing in the project site to excessive noise levels and no impacts regarding excessive airport noise will occur.

# 4.13.2 MITIGATION MEASURES

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>69</sup> Noise measurements collected by Ceqaology.

The preceding analysis determined that less than significant impacts regarding noise will result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The Proposed Project and other development around the Project Area are expected to comply with the requirements of their respective Hillside Development Construction Traffic Management Plans and Regulatory Compliance Measures relating to construction and operational noise aimed at limiting the time frame and level of the noise allowed. As a result, cumulative impacts from construction and operational noise would be less than significant. Additionally, the incremental effect of the Proposed Project of construction and operational noise would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts from construction and operational noise would be less than significant.

# 4.14 POPULATION/HOUSING

## 4.14.1 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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)? • Less than Significant Impact.

Growth-inducing impacts are generally associated with the provision of urban services to an undeveloped or rural area. Growth-inducing impacts include the following:

- New development in an area presently undeveloped and economic factors which may influence development. The project site is located within an existing residential neighborhood.
- *Extension of roadways and other transportation facilities.* The project will utilize the existing roadways, driveways, and sidewalks.
- *Extension of infrastructure and other improvements.* The project will utilize the existing infrastructure, though new utility lines will be installed within the project site. Nevertheless, the installation of new utility lines will not lead to subsequent development elsewhere since these new utility lines will serve the project only.
- *Major off-site public projects (treatment plants, etc.).* The project's increase in demand for utility services can be accommodated without the construction or expansion of landfills, water treatment plants, or wastewater treatment plants.
- The removal of housing requiring replacement housing elsewhere. The project site is undeveloped and vacant.
- Additional population growth leading to increased demand for goods and services. The project will add an estimated 26 new residents to the City using an average household size of 2.62 persons per unit multiplied by the number of housing units proposed (2.62 persons per unit X 10 units). This limited growth in population is unlikely to largely increase demand for goods and services.
- Short-term growth-inducing impacts related to the project's construction. The project will result in temporary employment during the construction phase.

The proposed project is an infill development that will utilize existing roadways and infrastructure. The new utility lines that will be provided will not extend into undeveloped areas and will not result in unplanned growth. In addition, the limited number of residents that will be added is well within SCAG's growth forecast for the City. In addition, the project is in conformance with SCAG's regional sustainable development policies that promote infill development. As a result, less than significant impacts will occur.

B. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? • No Impact.

As stated previously, the project site is vacant and undeveloped and does not contain any existing residential development. As a result, no impacts will occur.

## 4.14.2 MITIGATION MEASURES

The preceding analysis determined that less than significant impacts to population/housing will result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The Proposed Project and other development in and around the Project Area are expected to be single-family homes, consistent with the surrounding area. As a result, cumulative impacts to population and housing would be less than significant. Additionally, the incremental effect of the Proposed Project on population and housing would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts to population and housing would be less than significant.

# 4.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

## 4.15.1 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Would the project:

A. 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: Fire protection services; Police protection; Schools; Parks; other Governmental facilities? • Less than Significant Impact.

#### Fire Protection Services

The Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) provides fire protection service for the community of Mount Washington. The LAFD's 3,246 uniformed fire personnel are directly involved in fire prevention; firefighting; emergency medical care; technical rescue; hazardous materials mitigation; disaster response; public education, and community service throughout the City.<sup>70</sup> The Department also has 353 non-sworn professional support personnel that provide technical and administrative support. A total of 1,018 uniformed firefighters (including 270 serving as firefighters/paramedics) are always on duty at fire department facilities citywide, including 106 neighborhood fire stations strategically located across the Department's 471 square-mile jurisdiction.

LAFD Station 44 is the nearest first response station to the project site. This fire station is located 0.29 miles southwest of the project site at 1410 Cypress Avenue. The proposed project will undergo review by the City of Los Angeles Fire Department to ensure that the site and building design meet all applicable requirements of the Department. The proposed project would not place additional demands on fire services since the project will involve the construction of modern structures that will be subject to all pertinent fire and building codes. According to the City's ZIMAS database, the project site is located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ).<sup>71</sup> Such lands designated by the City of Los Angeles Fire Department pursuant to Government Code Section 51178 were identified and recommended to local agencies by the Director of Forestry and Fire Protection based on criteria that includes fuel loading, slope, fire weather, and other relevant factors. As a result, the project Applicant must comply with the Brush Clearance Requirements of the Fire Code (L.A.M.C. 57.322). Yearround compliance shall be maintained as described below on all native brush, weeds, grass, trees and hazardous vegetation within 200 feet of any structures/buildings, whether those

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>70</sup> Los Angeles City Fire Department. Organization. Organization | Los Angeles Fire Department (lafd.org)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>71</sup> City of Los Angeles. *ZIMAS*. http://zimas.lacity.org/

structures are on the owner's property or adjoining properties, and within 10 feet of any combustible fence or roadway/driveway used for vehicular travel.

1. Areas within 200 feet of structures and/or 10 feet of roadside surfaces or combustible fence: Grass shall be cut to three inches in height. Native brush shall be reduced in quantity to three inches in height.

2. For trees taller than 18 feet, trim lower branches so no foliage is within six feet of the ground, and remove all dead material. For trees and shrubs less than 18 feet, remove lower branches to 1/3 of their height, and remove all dead material.

3. Trees shall be trimmed up so the foliage is no closer than 10 feet from the outlet of a chimney.

4. All roof surfaces shall be maintained free of substantial accumulation of leaves, needles, twigs and any other combustible matter. Maintain five feet of vertical clearance between roof surfaces and portions of overhanging trees.

5. All cut vegetation and debris shall be removed in a legal manner. Cut vegetation may be machine processed (i.e.,chipped) and spread back onto the property at a depth not to exceed three inches within 30 feet of structures and six inches beyond 30 feet of structures. In addition, spread material shall not be placed within 10 feet of any usable roadside (in accordance with Fire Prevention Bureau Procedure No. 25).

In addition to adherence to the Fire Code, the Los Angeles City Council passed Ordinance 185,789, effective October 17, 2018, to increase requirements for brush clearance and fire safety in the VHFHSZ. This ordinance establishes appropriate safety measures necessary to mitigate the occurrence of such fires. Highlights of this ordinance include:

1. The use of metal cutting blades for grass or brush clearance shall be limited to those which are non-ferrous/non-sparking.

2. Brush clearance cannot be done on red flag days, when fire weather conditions are at their peak.

3. Individuals engaged in brush clearance operations shall not engage in any other activities during their actual clearance of grass or brush.

4. An approved fire extinguisher, or a pressurized garden hose with attached nozzle shall be within 10 feet of any grass or brush clearance operation, to quickly extinguish a small fire before it burns out of control.

5. A cell phone capable of dialing 9-1-1 shall be charged and readily accessible to the grass or brush clearance operation.

Additionally, the proposed project will be required to comply with the Hillside Development Construction Traffic Management Plan developed for the proposed project, which requires that the project (including all future residents) must comply with LAMC Section 57.322.1.1, which includes required adherence to specific Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) brush clearance regulations to reduce the ready fuel supply from brush vegetation in the event of a wildfire breaks out and to augment the spread, intensity, and damage caused by potential wildfires in the Project Area. Therefore, the proposed project's operation will help to reduce the intensity of wildfires in the project vicinity by eliminating a common fuel source. The HDCTMP also requires that grading and hauling activities be discontinued during periods of high winds and Red Flag days as determined by LAFD. The Owner and General Contractor must also cooperate with Fire Station 44 to ensure that the Project ensures fire safety and minimize hazards during construction. This will ensure the proposed project does not increase the likelihood or severity of wildfires in the area. Therefore, the potential impacts to fire protection services will be less than significant.

### **Police Protection Services**

The City of Los Angeles Police Department provides law enforcement services throughout the City. Currently, the police department is comprised of 10,000 sworn officers and 3,000 civilian employees. The closest first response station to the project site is the Northeast Community Police Station, located 1.75 miles to the northwest. The Northeast Community Police Department serves the communities of Atwater Village; Cypress Park; Eagle Rock; East Hollywood; Echo Park; Elysian Park; Elysian Valley; Franklin Hills; Garvanza; Glassell Park; Highland Park; Los Feliz; Mount Washington; Silver Lake, and Solano Canyon. The site plan will undergo review by the Department and the project Applicant will be required to implement the recommendations identified by the Department prior to the issuance of a building permit. As a result, any potential impacts to police protection services will be less than significant.

### School Services

As indicated previously, development of the ten parcels has the potential to add an estimated 26 residents to the City (2.62 persons per unit X 10 units). According to the United States Census, 21.3 percent of the City's population is under the age of 18. Assuming that 21 percent of the 26 new residents are school-aged persons, the project has the potential to increase enrollments by five students. The project Applicant will be required to pay all required school fees. As a result, any potential impacts will be less than significant.

#### Parks and Recreational Services

The City of Los Angeles Parks and Recreation Department operates multiple parks and

recreation facilities throughout the City. In addition, the California Department of Parks and Recreation operates numerous parks throughout the City. The nearest parks to the project site are Elyria Canyon Park, located 0.30 miles to the northeast and Rio de Los Angeles State Park, located 0.32 miles to the southwest. The proposed project has the potential to increase demand for local parks and recreational services. As a result, the project Applicant will be required to pay all pertinent Quimby Act/Park Development fees. The project will also include common and private open space. As a result, impacts to park and recreation services will be less than significant impacts.

### Library and Governmental Services

Library services are provided by the Los Angeles Public Library service. There are multiple libraries located throughout the City, with the closest library to the project site being the Cypress Park Branch Library, located 0.45 miles to the southeast of the project site. The project is not anticipated to result in a deterioration of library services since the Applicant will be required to pay development impact fees, which could be used to offset any increase in demand. In addition, no new governmental services will be needed, and the proposed project is not expected to have any impact on existing governmental services. The proposed project will not directly increase demand for governmental services. As a result, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

# 4.15.2 MITIGATION MEASURES

The preceding analysis determined that less than significant impacts to public services will result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Given the applicable low residential single-family designation the Proposed Project and other development in and around the Project Area are not expected to add a large number of people to the community, The Proposed Project and other development in and around the Project Area are expected to comply with the requirements of their respective Hillside Development Construction Traffic Management Plan, Regulatory Compliance Measures relating to brush clearance, and pay any applicable school or other development impact fees. As a result, cumulative impacts to public services would be less than significant. Additionally, the incremental effect of the Proposed Project to public services would be less than significant.

# 4.16 RECREATION

## 4.16.1 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Would the project:

A. 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?
Less than Significant Impact.

The City of Los Angeles Parks and Recreation Department operates multiple parks and recreation facilities throughout the City. In addition, the California Department of Parks and Recreation operates numerous parks throughout the City. The nearest parks to the project site are Elyria Canyon Park, located 0.30 miles to the northeast and Rio de Los Angeles State Park, located 0.32 miles to the southwest. The proposed project has the potential to increase demand for local parks and recreational services. As a result, the project Applicant will be required to pay all pertinent Quimby Act/Park Development fees. The project will also include common and private open space. As a result, less than significant impacts will occur.

 B. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? • No Impact.

The proposed project will include private open space. This open space will be constructed within the confines of the project site and no outside areas will be disturbed to accommodate the installation of the aforementioned amenities. As a result, no impacts will occur.

# 4.16.2 MITIGATION MEASURES

The preceding analysis determined that less than significant impacts to recreation will result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

Given the applicable low residential single-family designation of the Proposed Project and other development in and around the Project Area, cumulative development is not expected to add a large number of people to the community, The Proposed Project and other developments in and around the Project Area is expected to contain private open space and pay development impact fees. As a result, cumulative impacts to recreational resources would be less than significant. Additionally, the incremental effect of the Proposed Project to recreational resources would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts to recreational resources would be less than significant.

# 4.17 TRANSPORTATION

### 4.17.1 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Would the project:

A. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities? • Less than Significant Impact.

The project encompasses the construction, use and maintenance of 10 single-family dwelling units, with two units planned for immediate construction and occupation and the remaining eight units planned for construction and operation at a future date. As the proposed Project represents a discretionary request for new hillside construction greater than 1,000 square feet on a street less than 24 feet in width, the Project Applicant was required to submit a Construction Traffic Management Plan for review by the City's Department of Transportation (LADOT), in conjunction with LADOT's Hillside Development Construction Traffic Management Guidelines released on June 16, 2020. These guidelines state the purpose of a Construction Traffic Management Plan is to address transportation concerns specific to hillside communities, including narrow streets, limited emergency access, and location in a Very High Fire Severity Zone. The proposed Project will be subject to the measures detailed in the Project's Construction Traffic Management Plan reviewed and stamped-approved by LADOT on July 19, 2021 (Appendix G). Compliance with the Construction Traffic Management Plan will ensure that the proposed Project does not conflict with any programs, plans, ordinances, or policies addressing the City's circulation system. The proposed measures in the Construction Traffic Management Plan include, but are not limited to, limiting construction to the hours allowed by the LAMC; the appointment of a Construction Liaison Officer (CLO) to respond to inquiries or concerns of surrounding residents as well as the general public; a project hotline for complaints or inquiries; on-site construction across four (4) separate phases; on-site parking for employees; construction barriers in accordance with City requirements; site security; and unobstructed emergency access to and from the site.

The project is anticipated to generate an average of 99 trips per day, with nine trips occurring during the morning (AM) peak hour and 18 trips occurring during the evening (PM) peak hour.<sup>72</sup> Since the project will generate less than the threshold 25 peak hour trips in the AM peak hour and PM peak hour, no traffic study is required. In addition, the project will not negatively impact any local intersections and off-street parking will be provided. Adequate roadway width is available to accommodate trips generated by the proposed project since parking is prohibited along the west/south side of Future Street. Lastly, the project is exempt from the City's VMT analysis since the project will result in the generation of 99 daily trips, which is less than the 250 daily trip threshold. As a result, the potential impacts would be less than

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>72</sup> ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11<sup>th</sup> Edition.

significant.

B. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3 subdivision (b)? • Less than Significant Impact.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines were revised in December 2018 in response to Senate Bill (SB 743), which was adopted in 2013 to change the way transportation impacts were considered. These revisions mandated the transition from Level-of-Service (LOS) to Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) as the primary metric for evaluating a project's transportation impacts. The Transportation Assessment Guidelines (TAG) also requires the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) to examine whether the proposed project conflicts with the City's plans, programs, ordinances, and policies. In addition, Non-CEQA transportation analysis is also required to assess the project's potential transportation effects on pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities, project access, safety and circulation, project construction, and the potential for residential street intrusion.

In compliance with CEQA and/or in accordance with City regulations, LADOT may require applicants to analyze and assess project-specific transportation impacts based on the following criteria:

- If the Development Project is estimated to generate a net increase of 250 or more daily vehicle trips and requires discretionary action, a transportation assessment for a Development Project is required.
- A transportation assessment is required by City ordinance or regulation.

The project does not require the preparation of a formal transportation impact analysis since the project will result in the generation of fewer than 250 daily trips. The project's implementation will have less than significant impacts since the project will develop existing undeveloped properties located in an established urban area. When development is located in a more rural setting, such as further east in the desert areas, employees, patrons, visitors, and residents may have to travel farther since rural development is often located a significant distance from employment, entertainment, and population centers. Consequently, this distance is reduced when development is located in urban areas since employment, entertainment, and population centers tend to be set in more established communities. As a result, the potential impacts will be less than significant.

*C.* Substantially increases hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment))? • No Impact.

The proposed project is a request to construct 10 single-family dwelling units within 10 parcels located in the midst of an existing residential neighborhood, with two units planned for immediate construction and occupation, and the other eight units for a future, undetermined

date. Therefore, the proposed project will utilize existing streets and will not introduce incompatible uses or equipment to the adjacent streets. As a result, no impacts will occur.

### D. Result in inadequate emergency access? • Less than Significant Impact.

The proposed project will be required to meet minimum driveway widths established in the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code. These standards ensure that roadways have adequate width to accommodate emergency vehicle access and to permit the efficient movement of a large number of people. In addition, the proposed project will be required to comply with the Hillside Development Construction Traffic Management Plan developed for the proposed project, which requires that the project and adjacent areas be kept clear and unobstructed during all phases of construction. Therefore, the project's construction will not require the closure of Future Street or any of the nearby streets. The project Applicant will be required to adhere to the recommendations made in the Hillside Traffic Management Plan. As a result, the potential impacts will be less than significant.

# 4.17.2 MITIGATION MEASURES

The preceding analysis determined that less than significant impacts to transportation will result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The Proposed Project and other development in and around the Project Area are required to develop their own Hillside Development Construction Traffic Management Plans and comply with applicable traffic measures and any transportation related Regulatory Compliance Measures. As a result, cumulative transportation impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, the incremental effect of the Proposed Project on transportation would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts to transportation would be less than significant.

# 4.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

## 4.18.1 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Would the project:

A. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is: Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or 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 Resource Code Section 5024.1 In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significant Impact.

A Tribal Resource is defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 and includes the following:

- Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following: included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.
- 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 Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.
- A cultural landscape that meets the criteria of subdivision (a) is a tribal cultural resource to the extent that the landscape is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape.
- A historical resource described in Section 21084.1, a unique archaeological resource as defined in subdivision (g) of Section 21083.2, or a "non-unique archaeological resource" as defined in subdivision (h) of Section 21083.2 may also be a tribal cultural resource if it conforms with the criteria of subdivision (a).

A Sacred Lands File Search was conducted for the project by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). According to the letter, the search yielded positive results and the project team was advised to contact the local tribes for consultation (the Sacred Lands File Letter is provided in **Appendix F** – **Sacred Lands File Request Results**). AB-52 requires a lead agency to begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project, if the tribe requested to the lead agency, in writing, to be informed by the lead agency of proposed projects in that geographic area and the tribe requests consultation. Requests for consultation were mailed to six tribal representatives on August 29, 2018:

- Mr. Andrew Salas, Chairperson of the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians Kizh Nation.
- Mr. Anthony Morales, Chairperson of the Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians.
- Mr. Robert Dorame, Chairperson of the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council.
- Ms. Sandonne Goad, Chairperson of the Gabrielino/Tongva Nation.
- Mr. Charles Alvarez, Councilmember for the Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe.
- Mr. Scott Cozart, Chairperson of the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians.

The mandatory 30-day request for consultation period concluded and no responses were received by the City. Nevertheless, as indicated in Section 4.5 above, in the in the event there is inadvertent discovery of any potential archeological resources, the Project shall follow all federal, state and local regulations for archeological resources. Further, in the event human remains are encountered during the project's construction, Title 14; Chapter 3; Article 5; Section 15064.5 of CEQA and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(b) would apply and construction must cease until the remains have been removed from the site. Adherence to the abovementioned regulatory compliance measures will reduce any potential impacts to tribal cultural resources to a less than significant level.

# 4.18.2 MITIGATION MEASURES

The preceding analysis determined that less than significant impacts to tribal cultural resources will result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Given that the Project Site is currently void of any development and the Proposed Project and other development in and around the Project Area are required to comply with all applicable Regulatory Compliance Measures aimed at protecting known and unknown tribal cultural resources, cumulative impacts to tribal cultural resources are expected be less than significant. Additionally, the incremental effect of the Proposed Project on tribal cultural resources would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant.

# **4.19 UTILITIES/SERVICE SYSTEMS**

## 4.19.1 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Would the project:

A. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, or wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities or relocation of which could cause significant environmental impacts? • Less than Significant Impact.

The project site is presently vacant and undeveloped. There are no existing water or wastewater treatment plants, electric power plants, telecommunications facilities, natural gas facilities, or stormwater drainage infrastructure located on-site. Therefore, the project's implementation will not require the relocation of any of the aforementioned facilities. In addition, the increase in demand for waste disposal, water, wastewater treatment, electric power, and telecommunications services can be adequately handled with the existing capacity and no expansion of these services is required. As a result, the potential utility would be less than significant.

B. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and the reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years? • Less than Significant Impact.

The City of Los Angeles is served by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, which covers a 469 square mile area and provides over 3.9 million residents with water. Water distributed by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) is sourced by the Los Angeles Aqueduct, local groundwater, recycled water, and water purchased from the Metropolitan Water District. The project is expected to consume approximately 575 gallons of water per day.

According to the 2020 Urban Water Management Plan, total supplies are expected to exceed total demand.<sup>73</sup> The proposed project will be equipped with water efficient fixtures and drought tolerant landscaping will be planted throughout the project site to conserve water resources. As a result, the potential impacts will be less than significant.

C. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? • Less than Significant Impact.

The City operates more than 6,700 miles of public sewers that convey about 400 million gallons per day (MGD) of flow from residences and businesses to the City's four wastewater treatment

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>73</sup> Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. Urban Water Management Plan 2020. opladwpccb762836.pdf

and water reclamation plants.<sup>74</sup> The community of Mount Washington is located within the service boundaries of the Hyperion Treatment Plant. On average 275 million gallons of wastewater enters the Hyperion Water Reclamation Plant (HWRP) on a dry weather day. Because the amount of wastewater entering HWRP can double on rainy days, the plant was designed to accommodate both dry and wet weather days with a maximum daily flow of 450 million gallons of water per day (MGD) and peak wet weather flow of 800 MGD.<sup>75</sup> The proposed project is expected to generate approximately 460 gallons of sewage per day, which is well within the daily average totals for the Hyperion Water Reclamation Plant. The new plumbing fixtures that will be installed will consist of water conserving fixtures, as is required by the current City Code requirements, and no new or expanded sewage and/or water treatment facilities will be required to accommodate the proposed project. As a result, the impacts are expected to be less than significant.

D. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? • Less than Significant Impact.

Waste hauling services are provided by the Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation. Waste collected by the Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation is taken to the Central Los Angeles Recycling and Transfer Station (CLARTS). The CLARTS has a present capacity of 2,500 tons per day and a permitted capacity 4,025 tons per day. The CLARTS has a remaining capacity of 1,525 tons per day.<sup>76</sup> According to screening criteria used by the City of Los Angeles Planning Department, a project will potentially have a significant impact on solid waste generation if it generates in excess of five tons of solid waste per day. The project is anticipated to generate approximately 24.46 pounds of solid waste per day. This increase of 24.46 pounds per day is within the remaining capacity of the CLARTS. As a result, the potential solid waste impacts would be less than significant.

E. Comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? • No Impact.

The proposed project, like all other development in Los Angeles, will be required to adhere to City and County ordinances with respect to waste reduction and recycling. As a result, no impacts related to State and local statutes governing solid waste are anticipated.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>74</sup> Los Angeles Sanitation District. <u>https://www.lacitysan.org/san/faces/home/portal/s-lsh-wwd/s-lsh-wwd-cw</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>75</sup> City of Los Angeles Sanitation District. Hyperion Water Reclamation Plant. <u>Hyperion Water Reclamation Plant</u> (lacitysan.org)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>76</sup> City of Los Angeles Sanitation District. CLARTS - Facts and Services. <u>CLARTS Facts & Services (lacitysan.org)</u>

### 4.19.2 MITIGATION MEASURES

The preceding analysis determined that less than significant impacts to utilities/service systems will result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Given that Proposed Project is below the applicable impact thresholds and other new singlefamily developments in and around the Project Area are similarly not expected to exceed the threshold given the low residential single-family designation, cumulative impacts from Proposed Project would be less than significant. Additionally, the incremental effect of the Proposed Project on utilities/services would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts to utilities/services would be less than significant.

# 4.20 WILDFIRE

# 4.20.1 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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?
Less than Significant Impact.

According to ZIMAS, the project site is located within a designated very high fire hazard severity zone. Nevertheless, the project will be constructed within the designated project site and the project will not interfere or obstruct any City designated evacuation route. The proposed project will be required to comply with the Hillside Development Construction Traffic Management Plan developed for the proposed project, which requires that the project and adjacent areas be kept clear and unobstructed during all phases of construction. As a result, the potential impacts will be less than significant.

B. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? • Less than Significant Impact.

The project site contains areas of native or natural vegetation that may act as fuel for a potential wildfire. Furthermore, the proposed project may be exposed to criteria pollutant emissions generated by wildland fires due to the project site's location within a fire hazard severity zone. However, the potential impacts would not be exclusive to the project site since criteria pollutant emissions from wildland fires may affect the entire City as well as the surrounding cities and unincorporated county areas.

Furthermore, according to the City's ZIMAS database, the project site is located within a very high fire hazard severity zone (VHFHSZ).<sup>77</sup> Therefore, the future residents must comply with the brush clearance requirements listed in the City's Fire Code (L.A.M.C. 57.322). Year-round compliance shall be maintained as described below on all native brush, weeds, grass, trees and hazardous vegetation within 200 feet of any structures/buildings, whether those structures are on the owner's property or adjoining properties, and within 10 feet of any combustible fence or roadway/driveway used for vehicular travel.

1. Areas within 200 feet of structures and/or 10 feet of roadside surfaces or combustible fence: Grass shall be cut to three inches in height. Native brush shall be reduced in quantity to three inches in height.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>77</sup> ZIMAS. The City's ZIMAS program indicates that the site is located within a very high fire hazard severity zone.

2. For trees taller than 18 feet, trim lower branches so no foliage is within six feet of the ground, and remove all dead material. For trees and shrubs less than 18 feet, remove lower branches to 1/3 of their height, and remove all dead material.

3. Trees shall be trimmed up so the foliage is no closer than 10 feet from the outlet of a chimney.

4. All roof surfaces shall be maintained free of substantial accumulation of leaves, needles, twigs and any other combustible matter. Maintain five feet of vertical clearance between roof surfaces and portions of overhanging trees.

5. All cut vegetation and debris shall be removed in a legal manner. Cut vegetation may be machine processed (i.e.,chipped) and spread back onto the property at a depth not to exceed three inches within 30 feet of structures and six inches beyond 30 feet of structures. In addition, spread material shall not be placed within 10 feet of any usable roadside (in accordance with Fire Prevention Bureau Procedure No. 25).

In addition to adherence to the Fire Code, the Los Angeles City Council passed Ordinance 185,789, effective October 17, 2018, to increase requirements for brush clearance and fire safety in the VHFHSZ. This ordinance establishes appropriate safety measures necessary to mitigate the occurrence of such fires. Highlights of this ordinance include:

1. The use of metal cutting blades for grass or brush clearance shall be limited to those which are non-ferrous/non-sparking.

2. Brush clearance cannot be done on red flag days, when fire weather conditions are at their peak.

3. Individuals engaged in brush clearance operations shall not engage in any other activities during their actual clearance of grass or brush.

4. An approved fire extinguisher, or a pressurized garden hose with attached nozzle shall be within 10 feet of any grass or brush clearance operation, to quickly extinguish a small fire before it burns out of control.

5. A cell phone capable of dialing 9-1-1 shall be charged and readily accessible to the grass or brush clearance operation.

Additionally, the proposed project will be required to comply with the Hillside Development Construction Traffic Management Plan developed for the proposed project, which requires that the project (including all future residents) must comply with LAMC Section 57.322.1.1, which includes required adherence to specific Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) brush clearance regulations to reduce the ready fuel supply from brush vegetation in the event of a wildfire breaks out and to augment the spread, intensity, and damage caused by potential wildfires in the Project Area. Therefore, the proposed project's operation will help to reduce the intensity of wildfires in the project vicinity by eliminating a common fuel source. The HDCTMP also requires that grading and hauling activities be discontinued during periods of high winds and Red Flag days as determined by LAFD. The Owner and General Contractor must also cooperate with Fire Station 44 to ensure that the Project ensures fire safety and minimize hazards during construction. This will help to ensure the proposed project does not increase the likelihood or severity of wildfires in the area.

As a result, the potential pollution related wildfire impacts will be less than significant. *C. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?* • Less than Significant Impact.

The project will include the installation of new utility lines such as gas lines, water lines, etc. These utility lines will be located below ground surface. As a result, any potential impacts will be less than significant.

D. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including down slope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?
Less than Significant Impact.

As discussed in Section 4.7, the project site contains slopes. However, once complete, the project site will be stabilized by new hardscape surfaces, vegetation, and retaining walls. The inclusion of the aforementioned features will minimize the project's exposure to slope failure, landslides, or flooding as discussed in Section 4.10. In addition, the project will include operational stormwater appurtenances which will aid in the retention of the underlying soil. As a result, the potential impacts will be less than significant.

# 4.20.2 MITIGATION MEASURES

The preceding analysis determined that less than significant impacts regarding wildfires will result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The Proposed Project and other developments in and around the Project Area are required to develop their respective Hillside Development Construction Traffic Management Plans and comply with all applicable Regulatory Compliance Measures relating to wildfires. As a result, cumulative wildfire impacts from the Proposed Project would be less than significant. Additionally, the incremental effect of the Proposed Project on wildfires would not be

cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative wildfire impacts would be less than significant.

# 4.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

The proposed project will not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment since the project's air quality emissions will be below the thresholds of significance outlined by the SCAQMD. With the implementation of the proposed Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-1, impacts to protected species or habitat will be less than significant. The project Applicant will be required to implement Low Impact Development (LID) measures, also known as Best Management Practices (BMPs) into the project's design. These operational Best Management Practices (BMPs) will reduce the volume of water discharged into the local storm drains and will filter out any contaminants present in the stormwater runoff. The addition of project trips will not negatively impact any local intersection. Lastly, the project will include energy and water efficient appliances and fixtures. As a result, the potential impacts are considered to be less than significant with mitigation.

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

The proposed project will develop on a vacant Hillside Area which is generally surrounded by other single-family development. This sort of infill development is seen as an important strategy in combating the release of GHG emissions. Infill development provides a regional benefit in terms of a reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) since the project is consistent with the regional and State sustainable growth objectives identified in the State's Strategic Growth Council (SGC). Infill development reduces VMT by recycling existing undeveloped or underutilized properties located in established urban areas. In addition, the project's cumulative air quality impacts are below the thresholds of significance established by the SCAQMD. As a result, the projects potential impacts are considered to be less than significant.

A significant impact may occur if the proposed Project, in conjunction with the related projects, would result in impacts that are less than significant when viewed separately but significant when viewed together. The following projects were or are filed with the Department of City Planning within the last 10 years and within a 500-foot radius:
FUTURE STREET SINGLE-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT • 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152 AND 3164 FUTURE

Street

	PROJECTS WITHIN A 500-	FOOT RADIUS O	F THE SUBJECT	SITE
ADDRESS	CASE NUMBER	Date Filed	Status	Scope of Work
1515 N KILLARNEY			Permit	
AVE	ZA-2014-3091-ZAD-SPP	8/21/2014	Issued	New Single-Family Home
1521 N KILLARNEY			Permit	
AVE	ZA-2014-3100-ZAD-SPP	8/21/2014	Issued	New Single-Family Home
1606 N KILLARNEY				
AVE	DIR-2015-3054-SPP	8/17/2015	Permitting	New Single-Family Home
1454 N KILLARNEY				
AVE	ZA-2018-1003-ZAD-SPP	2/23/2018	Permitting	New Single-Family Home
1538 N RANDALL CT	DIR-2018-1190-SPP	3/6/2018	Permitting	New Single-Family Home
			Permit	
3001 E FUTURE ST	DIR-2018-2087-SPP	4/12/2018	Issued	New Single-Family Home
			Permit	Addition to Single-Family
1433-35 N CLIFF DR	DIR-2018-5876-SPP	10/10/2018	Issued	Home
1512 N CLIFF DR	DIR-2019-1246-SPP	3/1/2019	Permitting	New Single-Family Home
3222 E FUTURE ST	DIR-2019-1509-SPP	3/13/2019	Permitting	New Single-Family Home
			Permit	Addition to Single-Family
1713 N BURNELL DR	DIR-2019-5718-SPP	9/25/2019	Issued	Home

Per the table above, there were eight (8) other projects filed that included construction of a single-family dwellings and two (2) additions to existing single-family homes. While there are multiple projects within the vicinity of the Project site, each project is subject to specific RCMs that, when considered cumulatively, reduce any potential impacts to less than significant. Additionally, all nearby active projects were proposed at different times over a nine (9) year period, resulting in staggered construction staging times and timelines. Although projects may be constructed in the project vicinity, the cumulative impacts to which the proposed Project would contribute would be less than significant.

• Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? • Less than Significant Impact.

A significant impact may occur if the proposed Project has the potential to result in significant impacts, as discussed in the preceding sections. All potential impacts of the proposed Project have been identified, and Mitigation Measure and RCMs have been identified, where applicable, to reduce all potential impacts to less than significant levels. Upon implementation of the Mitigation Measure and RCMs identified and compliance with existing regulations, the proposed Project would not have the potential to result in substantial adverse impacts on human beings either directly or indirectly. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

# THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

#### STREET

# **SECTION 5 CONCLUSIONS**

# 5.1 FINDINGS

When making the findings required by paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 21081 or when adopting a mitigated negative declaration pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of Section 21080, the following requirements shall apply:

- (1) The public agency shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The reporting or monitoring program shall be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation. For those changes which have been required or incorporated into the project at the request of a responsible agency or a public agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project, that agency shall, if so requested by the lead agency or a responsible agency, prepare and submit a proposed reporting or monitoring program.
- (2) The lead agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which its decision is based.
- (b) A public agency shall provide that measures to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment are fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures. Conditions of project approval may be set forth in referenced documents which address required mitigation measures or, in the case of the adoption of a plan, policy, regulation, or other public project, by incorporating the mitigation measures into the plan, policy, regulation, or project design.
- (c) Prior to the closing of the public review period for a draft environmental impact report or mitigated negative declaration, a responsible agency, or a public agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by the project, shall either submit to the lead agency complete and detailed performance objectives for mitigation measures which would address the significant effects on the environment identified by the responsible agency or agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by the project, or refer the lead agency to appropriate, readily available guidelines or reference documents. Any mitigation measures submitted to a lead agency by a responsible agency or an agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by the project shall be limited to measures which mitigate impacts to resources which are subject to the statutory authority of, and definitions applicable to, that agency. Compliance or noncompliance by a responsible agency or agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by a project with that requirement shall not limit the authority of the responsible agency or agency having jurisdiction over natural resources affected by a project with that requirement shall not limit the authority of the

project, or the authority of the lead agency, to approve, condition, or deny projects as provided by this division or any other provision of law.

# **5.2 PREPARERS**

#### Prepared By:

Ceqaology 122A East Foothill Boulevard #178 Arcadia, California 91006

Bryan Hamilton, Principal Planner Justin Hamilton, Junior Planner

# **5.3 REFERENCES**

- 2021 California State CEQA Guidelines;
- California Department of Transportation;
- City of Los Angeles Municipal Code;
- Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan;
- Mount Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan; and,
- ZIMAS.

INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION • CITY OF LOS ANGELES

FUTURE STREET SINGLE-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT • 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152 AND 3164 FUTURE

Street

# **APPENDIX**

CITY OF LOS ANGELES FUTURE STREET SINGLE-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152, and 3164 FUTURE STREET



**REPORT PREPARED FOR:** 

**REPORT PREPARED BY:** 

CITY OF LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

200 North Spring Street Room 621 Los Angeles, California 90012



CEQAOLOGY URBAN/ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING 122A EAST FOOTHILL BOULEVARD BOX #417

# ARCADIA, CALIFORNIA 91006



REPORT DATED: DECEMBER 14, 2023 INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION • CITY OF LOS ANGELES FUTURE STREET SINGLE-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT • 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152 AND 3164 FUTURE

STREET

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

- APPENDIX A CALEEMOD WORKSHEETS
- APPENDIX B BIOLOGICAL REPORT
- APPENDIX C PROTECTED TREE REPORT
- APPENDIX D CHRIS (CULTURAL HISTORIC RESOURCES INFORMATION SYSTEM) LETTER
- **APPENDIX E CONSTRUCTION NOISE WORKSHEETS**
- **APPENDIX F SACRED LANDS FILE REQUEST RESULTS**
- APPENDIX G CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN

# APPENDIX A – CALEEMOD WORKSHEETS

APPENDIX A-1:

# CALEEMOD WORKSHEETS FOR 3152 AND 3164 FUTURE STREET

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# **Future Street Single Family**

Los Angeles-South Coast County, Summer

# **1.0 Project Characteristics**

#### 1.1 Land Usage

Land	l Uses	Size		Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Single Far	nily Housing	2.00		Dwelling Unit	0.65	3,600.00	6
1.2 Other Proj	ect Characterist	ics					
Urbanization	Urban	Wind Speed (m/s)	2.2	Precipitation Freq (Da	<b>ays)</b> 33		
Climate Zone	12			Operational Year	2024		
Utility Company	Los Angeles Departm	nent of Water & Power					
CO2 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	691.98	CH4 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.033	N2O Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.004		

## 1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

Project Characteristics -

Land Use -

Construction Phase - Construction times are estimated.

Off-road Equipment - Construction equipment estimated based on observations made of similar development.

Off-road Equipment - Construction equipment estimated based on observations made of similar development.

Off-road Equipment - Construction equipment estimated based on observations made of similar development.

Off-road Equipment - Construction equipment estimated based on observations made of similar development.

Off-road Equipment -

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

Off-road Equipment - Construction equipment estimated based on observations made of similar development.

Off-road Equipment - Construction equipment estimated based on observations made of similar development.

Off-road Equipment -

Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation -

Mobile Land Use Mitigation -

Area Mitigation -

Energy Mitigation -

Water Mitigation -

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblConstDustMitigation	WaterUnpavedRoadVehicleSpeed	0	15
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	5.00	22.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	100.00	152.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	2.00	20.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	5.00	22.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	1.00	21.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	100.00	23.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	1.00	22.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	2.00	20.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	100.00	23.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	100.00	152.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	5.00	22.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	5.00	21.00
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	6/22/2022	12/31/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	6/8/2022	10/31/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	1/19/2022	2/28/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	6/15/2022	11/30/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	1/17/2022	1/31/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	6/16/2022	12/1/2022

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	1/20/2022	4/1/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	1/18/2022	2/1/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	6/9/2022	11/1/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	1/15/2022	1/1/2022
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.50	0.50
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.38	0.38
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.37	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.38	0.38
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.37	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.50	0.50
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.38	0.38
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.38	0.38
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.37	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.37	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.37	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.37	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.37	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Bore/Drill Rigs
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Aerial Lifts
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Excavators
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Excavators
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Forklifts
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Concrete/Industrial Saws
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Excavators
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Concrete/Industrial Saws

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Bore/Drill Rigs
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Excavators
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Cement and Mortar Mixers
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Excavators
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Aerial Lifts
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Rollers
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Excavators
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	4.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	4.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	2.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	2.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	6.00	8.00

2.0 Emissions Summary

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

#### 2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission)

Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year					lb/e	day							lb/d	lay		
2022	1.2285	8.0960	10.7306	0.0197	0.0894	0.4250	0.4362	0.0237	0.4030	0.4060	0.0000	1,902.486 5	1,902.486 5	0.6122	2.0000e- 003	1,917.867 1
2023	1.2643	7.3044	10.1047	0.0197	0.0894	0.3311	0.3423	0.0237	0.3149	0.3179	0.0000	1,903.721 4	1,903.721 4	0.6127	1.8500e- 003	1,919.108 2
Maximum	1.2643	8.0960	10.7306	0.0197	0.0894	0.4250	0.4362	0.0237	0.4030	0.4060	0.0000	1,903.721 4	1,903.721 4	0.6127	2.0000e- 003	1,919.108 2

#### Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
2022	1.2285	8.0960	10.7306	0.0197	0.0894	0.4250	0.4362	0.0237	0.4030	0.4060	0.0000	1,902.486 5	1,902.486 5	0.6122	2.0000e- 003	1,917.867 1
2023	1.2643	7.3044	10.1047	0.0197	0.0894	0.3311	0.3423	0.0237	0.3149	0.3179	0.0000	1,903.721 4	1,903.721 4	0.6127	1.8500e- 003	1,919.108 2
Maximum	1.2643	8.0960	10.7306	0.0197	0.0894	0.4250	0.4362	0.0237	0.4030	0.4060	0.0000	1,903.721 4	1,903.721 4	0.6127	2.0000e- 003	1,919.108 2

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

#### 2.2 Overall Operational

#### Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Area	0.6065	0.0434	1.1820	2.6000e- 003		0.1537	0.1537		0.1537	0.1537	18.7338	36.2971	55.0309	0.0562	1.2700e- 003	56.8137
Energy	1.6300e- 003	0.0139	5.9300e- 003	9.0000e- 005		1.1300e- 003	1.1300e- 003		1.1300e- 003	1.1300e- 003		17.8011	17.8011	3.4000e- 004	3.3000e- 004	17.9069
Mobile	0.0576	0.0585	0.5883	1.3100e- 003	0.1373	9.3000e- 004	0.1382	0.0366	8.6000e- 004	0.0374		133.8954	133.8954	8.6900e- 003	5.3500e- 003	135.7064
Total	0.6657	0.1158	1.7762	4.0000e- 003	0.1373	0.1558	0.2930	0.0366	0.1557	0.1923	18.7338	187.9936	206.7274	0.0652	6.9500e- 003	210.4270

#### Mitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/c	day		
Area	0.0824	1.9000e- 003	0.1649	1.0000e- 005		9.1000e- 004	9.1000e- 004		9.1000e- 004	9.1000e- 004	0.0000	0.2971	0.2971	2.9000e- 004	0.0000	0.3042
Energy	1.6300e- 003	0.0139	5.9300e- 003	9.0000e- 005		1.1300e- 003	1.1300e- 003		1.1300e- 003	1.1300e- 003		17.8011	17.8011	3.4000e- 004	3.3000e- 004	17.9069
Mobile	0.0576	0.0585	0.5883	1.3100e- 003	0.1373	9.3000e- 004	0.1382	0.0366	8.6000e- 004	0.0374		133.8954	133.8954	8.6900e- 003	5.3500e- 003	135.7064
Total	0.1416	0.0743	0.7591	1.4100e- 003	0.1373	2.9700e- 003	0.1402	0.0366	2.9000e- 003	0.0395	0.0000	151.9936	151.9936	9.3200e- 003	5.6800e- 003	153.9176

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	78.73	35.83	57.26	64.75	0.00	98.09	52.14	0.00	98.14	79.47	100.00	19.15	26.48	85.70	18.27	26.85

# **3.0 Construction Detail**

#### **Construction Phase**

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Site Preparation (3152 Future St)	Site Preparation	1/1/2022	1/31/2022	5	21	
2	Grading (3152 Future St)	Grading	2/1/2022	2/28/2022	5	20	
3	Building Construction (3152 Future St)	Building Construction	4/1/2022	10/31/2022	5	152	
4	Paving (3152 Future St)	Paving	11/1/2022	11/30/2022	5	22	
5	Architectural Coating (3152 Future St)	Architectural Coating	12/1/2022	12/31/2022	5	22	
6	Shoring/Piling (3152 Future St)	Building Construction	3/1/2022	3/31/2022	5	23	
7	Site Preparation (3164 Future St)	Site Preparation	1/1/2023	1/31/2023	5	22	
8	Grading (3164 Future St)	Grading	2/1/2023	2/28/2023	5	20	
9	Shoring/Piling (3164 Future St)	Building Construction	3/1/2023	3/31/2023	5	23	
10	Building Construction (3164 Future St)	Building Construction	4/1/2023	10/31/2023	5	152	
11	Paving (3164 Future St)	Paving	11/1/2023	11/30/2023	5	22	
12	Architectural Coatings (3164 Future St)	Architectural Coating	12/1/2023	12/31/2023	5	21	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 0

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 0

Acres of Paving: 0

Residential Indoor: 7,290; Residential Outdoor: 2,430; Non-Residential Indoor: 0; Non-Residential Outdoor: 0; Striped Parking Area: 0 (Architectural Coating – sqft)

#### OffRoad Equipment

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Architectural Coating (3152 Future St)	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48
Paving (3152 Future St)	Cement and Mortar Mixers	17	6.00	9	0.56
Architectural Coatings (3164 Future St)	Air Compressors	17	6.00	78	0.48
Paving (3152 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	1	8.00	65	0.37
Shoring/Piling (3152 Future St)	Bore/Drill Rigs	1	6.00	221	0.50
Building Construction (3152 Future St)	Aerial Lifts	1	8.00	63	0.31
Grading (3152 Future St)	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Shoring/Piling (3152 Future St)	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Paving (3152 Future St)	Rollers	1	7.00	80	0.38
Paving (3164 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	1	8.00	65	0.37
Building Construction (3152 Future St)	Forklifts	2	8.00	89	0.20
Shoring/Piling (3152 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	1	8.00	65	0.37
Building Construction (3164 Future St)	Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	8.00	81	0.73
Building Construction (3152 Future St)	Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	8.00	81	0.73
Site Preparation (3164 Future St)	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Grading (3152 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	1	8.00	65	0.37
Shoring/Piling (3152 Future St)	Cranes	1	4.00	231	0.29
Shoring/Piling (3164 Future St)	Cranes	1	4.00	231	0.29
Building Construction (3164 Future St)	Forklifts	2	6.00	. 89	0.20
Shoring/Piling (3152 Future St)	Forklifts	2	6.00	89	0.20
Shoring/Piling (3164 Future St)	Forklifts	2	6.00	89	0.20
Shoring/Piling (3164 Future St)	Bore/Drill Rigs	1	6.00	221	0.50
Grading (3164 Future St)	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Paving (3164 Future St)	Cement and Mortar Mixers	1	6.00	9	0.56
Shoring/Piling (3164 Future St)	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Building Construction (3164 Future St)	Aerial Lifts	1	8.00	63	0.31
Site Preparation (3164 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	11	8.00	65	0.37
Paving (3164 Future St)	Rollers	1,	7.00	80	0.38

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

Shoring/Piling (3164 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	1	8.00	65	0.37
Grading (3164 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	1	8.00	65	0.37
Site Preparation (3152 Future St)	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Site Preparation (3152 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	1	8.00	65	0.37
Building Construction (3152 Future St)	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.00	97	0.37
Building Construction (3152 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	1	8.00	65	0.37
Building Construction (3164 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	1	8.00	65	0.37
Building Construction (3164 Future St)	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.00	97	0.37

#### Trips and VMT

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Shoring/Piling (3152	6	1.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Site Preparation (3152	2	5.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading (3152 Future	2	5.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	6	1.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving (3152 Future	3	8.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coating (3152 Future St)	1	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Site Preparation (3164	2	5.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading (3164 Future	2	5.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Shoring/Piling (3164	6	1.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	6	1.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving (3164 Future	3	8.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coatings	1	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

#### **3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction**

Water Exposed Area

Reduce Vehicle Speed on Unpaved Roads

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

### 3.2 Site Preparation (3152 Future St) - 2022

#### **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/c	lay		
Fugitive Dust			1		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2720	2.7056	4.6423	7.2400e- 003		0.1204	0.1204		0.1108	0.1108		700.4065	700.4065	0.2265		706.0697
Total	0.2720	2.7056	4.6423	7.2400e- 003	0.0000	0.1204	0.1204	0.0000	0.1108	0.1108		700.4065	700.4065	0.2265		706.0697

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0173	0.0126	0.1968	5.1000e- 004	0.0559	3.6000e- 004	0.0563	0.0148	3.3000e- 004	0.0152		51.6721	51.6721	1.4100e- 003	1.2500e- 003	52.0801
Total	0.0173	0.0126	0.1968	5.1000e- 004	0.0559	3.6000e- 004	0.0563	0.0148	3.3000e- 004	0.0152		51.6721	51.6721	1.4100e- 003	1.2500e- 003	52.0801

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

### 3.2 Site Preparation (3152 Future St) - 2022

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Fugitive Dust		, , ,	1		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		1 1 1	0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2720	2.7056	4.6423	7.2400e- 003		0.1204	0.1204		0.1108	0.1108	0.0000	700.4065	700.4065	0.2265		706.0697
Total	0.2720	2.7056	4.6423	7.2400e- 003	0.0000	0.1204	0.1204	0.0000	0.1108	0.1108	0.0000	700.4065	700.4065	0.2265		706.0697

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0173	0.0126	0.1968	5.1000e- 004	0.0559	3.6000e- 004	0.0563	0.0148	3.3000e- 004	0.0152		51.6721	51.6721	1.4100e- 003	1.2500e- 003	52.0801
Total	0.0173	0.0126	0.1968	5.1000e- 004	0.0559	3.6000e- 004	0.0563	0.0148	3.3000e- 004	0.0152		51.6721	51.6721	1.4100e- 003	1.2500e- 003	52.0801

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.3 Grading (3152 Future St) - 2022

#### **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	lay		
Fugitive Dust		1 1 1			0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2720	2.7056	4.6423	7.2400e- 003		0.1204	0.1204		0.1108	0.1108		700.4065	700.4065	0.2265		706.0697
Total	0.2720	2.7056	4.6423	7.2400e- 003	0.0000	0.1204	0.1204	0.0000	0.1108	0.1108		700.4065	700.4065	0.2265		706.0697

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0173	0.0126	0.1968	5.1000e- 004	0.0559	3.6000e- 004	0.0563	0.0148	3.3000e- 004	0.0152		51.6721	51.6721	1.4100e- 003	1.2500e- 003	52.0801
Total	0.0173	0.0126	0.1968	5.1000e- 004	0.0559	3.6000e- 004	0.0563	0.0148	3.3000e- 004	0.0152		51.6721	51.6721	1.4100e- 003	1.2500e- 003	52.0801

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.3 Grading (3152 Future St) - 2022

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Fugitive Dust		, , ,	1		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2720	2.7056	4.6423	7.2400e- 003		0.1204	0.1204		0.1108	0.1108	0.0000	700.4065	700.4065	0.2265		706.0697
Total	0.2720	2.7056	4.6423	7.2400e- 003	0.0000	0.1204	0.1204	0.0000	0.1108	0.1108	0.0000	700.4065	700.4065	0.2265		706.0697

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0173	0.0126	0.1968	5.1000e- 004	0.0559	3.6000e- 004	0.0563	0.0148	3.3000e- 004	0.0152		51.6721	51.6721	1.4100e- 003	1.2500e- 003	52.0801
Total	0.0173	0.0126	0.1968	5.1000e- 004	0.0559	3.6000e- 004	0.0563	0.0148	3.3000e- 004	0.0152		51.6721	51.6721	1.4100e- 003	1.2500e- 003	52.0801

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.4 Building Construction (3152 Future St) - 2022

# **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	0.8553	8.0755	10.6913	0.0162		0.4250	0.4250	1 1 1	0.4030	0.4030		1,552.976 4	1,552.976 4	0.3429		1,561.549 2
Total	0.8553	8.0755	10.6913	0.0162		0.4250	0.4250		0.4030	0.4030		1,552.976 4	1,552.976 4	0.3429		1,561.549 2

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	Jay							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	3.4600e- 003	2.5300e- 003	0.0394	1.0000e- 004	0.0112	7.0000e- 005	0.0113	2.9600e- 003	7.0000e- 005	3.0300e- 003		10.3344	10.3344	2.8000e- 004	2.5000e- 004	10.4160
Total	3.4600e- 003	2.5300e- 003	0.0394	1.0000e- 004	0.0112	7.0000e- 005	0.0113	2.9600e- 003	7.0000e- 005	3.0300e- 003		10.3344	10.3344	2.8000e- 004	2.5000e- 004	10.4160

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.4 Building Construction (3152 Future St) - 2022

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	day		
Off-Road	0.8553	8.0755	10.6913	0.0162		0.4250	0.4250	1 1 1	0.4030	0.4030	0.0000	1,552.976 4	1,552.976 4	0.3429		1,561.549 2
Total	0.8553	8.0755	10.6913	0.0162		0.4250	0.4250		0.4030	0.4030	0.0000	1,552.976 4	1,552.976 4	0.3429		1,561.549 2

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	3.4600e- 003	2.5300e- 003	0.0394	1.0000e- 004	0.0112	7.0000e- 005	0.0113	2.9600e- 003	7.0000e- 005	3.0300e- 003		10.3344	10.3344	2.8000e- 004	2.5000e- 004	10.4160
Total	3.4600e- 003	2.5300e- 003	0.0394	1.0000e- 004	0.0112	7.0000e- 005	0.0113	2.9600e- 003	7.0000e- 005	3.0300e- 003		10.3344	10.3344	2.8000e- 004	2.5000e- 004	10.4160

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.5 Paving (3152 Future St) - 2022

#### **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Off-Road	0.2592	2.7149	3.2463	4.9000e- 003		0.1323	0.1323		0.1226	0.1226		460.6193	460.6193	0.1407		464.1357
Paving	0.0000					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Total	0.2592	2.7149	3.2463	4.9000e- 003		0.1323	0.1323		0.1226	0.1226		460.6193	460.6193	0.1407		464.1357

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0277	0.0202	0.3149	8.2000e- 004	0.0894	5.7000e- 004	0.0900	0.0237	5.3000e- 004	0.0242		82.6754	82.6754	2.2500e- 003	2.0000e- 003	83.3282
Total	0.0277	0.0202	0.3149	8.2000e- 004	0.0894	5.7000e- 004	0.0900	0.0237	5.3000e- 004	0.0242		82.6754	82.6754	2.2500e- 003	2.0000e- 003	83.3282

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.5 Paving (3152 Future St) - 2022

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	0.2592	2.7149	3.2463	4.9000e- 003		0.1323	0.1323		0.1226	0.1226	0.0000	460.6193	460.6193	0.1407		464.1357
Paving	0.0000					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Total	0.2592	2.7149	3.2463	4.9000e- 003		0.1323	0.1323		0.1226	0.1226	0.0000	460.6193	460.6193	0.1407		464.1357

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0277	0.0202	0.3149	8.2000e- 004	0.0894	5.7000e- 004	0.0900	0.0237	5.3000e- 004	0.0242		82.6754	82.6754	2.2500e- 003	2.0000e- 003	83.3282
Total	0.0277	0.0202	0.3149	8.2000e- 004	0.0894	5.7000e- 004	0.0900	0.0237	5.3000e- 004	0.0242		82.6754	82.6754	2.2500e- 003	2.0000e- 003	83.3282

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.6 Architectural Coating (3152 Future St) - 2022

#### **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Archit. Coating	1.0239	, , ,				0.0000	0.0000	1	0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2045	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e- 003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817		281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062
Total	1.2285	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e- 003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817		281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.6 Architectural Coating (3152 Future St) - 2022

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/d	day		
Archit. Coating	1.0239	, , ,				0.0000	0.0000	, , ,	0.0000	0.0000		1 1 1	0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2045	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e- 003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062
Total	1.2285	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e- 003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.7 Shoring/Piling (3152 Future St) - 2022

# **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Off-Road	0.7986	8.0935	8.8683	0.0196		0.3672	0.3672	1 1 1	0.3379	0.3379		1,892.152 1	1,892.152 1	0.6120		1,907.451 1
Total	0.7986	8.0935	8.8683	0.0196		0.3672	0.3672		0.3379	0.3379		1,892.152 1	1,892.152 1	0.6120		1,907.451 1

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	3.4600e- 003	2.5300e- 003	0.0394	1.0000e- 004	0.0112	7.0000e- 005	0.0113	2.9600e- 003	7.0000e- 005	3.0300e- 003		10.3344	10.3344	2.8000e- 004	2.5000e- 004	10.4160
Total	3.4600e- 003	2.5300e- 003	0.0394	1.0000e- 004	0.0112	7.0000e- 005	0.0113	2.9600e- 003	7.0000e- 005	3.0300e- 003		10.3344	10.3344	2.8000e- 004	2.5000e- 004	10.4160

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.7 Shoring/Piling (3152 Future St) - 2022

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	lay		
Off-Road	0.7986	8.0935	8.8683	0.0196		0.3672	0.3672	- 	0.3379	0.3379	0.0000	1,892.152 1	1,892.152 1	0.6120		1,907.451 1
Total	0.7986	8.0935	8.8683	0.0196		0.3672	0.3672		0.3379	0.3379	0.0000	1,892.152 1	1,892.152 1	0.6120		1,907.451 1

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	day							lb/c	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	3.4600e- 003	2.5300e- 003	0.0394	1.0000e- 004	0.0112	7.0000e- 005	0.0113	2.9600e- 003	7.0000e- 005	3.0300e- 003		10.3344	10.3344	2.8000e- 004	2.5000e- 004	10.4160
Total	3.4600e- 003	2.5300e- 003	0.0394	1.0000e- 004	0.0112	7.0000e- 005	0.0113	2.9600e- 003	7.0000e- 005	3.0300e- 003		10.3344	10.3344	2.8000e- 004	2.5000e- 004	10.4160

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

### 3.8 Site Preparation (3164 Future St) - 2023

#### Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/d	lay		
Fugitive Dust		1 1 1			0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2544	2.4176	4.6538	7.2600e- 003		0.1053	0.1053		0.0969	0.0969		702.2796	702.2796	0.2271		707.9579
Total	0.2544	2.4176	4.6538	7.2600e- 003	0.0000	0.1053	0.1053	0.0000	0.0969	0.0969		702.2796	702.2796	0.2271		707.9579

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0160	0.0112	0.1807	4.9000e- 004	0.0559	3.4000e- 004	0.0562	0.0148	3.1000e- 004	0.0151		50.0038	50.0038	1.2600e- 003	1.1500e- 003	50.3792
Total	0.0160	0.0112	0.1807	4.9000e- 004	0.0559	3.4000e- 004	0.0562	0.0148	3.1000e- 004	0.0151		50.0038	50.0038	1.2600e- 003	1.1500e- 003	50.3792

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

### 3.8 Site Preparation (3164 Future St) - 2023

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/c	day		
Fugitive Dust			1		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2544	2.4176	4.6538	7.2600e- 003		0.1053	0.1053		0.0969	0.0969	0.0000	702.2796	702.2796	0.2271		707.9579
Total	0.2544	2.4176	4.6538	7.2600e- 003	0.0000	0.1053	0.1053	0.0000	0.0969	0.0969	0.0000	702.2796	702.2796	0.2271		707.9579

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0160	0.0112	0.1807	4.9000e- 004	0.0559	3.4000e- 004	0.0562	0.0148	3.1000e- 004	0.0151		50.0038	50.0038	1.2600e- 003	1.1500e- 003	50.3792
Total	0.0160	0.0112	0.1807	4.9000e- 004	0.0559	3.4000e- 004	0.0562	0.0148	3.1000e- 004	0.0151		50.0038	50.0038	1.2600e- 003	1.1500e- 003	50.3792

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.9 Grading (3164 Future St) - 2023

#### **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	lay		
Fugitive Dust		1 1 1			0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2544	2.4176	4.6538	7.2600e- 003		0.1053	0.1053		0.0969	0.0969		702.2796	702.2796	0.2271		707.9579
Total	0.2544	2.4176	4.6538	7.2600e- 003	0.0000	0.1053	0.1053	0.0000	0.0969	0.0969		702.2796	702.2796	0.2271		707.9579

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0160	0.0112	0.1807	4.9000e- 004	0.0559	3.4000e- 004	0.0562	0.0148	3.1000e- 004	0.0151		50.0038	50.0038	1.2600e- 003	1.1500e- 003	50.3792
Total	0.0160	0.0112	0.1807	4.9000e- 004	0.0559	3.4000e- 004	0.0562	0.0148	3.1000e- 004	0.0151		50.0038	50.0038	1.2600e- 003	1.1500e- 003	50.3792

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.9 Grading (3164 Future St) - 2023

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/c	lay		
Fugitive Dust		, , ,	1		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2544	2.4176	4.6538	7.2600e- 003		0.1053	0.1053		0.0969	0.0969	0.0000	702.2796	702.2796	0.2271		707.9579
Total	0.2544	2.4176	4.6538	7.2600e- 003	0.0000	0.1053	0.1053	0.0000	0.0969	0.0969	0.0000	702.2796	702.2796	0.2271		707.9579

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0160	0.0112	0.1807	4.9000e- 004	0.0559	3.4000e- 004	0.0562	0.0148	3.1000e- 004	0.0151		50.0038	50.0038	1.2600e- 003	1.1500e- 003	50.3792
Total	0.0160	0.0112	0.1807	4.9000e- 004	0.0559	3.4000e- 004	0.0562	0.0148	3.1000e- 004	0.0151		50.0038	50.0038	1.2600e- 003	1.1500e- 003	50.3792

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.10 Shoring/Piling (3164 Future St) - 2023

#### Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Off-Road	0.7461	7.3021	8.8205	0.0196		0.3237	0.3237	1 1 1	0.2978	0.2978		1,893.720 7	1,893.720 7	0.6125		1,909.032 4
Total	0.7461	7.3021	8.8205	0.0196		0.3237	0.3237		0.2978	0.2978		1,893.720 7	1,893.720 7	0.6125		1,909.032 4

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e	
Category	lb/day										lb/day						
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
Worker	3.2000e- 003	2.2300e- 003	0.0361	1.0000e- 004	0.0112	7.0000e- 005	0.0112	2.9600e- 003	6.0000e- 005	3.0300e- 003		10.0008	10.0008	2.5000e- 004	2.3000e- 004	10.0758	
Total	3.2000e- 003	2.2300e- 003	0.0361	1.0000e- 004	0.0112	7.0000e- 005	0.0112	2.9600e- 003	6.0000e- 005	3.0300e- 003		10.0008	10.0008	2.5000e- 004	2.3000e- 004	10.0758	

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.10 Shoring/Piling (3164 Future St) - 2023

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	0.7461	7.3021	8.8205	0.0196		0.3237	0.3237	1 1 1	0.2978	0.2978	0.0000	1,893.720 7	1,893.720 7	0.6125		1,909.032 4
Total	0.7461	7.3021	8.8205	0.0196		0.3237	0.3237		0.2978	0.2978	0.0000	1,893.720 7	1,893.720 7	0.6125		1,909.032 4

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	3.2000e- 003	2.2300e- 003	0.0361	1.0000e- 004	0.0112	7.0000e- 005	0.0112	2.9600e- 003	6.0000e- 005	3.0300e- 003		10.0008	10.0008	2.5000e- 004	2.3000e- 004	10.0758
Total	3.2000e- 003	2.2300e- 003	0.0361	1.0000e- 004	0.0112	7.0000e- 005	0.0112	2.9600e- 003	6.0000e- 005	3.0300e- 003		10.0008	10.0008	2.5000e- 004	2.3000e- 004	10.0758
#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 3.11 Building Construction (3164 Future St) - 2023

# **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/d	day		
Off-Road	0.7377	6.9476	10.0686	0.0154		0.3311	0.3311	1 1 1	0.3149	0.3149		1,477.359 1	1,477.359 1	0.3153		1,485.242 3
Total	0.7377	6.9476	10.0686	0.0154		0.3311	0.3311		0.3149	0.3149		1,477.359 1	1,477.359 1	0.3153		1,485.242 3

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	day							lb/c	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	3.2000e- 003	2.2300e- 003	0.0361	1.0000e- 004	0.0112	7.0000e- 005	0.0112	2.9600e- 003	6.0000e- 005	3.0300e- 003		10.0008	10.0008	2.5000e- 004	2.3000e- 004	10.0758
Total	3.2000e- 003	2.2300e- 003	0.0361	1.0000e- 004	0.0112	7.0000e- 005	0.0112	2.9600e- 003	6.0000e- 005	3.0300e- 003		10.0008	10.0008	2.5000e- 004	2.3000e- 004	10.0758

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 3.11 Building Construction (3164 Future St) - 2023

## **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	0.7377	6.9476	10.0686	0.0154		0.3311	0.3311	1 1 1	0.3149	0.3149	0.0000	1,477.359 1	1,477.359 1	0.3153		1,485.242 3
Total	0.7377	6.9476	10.0686	0.0154		0.3311	0.3311		0.3149	0.3149	0.0000	1,477.359 1	1,477.359 1	0.3153		1,485.242 3

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	day							lb/c	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	3.2000e- 003	2.2300e- 003	0.0361	1.0000e- 004	0.0112	7.0000e- 005	0.0112	2.9600e- 003	6.0000e- 005	3.0300e- 003		10.0008	10.0008	2.5000e- 004	2.3000e- 004	10.0758
Total	3.2000e- 003	2.2300e- 003	0.0361	1.0000e- 004	0.0112	7.0000e- 005	0.0112	2.9600e- 003	6.0000e- 005	3.0300e- 003		10.0008	10.0008	2.5000e- 004	2.3000e- 004	10.0758

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 3.12 Paving (3164 Future St) - 2023

#### **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	0.2434	2.5462	3.2318	4.8900e- 003		0.1174	0.1174		0.1089	0.1089		459.9049	459.9049	0.1404		463.4155
Paving	0.0000		1			0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Total	0.2434	2.5462	3.2318	4.8900e- 003		0.1174	0.1174		0.1089	0.1089		459.9049	459.9049	0.1404		463.4155

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0256	0.0179	0.2891	7.9000e- 004	0.0894	5.4000e- 004	0.0900	0.0237	5.0000e- 004	0.0242		80.0060	80.0060	2.0200e- 003	1.8500e- 003	80.6067
Total	0.0256	0.0179	0.2891	7.9000e- 004	0.0894	5.4000e- 004	0.0900	0.0237	5.0000e- 004	0.0242		80.0060	80.0060	2.0200e- 003	1.8500e- 003	80.6067

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 3.12 Paving (3164 Future St) - 2023

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Off-Road	0.2434	2.5462	3.2318	4.8900e- 003		0.1174	0.1174		0.1089	0.1089	0.0000	459.9049	459.9049	0.1404		463.4155
Paving	0.0000	1				0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Total	0.2434	2.5462	3.2318	4.8900e- 003		0.1174	0.1174		0.1089	0.1089	0.0000	459.9049	459.9049	0.1404		463.4155

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0256	0.0179	0.2891	7.9000e- 004	0.0894	5.4000e- 004	0.0900	0.0237	5.0000e- 004	0.0242		80.0060	80.0060	2.0200e- 003	1.8500e- 003	80.6067
Total	0.0256	0.0179	0.2891	7.9000e- 004	0.0894	5.4000e- 004	0.0900	0.0237	5.0000e- 004	0.0242		80.0060	80.0060	2.0200e- 003	1.8500e- 003	80.6067

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 3.13 Architectural Coatings (3164 Future St) - 2023

## **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Archit. Coating	1.0727					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.1917	1.3030	1.8111	2.9700e- 003		0.0708	0.0708		0.0708	0.0708		281.4481	281.4481	0.0168		281.8690
Total	1.2643	1.3030	1.8111	2.9700e- 003		0.0708	0.0708		0.0708	0.0708		281.4481	281.4481	0.0168		281.8690

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 3.13 Architectural Coatings (3164 Future St) - 2023

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Archit. Coating	1.0727	, , ,	1			0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		1 1 1	0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.1917	1.3030	1.8111	2.9700e- 003		0.0708	0.0708		0.0708	0.0708	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0168		281.8690
Total	1.2643	1.3030	1.8111	2.9700e- 003		0.0708	0.0708		0.0708	0.0708	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0168		281.8690

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile

## 4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Mitigated	0.0576	0.0585	0.5883	1.3100e- 003	0.1373	9.3000e- 004	0.1382	0.0366	8.6000e- 004	0.0374		133.8954	133.8954	8.6900e- 003	5.3500e- 003	135.7064
Unmitigated	0.0576	0.0585	0.5883	1.3100e- 003	0.1373	9.3000e- 004	0.1382	0.0366	8.6000e- 004	0.0374		133.8954	133.8954	8.6900e- 003	5.3500e- 003	135.7064

## **4.2 Trip Summary Information**

	Aver	age Daily Trip Ra	te	Unmitigated	Mitigated
Land Use	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
Single Family Housing	18.88	19.08	17.10	63,745	63,745
Total	18.88	19.08	17.10	63,745	63,745

## 4.3 Trip Type Information

		Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpos	se %
Land Use	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
Single Family Housing	14.70	5.90	8.70	40.20	19.20	40.60	86	11	3

## 4.4 Fleet Mix

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Single Family Housing	0.542464	0.063735	0.188241	0.126899	0.023249	0.006239	0.010717	0.008079	0.000923	0.000604	0.024795	0.000702	0.003352

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

## 5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

Exceed Title 24

Install High Efficiency Lighting

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	Jay		
NaturalGas Mitigated	1.6300e- 003	0.0139	5.9300e- 003	9.0000e- 005		1.1300e- 003	1.1300e- 003		1.1300e- 003	1.1300e- 003		17.8011	17.8011	3.4000e- 004	3.3000e- 004	17.9069
NaturalGas Unmitigated	1.6300e- 003	0.0139	5.9300e- 003	9.0000e- 005		1.1300e- 003	1.1300e- 003		1.1300e- 003	1.1300e- 003		17.8011	17.8011	3.4000e- 004	3.3000e- 004	17.9069

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

#### 5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

**Unmitigated** 

	NaturalGa s Use	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Single Family Housing	151.31	1.6300e- 003	0.0139	5.9300e- 003	9.0000e- 005		1.1300e- 003	1.1300e- 003		1.1300e- 003	1.1300e- 003		17.8011	17.8011	3.4000e- 004	3.3000e- 004	17.9069
Total		1.6300e- 003	0.0139	5.9300e- 003	9.0000e- 005		1.1300e- 003	1.1300e- 003		1.1300e- 003	1.1300e- 003		17.8011	17.8011	3.4000e- 004	3.3000e- 004	17.9069

## Mitigated

	NaturalGa s Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr					lb/e	day							lb/c	day		
Single Family Housing	0.15131	1.6300e- 003	0.0139	5.9300e- 003	9.0000e- 005		1.1300e- 003	1.1300e- 003		1.1300e- 003	1.1300e- 003		17.8011	17.8011	3.4000e- 004	3.3000e- 004	17.9069
Total		1.6300e- 003	0.0139	5.9300e- 003	9.0000e- 005		1.1300e- 003	1.1300e- 003		1.1300e- 003	1.1300e- 003		17.8011	17.8011	3.4000e- 004	3.3000e- 004	17.9069

# 6.0 Area Detail

#### 6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

No Hearths Installed

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/d	day		
Mitigated	0.0824	1.9000e- 003	0.1649	1.0000e- 005		9.1000e- 004	9.1000e- 004		9.1000e- 004	9.1000e- 004	0.0000	0.2971	0.2971	2.9000e- 004	0.0000	0.3042
Unmitigated	0.6065	0.0434	1.1820	2.6000e- 003		0.1537	0.1537		0.1537	0.1537	18.7338	36.2971	55.0309	0.0562	1.2700e- 003	56.8137

# 6.2 Area by SubCategory

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					lb/d	day							lb/c	lay		
Architectural Coating	6.1700e- 003					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Consumer Products	0.0713					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Hearth	0.5241	0.0415	1.0171	2.5900e- 003		0.1528	0.1528		0.1528	0.1528	18.7338	36.0000	54.7338	0.0559	1.2700e- 003	56.5095
Landscaping	4.9600e- 003	1.9000e- 003	0.1649	1.0000e- 005		9.1000e- 004	9.1000e- 004		9.1000e- 004	9.1000e- 004		0.2971	0.2971	2.9000e- 004		0.3042
Total	0.6065	0.0434	1.1820	2.6000e- 003		0.1537	0.1537		0.1537	0.1537	18.7338	36.2971	55.0309	0.0562	1.2700e- 003	56.8137

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 6.2 Area by SubCategory

#### Mitigated

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					lb/e	day							lb/e	day		
Architectural Coating	6.1700e- 003					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Consumer Products	0.0713					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Hearth	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Landscaping	4.9600e- 003	1.9000e- 003	0.1649	1.0000e- 005		9.1000e- 004	9.1000e- 004		9.1000e- 004	9.1000e- 004		0.2971	0.2971	2.9000e- 004		0.3042
Total	0.0824	1.9000e- 003	0.1649	1.0000e- 005		9.1000e- 004	9.1000e- 004		9.1000e- 004	9.1000e- 004	0.0000	0.2971	0.2971	2.9000e- 004	0.0000	0.3042

# 7.0 Water Detail

## 7.1 Mitigation Measures Water

Install Low Flow Bathroom Faucet

Install Low Flow Kitchen Faucet

Install Low Flow Toilet

Install Low Flow Shower

Use Water Efficient Landscaping

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 8.0 Waste Detail

8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

## 9.0 Operational Offroad

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type

## **10.0 Stationary Equipment**

#### Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	-----------	------------	-------------	-------------	-----------

#### **Boilers**

Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type

#### **User Defined Equipment**

Equipment Type

Number

## **11.0 Vegetation**

APPENDIX A-2:

# CALEEMOD WORKSHEETS FOR 3152 AND 3164 FUTURE STREET

# (ANNUAL EMISSIONS)

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## **Future Street Single Family**

Los Angeles-South Coast County, Annual

## **1.0 Project Characteristics**

#### 1.1 Land Usage

Land	I Uses	Size		Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Single Far	nily Housing	2.00		Dwelling Unit	0.65	3,600.00	6
1.2 Other Proj	ect Characterist	ics					
Urbanization	Urban	Wind Speed (m/s)	2.2	Precipitation Freq (D	<b>ays)</b> 33		
Climate Zone	12			Operational Year	2024		
Utility Company	Los Angeles Departn	nent of Water & Power					
CO2 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	691.98	CH4 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.033	N2O Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.004		

## 1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

Project Characteristics -

Land Use -

Construction Phase - Construction times are estimated.

Off-road Equipment - Construction equipment estimated based on observations made of similar development.

Off-road Equipment - Construction equipment estimated based on observations made of similar development.

Off-road Equipment - Construction equipment estimated based on observations made of similar development.

Off-road Equipment - Construction equipment estimated based on observations made of similar development.

Off-road Equipment -

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

Off-road Equipment - Construction equipment estimated based on observations made of similar development.

Off-road Equipment - Construction equipment estimated based on observations made of similar development.

Off-road Equipment -

Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation -

Mobile Land Use Mitigation -

Area Mitigation -

Energy Mitigation -

Water Mitigation -

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblConstDustMitigation	WaterUnpavedRoadVehicleSpeed	0	15
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	5.00	22.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	100.00	152.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	2.00	20.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	5.00	22.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	1.00	21.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	100.00	23.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	1.00	22.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	2.00	20.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	100.00	23.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	100.00	152.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	5.00	22.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	5.00	21.00
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	6/22/2022	12/31/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	6/8/2022	10/31/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	1/19/2022	2/28/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	6/15/2022	11/30/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	1/17/2022	1/31/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	6/16/2022	12/1/2022

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	1/20/2022	4/1/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	1/18/2022	2/1/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	6/9/2022	11/1/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	1/15/2022	1/1/2022
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.50	0.50
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.38	0.38
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.37	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.37	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.38	0.38
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.50	0.50
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.38	0.38
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.38	0.38
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.37	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.37	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.37	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.37	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.37	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Bore/Drill Rigs
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Aerial Lifts
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Excavators
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Excavators
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Forklifts
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Concrete/Industrial Saws
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Concrete/Industrial Saws
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Excavators
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Bore/Drill Rigs
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Excavators
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Cement and Mortar Mixers
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Excavators
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Aerial Lifts
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Rollers
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Excavators
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Skid Steer Loaders
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentType		Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	4.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	4.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	2.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	2.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	6.00	8.00

2.0 Emissions Summary

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 2.1 Overall Construction

## **Unmitigated Construction**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
2022	0.0971	0.8084	1.0757	1.7200e- 003	3.0500e- 003	0.0414	0.0444	8.1000e- 004	0.0391	0.0399	0.0000	149.7479	149.7479	0.0359	7.0000e- 005	150.6658
2023	0.0868	0.7052	1.0285	1.6600e- 003	3.0700e- 003	0.0332	0.0362	8.2000e- 004	0.0314	0.0322	0.0000	144.7106	144.7106	0.0341	6.0000e- 005	145.5816
Maximum	0.0971	0.8084	1.0757	1.7200e- 003	3.0700e- 003	0.0414	0.0444	8.2000e- 004	0.0391	0.0399	0.0000	149.7479	149.7479	0.0359	7.0000e- 005	150.6658

## Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
2022	0.0971	0.8084	1.0757	1.7200e- 003	3.0500e- 003	0.0414	0.0444	8.1000e- 004	0.0391	0.0399	0.0000	149.7477	149.7477	0.0359	7.0000e- 005	150.6656
2023	0.0868	0.7052	1.0285	1.6600e- 003	3.0700e- 003	0.0332	0.0362	8.2000e- 004	0.0314	0.0322	0.0000	144.7104	144.7104	0.0341	6.0000e- 005	145.5815
Maximum	0.0971	0.8084	1.0757	1.7200e- 003	3.0700e- 003	0.0414	0.0444	8.2000e- 004	0.0391	0.0399	0.0000	149.7477	149.7477	0.0359	7.0000e- 005	150.6656

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Quarter	Start Date	End Date	Maximum Unmitigated ROG + NOX (tons/quarter)	Maximum Mitigated ROG + NOX (tons/quarter)
1	1-1-2022	3-31-2022	0.1619	0.1619
2	4-1-2022	6-30-2022	0.2904	0.2904
3	7-1-2022	9-30-2022	0.2936	0.2936
4	10-1-2022	12-31-2022	0.1606	0.1606
5	1-1-2023	3-31-2023	0.1461	0.1461
6	4-1-2023	6-30-2023	0.2500	0.2500
7	7-1-2023	9-30-2023	0.2527	0.2527
		Highest	0.2936	0.2936

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 2.2 Overall Operational

#### Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category			MT/yr													
Area	0.0213	7.6000e- 004	0.0333	3.0000e- 005		2.0200e- 003	2.0200e- 003		2.0200e- 003	2.0200e- 003	0.2124	0.4419	0.6544	6.7000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	0.6753
Energy	3.0000e- 004	2.5400e- 003	1.0800e- 003	2.0000e- 005		2.1000e- 004	2.1000e- 004		2.1000e- 004	2.1000e- 004	0.0000	7.8970	7.8970	2.9000e- 004	8.0000e- 005	7.9289
Mobile	9.9000e- 003	0.0114	0.1033	2.3000e- 004	0.0240	1.7000e- 004	0.0241	6.3900e- 003	1.5000e- 004	6.5400e- 003	0.0000	20.9187	20.9187	1.4300e- 003	9.1000e- 004	21.2249
Waste						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.4994	0.0000	0.4994	0.0295	0.0000	1.2371
Water						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0413	0.8190	0.8604	4.2900e- 003	1.0000e- 004	0.9988
Total	0.0315	0.0147	0.1377	2.8000e- 004	0.0240	2.4000e- 003	0.0263	6.3900e- 003	2.3800e- 003	8.7700e- 003	0.7531	30.0767	30.8298	0.0362	1.1000e- 003	32.0650

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 2.2 Overall Operational

#### Mitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Area	0.0148	2.4000e- 004	0.0206	0.0000		1.1000e- 004	1.1000e- 004		1.1000e- 004	1.1000e- 004	0.0000	0.0337	0.0337	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	0.0345
Energy	3.0000e- 004	2.5400e- 003	1.0800e- 003	2.0000e- 005		2.1000e- 004	2.1000e- 004		2.1000e- 004	2.1000e- 004	0.0000	7.8970	7.8970	2.9000e- 004	8.0000e- 005	7.9289
Mobile	9.9000e- 003	0.0114	0.1033	2.3000e- 004	0.0240	1.7000e- 004	0.0241	6.3900e- 003	1.5000e- 004	6.5400e- 003	0.0000	20.9187	20.9187	1.4300e- 003	9.1000e- 004	21.2249
Waste	ri — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.4994	0.0000	0.4994	0.0295	0.0000	1.2371
Water	n — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0331	0.7125	0.7456	3.4300e- 003	8.0000e- 005	0.8565
Total	0.0250	0.0142	0.1250	2.5000e- 004	0.0240	4.9000e- 004	0.0244	6.3900e- 003	4.7000e- 004	6.8600e- 003	0.5324	29.5619	30.0944	0.0347	1.0700e- 003	31.2819

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	20.82	3.54	9.23	10.71	0.00	79.58	7.25	0.00	80.25	21.78	29.31	1.71	2.39	4.14	2.73	2.44

# **3.0 Construction Detail**

#### **Construction Phase**

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Site Preparation (3152 Future St)	Site Preparation	1/1/2022	1/31/2022	5	21	
2	Grading (3152 Future St)	Grading	2/1/2022	2/28/2022	5	20	
3	Building Construction (3152 Future St)	Building Construction	4/1/2022	10/31/2022	5	152	

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

4	Paving (3152 Future St)	Paving	11/1/2022	11/30/2022	5	22	
5	Architectural Coating (3152 Future St)	Architectural Coating	12/1/2022	12/31/2022	5	22	
6	Shoring/Piling (3152 Future St)	Building Construction	3/1/2022	3/31/2022	5	23	
7	Site Preparation (3164 Future St)	Site Preparation	1/1/2023	1/31/2023	5	22	
8	Grading (3164 Future St)	Grading	2/1/2023	2/28/2023	5	20	
9	Shoring/Piling (3164 Future St)	Building Construction	3/1/2023	3/31/2023	5	23	
10	Building Construction (3164 Future St)	Building Construction	4/1/2023	10/31/2023	5	152	
11	Paving (3164 Future St)	Paving	11/1/2023	11/30/2023	5	22	
12	Architectural Coatings (3164 Future St)	Architectural Coating	12/1/2023	12/31/2023	5	21	

#### Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 0

#### Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 0

#### Acres of Paving: 0

Residential Indoor: 7,290; Residential Outdoor: 2,430; Non-Residential Indoor: 0; Non-Residential Outdoor: 0; Striped Parking Area: 0 (Architectural Coating – sqft)

#### OffRoad Equipment

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Architectural Coating (3152 Future St)	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48
Paving (3152 Future St)	Cement and Mortar Mixers	1	6.00	9	0.56
Architectural Coatings (3164 Future St)	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48
Paving (3152 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	1	8.00	65	0.37
Shoring/Piling (3152 Future St)	Bore/Drill Rigs	1	6.00	221	0.50
Building Construction (3152 Future St)	Aerial Lifts	1	8.00	63	0.31
Grading (3152 Future St)	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Shoring/Piling (3152 Future St)	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Paving (3152 Future St)	Rollers	1	7.00	80	0.38
Paving (3164 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	1	8.00	65	0.37

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

Building Construction (3152 Future St)	Forklifts	2	8.00	89	0.20
Shoring/Piling (3152 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	1	8.00	65	0.37
Building Construction (3164 Future St)	Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	8.00	81	0.73
Building Construction (3152 Future St)	Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	8.00	81	0.73
Site Preparation (3164 Future St)	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Grading (3152 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	1	8.00	65	0.37
Shoring/Piling (3152 Future St)	Cranes	1	4.00	231	0.29
Shoring/Piling (3164 Future St)	Cranes	1	4.00	231	0.29
Building Construction (3164 Future St)	Forklifts	2	6.00	89	0.20
Shoring/Piling (3152 Future St)	Forklifts	2	6.00	89	0.20
Shoring/Piling (3164 Future St)	Forklifts	2	6.00	89	0.20
Shoring/Piling (3164 Future St)	Bore/Drill Rigs	1	6.00	221	0.50
Grading (3164 Future St)	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Paving (3164 Future St)	Cement and Mortar Mixers	1	6.00	9	0.56
Shoring/Piling (3164 Future St)	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Building Construction (3164 Future St)	Aerial Lifts	1	8.00	63	0.31
Site Preparation (3164 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	1	8.00	65	0.37
Paving (3164 Future St)	Rollers	1	7.00	80	0.38
Shoring/Piling (3164 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	1	8.00	65	0.37
Grading (3164 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	1	8.00	65	0.37
Site Preparation (3152 Future St)	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Site Preparation (3152 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	1	8.00	65	0.37
Building Construction (3152 Future St)	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.00	97	0.37
Building Construction (3152 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	1	8.00	65	0.37
Building Construction (3164 Future St)	Skid Steer Loaders	1	8.00	65	0.37
Building Construction (3164 Future St)	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.00	97	0.37

Trips and VMT

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Shoring/Piling (3152	6	1.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Site Preparation (3152	2	5.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading (3152 Future	2	5.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	6	1.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving (3152 Future	3	8.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coating	1	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Site Preparation (3164	2	5.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading (3164 Future	2	5.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Shoring/Piling (3164	6	1.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	6	1.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving (3164 Future	3	8.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coatings (3164 Euture St)	1	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

#### **3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction**

Water Exposed Area

Reduce Vehicle Speed on Unpaved Roads

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 3.2 Site Preparation (3152 Future St) - 2022

## Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Fugitive Dust					0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.8600e- 003	0.0284	0.0487	8.0000e- 005		1.2600e- 003	1.2600e- 003		1.1600e- 003	1.1600e- 003	0.0000	6.6717	6.6717	2.1600e- 003	0.0000	6.7256
Total	2.8600e- 003	0.0284	0.0487	8.0000e- 005	0.0000	1.2600e- 003	1.2600e- 003	0.0000	1.1600e- 003	1.1600e- 003	0.0000	6.6717	6.6717	2.1600e- 003	0.0000	6.7256

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr			MT/yr							
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.8000e- 004	1.5000e- 004	1.9500e- 003	1.0000e- 005	5.8000e- 004	0.0000	5.8000e- 004	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.4732	0.4732	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4773
Total	1.8000e- 004	1.5000e- 004	1.9500e- 003	1.0000e- 005	5.8000e- 004	0.0000	5.8000e- 004	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.4732	0.4732	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4773

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 3.2 Site Preparation (3152 Future St) - 2022

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Fugitive Dust		1 1 1	1		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.8600e- 003	0.0284	0.0487	8.0000e- 005		1.2600e- 003	1.2600e- 003	1 1 1	1.1600e- 003	1.1600e- 003	0.0000	6.6717	6.6717	2.1600e- 003	0.0000	6.7256
Total	2.8600e- 003	0.0284	0.0487	8.0000e- 005	0.0000	1.2600e- 003	1.2600e- 003	0.0000	1.1600e- 003	1.1600e- 003	0.0000	6.6717	6.6717	2.1600e- 003	0.0000	6.7256

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category				tons/yr MT/yr												
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.8000e- 004	1.5000e- 004	1.9500e- 003	1.0000e- 005	5.8000e- 004	0.0000	5.8000e- 004	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.4732	0.4732	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4773
Total	1.8000e- 004	1.5000e- 004	1.9500e- 003	1.0000e- 005	5.8000e- 004	0.0000	5.8000e- 004	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.4732	0.4732	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4773

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.3 Grading (3152 Future St) - 2022

## **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Fugitive Dust					0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.7200e- 003	0.0271	0.0464	7.0000e- 005		1.2000e- 003	1.2000e- 003		1.1100e- 003	1.1100e- 003	0.0000	6.3540	6.3540	2.0600e- 003	0.0000	6.4054
Total	2.7200e- 003	0.0271	0.0464	7.0000e- 005	0.0000	1.2000e- 003	1.2000e- 003	0.0000	1.1100e- 003	1.1100e- 003	0.0000	6.3540	6.3540	2.0600e- 003	0.0000	6.4054

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category																
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.7000e- 004	1.4000e- 004	1.8500e- 003	0.0000	5.5000e- 004	0.0000	5.5000e- 004	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	0.4506	0.4506	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4546
Total	1.7000e- 004	1.4000e- 004	1.8500e- 003	0.0000	5.5000e- 004	0.0000	5.5000e- 004	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	0.4506	0.4506	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4546

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 3.3 Grading (3152 Future St) - 2022

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Fugitive Dust		1 1 1	1		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.7200e- 003	0.0271	0.0464	7.0000e- 005		1.2000e- 003	1.2000e- 003		1.1100e- 003	1.1100e- 003	0.0000	6.3540	6.3540	2.0600e- 003	0.0000	6.4054
Total	2.7200e- 003	0.0271	0.0464	7.0000e- 005	0.0000	1.2000e- 003	1.2000e- 003	0.0000	1.1100e- 003	1.1100e- 003	0.0000	6.3540	6.3540	2.0600e- 003	0.0000	6.4054

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.7000e- 004	1.4000e- 004	1.8500e- 003	0.0000	5.5000e- 004	0.0000	5.5000e- 004	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	0.4506	0.4506	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4546
Total	1.7000e- 004	1.4000e- 004	1.8500e- 003	0.0000	5.5000e- 004	0.0000	5.5000e- 004	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	0.4506	0.4506	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4546

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.4 Building Construction (3152 Future St) - 2022

## **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.0650	0.6137	0.8125	1.2300e- 003		0.0323	0.0323	1 1 1	0.0306	0.0306	0.0000	107.0716	107.0716	0.0236	0.0000	107.6626
Total	0.0650	0.6137	0.8125	1.2300e- 003		0.0323	0.0323		0.0306	0.0306	0.0000	107.0716	107.0716	0.0236	0.0000	107.6626

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.6000e- 004	2.2000e- 004	2.8200e- 003	1.0000e- 005	8.3000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	8.4000e- 004	2.2000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	2.3000e- 004	0.0000	0.6849	0.6849	2.0000e- 005	2.0000e- 005	0.6910
Total	2.6000e- 004	2.2000e- 004	2.8200e- 003	1.0000e- 005	8.3000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	8.4000e- 004	2.2000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	2.3000e- 004	0.0000	0.6849	0.6849	2.0000e- 005	2.0000e- 005	0.6910

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.4 Building Construction (3152 Future St) - 2022

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.0650	0.6137	0.8125	1.2300e- 003		0.0323	0.0323	1 1 1	0.0306	0.0306	0.0000	107.0714	107.0714	0.0236	0.0000	107.6625
Total	0.0650	0.6137	0.8125	1.2300e- 003		0.0323	0.0323		0.0306	0.0306	0.0000	107.0714	107.0714	0.0236	0.0000	107.6625

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.6000e- 004	2.2000e- 004	2.8200e- 003	1.0000e- 005	8.3000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	8.4000e- 004	2.2000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	2.3000e- 004	0.0000	0.6849	0.6849	2.0000e- 005	2.0000e- 005	0.6910
Total	2.6000e- 004	2.2000e- 004	2.8200e- 003	1.0000e- 005	8.3000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	8.4000e- 004	2.2000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	2.3000e- 004	0.0000	0.6849	0.6849	2.0000e- 005	2.0000e- 005	0.6910

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.5 Paving (3152 Future St) - 2022

## **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	2.8500e- 003	0.0299	0.0357	5.0000e- 005		1.4600e- 003	1.4600e- 003	1	1.3500e- 003	1.3500e- 003	0.0000	4.5965	4.5965	1.4000e- 003	0.0000	4.6316
Paving	0.0000					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	2.8500e- 003	0.0299	0.0357	5.0000e- 005		1.4600e- 003	1.4600e- 003		1.3500e- 003	1.3500e- 003	0.0000	4.5965	4.5965	1.4000e- 003	0.0000	4.6316

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	3.0000e- 004	2.5000e- 004	3.2600e- 003	1.0000e- 005	9.6000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	9.7000e- 004	2.6000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	2.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.7931	0.7931	2.0000e- 005	2.0000e- 005	0.8001
Total	3.0000e- 004	2.5000e- 004	3.2600e- 003	1.0000e- 005	9.6000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	9.7000e- 004	2.6000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	2.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.7931	0.7931	2.0000e- 005	2.0000e- 005	0.8001

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.5 Paving (3152 Future St) - 2022

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	2.8500e- 003	0.0299	0.0357	5.0000e- 005		1.4600e- 003	1.4600e- 003	1	1.3500e- 003	1.3500e- 003	0.0000	4.5965	4.5965	1.4000e- 003	0.0000	4.6316
Paving	0.0000					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	2.8500e- 003	0.0299	0.0357	5.0000e- 005		1.4600e- 003	1.4600e- 003		1.3500e- 003	1.3500e- 003	0.0000	4.5965	4.5965	1.4000e- 003	0.0000	4.6316

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	3.0000e- 004	2.5000e- 004	3.2600e- 003	1.0000e- 005	9.6000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	9.7000e- 004	2.6000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	2.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.7931	0.7931	2.0000e- 005	2.0000e- 005	0.8001
Total	3.0000e- 004	2.5000e- 004	3.2600e- 003	1.0000e- 005	9.6000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	9.7000e- 004	2.6000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	2.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.7931	0.7931	2.0000e- 005	2.0000e- 005	0.8001

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 3.6 Architectural Coating (3152 Future St) - 2022

## **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Archit. Coating	0.0113					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.2500e- 003	0.0155	0.0200	3.0000e- 005		9.0000e- 004	9.0000e- 004		9.0000e- 004	9.0000e- 004	0.0000	2.8086	2.8086	1.8000e- 004	0.0000	2.8132
Total	0.0135	0.0155	0.0200	3.0000e- 005		9.0000e- 004	9.0000e- 004		9.0000e- 004	9.0000e- 004	0.0000	2.8086	2.8086	1.8000e- 004	0.0000	2.8132

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	'/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 3.6 Architectural Coating (3152 Future St) - 2022

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Archit. Coating	0.0113	1 1 1	1 1 1			0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.2500e- 003	0.0155	0.0200	3.0000e- 005		9.0000e- 004	9.0000e- 004		9.0000e- 004	9.0000e- 004	0.0000	2.8086	2.8086	1.8000e- 004	0.0000	2.8132
Total	0.0135	0.0155	0.0200	3.0000e- 005		9.0000e- 004	9.0000e- 004		9.0000e- 004	9.0000e- 004	0.0000	2.8086	2.8086	1.8000e- 004	0.0000	2.8132

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e	
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr						
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
Worker	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
Total	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 3.7 Shoring/Piling (3152 Future St) - 2022

## **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e	
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr						
Off-Road	9.1800e- 003	0.0931	0.1020	2.2000e- 004		4.2200e- 003	4.2200e- 003		3.8900e- 003	3.8900e- 003	0.0000	19.7401	19.7401	6.3800e- 003	0.0000	19.8997	
Total	9.1800e- 003	0.0931	0.1020	2.2000e- 004		4.2200e- 003	4.2200e- 003		3.8900e- 003	3.8900e- 003	0.0000	19.7401	19.7401	6.3800e- 003	0.0000	19.8997	

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e	
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr						
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
Worker	4.0000e- 005	3.0000e- 005	4.3000e- 004	0.0000	1.3000e- 004	0.0000	1.3000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	0.1036	0.1036	0.0000	0.0000	0.1046	
Total	4.0000e- 005	3.0000e- 005	4.3000e- 004	0.0000	1.3000e- 004	0.0000	1.3000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	0.1036	0.1036	0.0000	0.0000	0.1046	

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 3.7 Shoring/Piling (3152 Future St) - 2022

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e	
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr						
Off-Road	9.1800e- 003	0.0931	0.1020	2.2000e- 004		4.2200e- 003	4.2200e- 003	- 	3.8900e- 003	3.8900e- 003	0.0000	19.7401	19.7401	6.3800e- 003	0.0000	19.8997	
Total	9.1800e- 003	0.0931	0.1020	2.2000e- 004		4.2200e- 003	4.2200e- 003		3.8900e- 003	3.8900e- 003	0.0000	19.7401	19.7401	6.3800e- 003	0.0000	19.8997	

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e	
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr						
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
Worker	4.0000e- 005	3.0000e- 005	4.3000e- 004	0.0000	1.3000e- 004	0.0000	1.3000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	0.1036	0.1036	0.0000	0.0000	0.1046	
Total	4.0000e- 005	3.0000e- 005	4.3000e- 004	0.0000	1.3000e- 004	0.0000	1.3000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	0.1036	0.1036	0.0000	0.0000	0.1046	
### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.8 Site Preparation (3164 Future St) - 2023

# Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Fugitive Dust		1 1 1			0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.8000e- 003	0.0266	0.0512	8.0000e- 005		1.1600e- 003	1.1600e- 003		1.0700e- 003	1.0700e- 003	0.0000	7.0081	7.0081	2.2700e- 003	0.0000	7.0647
Total	2.8000e- 003	0.0266	0.0512	8.0000e- 005	0.0000	1.1600e- 003	1.1600e- 003	0.0000	1.0700e- 003	1.0700e- 003	0.0000	7.0081	7.0081	2.2700e- 003	0.0000	7.0647

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.7000e- 004	1.4000e- 004	1.8700e- 003	1.0000e- 005	6.0000e- 004	0.0000	6.1000e- 004	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.4797	0.4797	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4838
Total	1.7000e- 004	1.4000e- 004	1.8700e- 003	1.0000e- 005	6.0000e- 004	0.0000	6.1000e- 004	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.4797	0.4797	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4838

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.8 Site Preparation (3164 Future St) - 2023

### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Fugitive Dust					0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.8000e- 003	0.0266	0.0512	8.0000e- 005		1.1600e- 003	1.1600e- 003		1.0700e- 003	1.0700e- 003	0.0000	7.0081	7.0081	2.2700e- 003	0.0000	7.0647
Total	2.8000e- 003	0.0266	0.0512	8.0000e- 005	0.0000	1.1600e- 003	1.1600e- 003	0.0000	1.0700e- 003	1.0700e- 003	0.0000	7.0081	7.0081	2.2700e- 003	0.0000	7.0647

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.7000e- 004	1.4000e- 004	1.8700e- 003	1.0000e- 005	6.0000e- 004	0.0000	6.1000e- 004	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.4797	0.4797	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4838
Total	1.7000e- 004	1.4000e- 004	1.8700e- 003	1.0000e- 005	6.0000e- 004	0.0000	6.1000e- 004	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.4797	0.4797	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4838

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.9 Grading (3164 Future St) - 2023

### **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Fugitive Dust					0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.5400e- 003	0.0242	0.0465	7.0000e- 005		1.0500e- 003	1.0500e- 003		9.7000e- 004	9.7000e- 004	0.0000	6.3710	6.3710	2.0600e- 003	0.0000	6.4225
Total	2.5400e- 003	0.0242	0.0465	7.0000e- 005	0.0000	1.0500e- 003	1.0500e- 003	0.0000	9.7000e- 004	9.7000e- 004	0.0000	6.3710	6.3710	2.0600e- 003	0.0000	6.4225

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.6000e- 004	1.3000e- 004	1.7000e- 003	0.0000	5.5000e- 004	0.0000	5.5000e- 004	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	0.4361	0.4361	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4398
Total	1.6000e- 004	1.3000e- 004	1.7000e- 003	0.0000	5.5000e- 004	0.0000	5.5000e- 004	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	0.4361	0.4361	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4398

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.9 Grading (3164 Future St) - 2023

### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Fugitive Dust		1 1 1	, , ,	, , ,	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.5400e- 003	0.0242	0.0465	7.0000e- 005		1.0500e- 003	1.0500e- 003	1 1 1	9.7000e- 004	9.7000e- 004	0.0000	6.3710	6.3710	2.0600e- 003	0.0000	6.4225
Total	2.5400e- 003	0.0242	0.0465	7.0000e- 005	0.0000	1.0500e- 003	1.0500e- 003	0.0000	9.7000e- 004	9.7000e- 004	0.0000	6.3710	6.3710	2.0600e- 003	0.0000	6.4225

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.6000e- 004	1.3000e- 004	1.7000e- 003	0.0000	5.5000e- 004	0.0000	5.5000e- 004	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	0.4361	0.4361	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4398
Total	1.6000e- 004	1.3000e- 004	1.7000e- 003	0.0000	5.5000e- 004	0.0000	5.5000e- 004	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	0.4361	0.4361	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4398

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.10 Shoring/Piling (3164 Future St) - 2023

# Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	8.5800e- 003	0.0840	0.1014	2.3000e- 004		3.7200e- 003	3.7200e- 003		3.4200e- 003	3.4200e- 003	0.0000	19.7565	19.7565	6.3900e- 003	0.0000	19.9162
Total	8.5800e- 003	0.0840	0.1014	2.3000e- 004		3.7200e- 003	3.7200e- 003		3.4200e- 003	3.4200e- 003	0.0000	19.7565	19.7565	6.3900e- 003	0.0000	19.9162

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					tons	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	4.0000e- 005	3.0000e- 005	3.9000e- 004	0.0000	1.3000e- 004	0.0000	1.3000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	0.1003	0.1003	0.0000	0.0000	0.1012
Total	4.0000e- 005	3.0000e- 005	3.9000e- 004	0.0000	1.3000e- 004	0.0000	1.3000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	0.1003	0.1003	0.0000	0.0000	0.1012

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.10 Shoring/Piling (3164 Future St) - 2023

### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	8.5800e- 003	0.0840	0.1014	2.3000e- 004		3.7200e- 003	3.7200e- 003		3.4200e- 003	3.4200e- 003	0.0000	19.7565	19.7565	6.3900e- 003	0.0000	19.9162
Total	8.5800e- 003	0.0840	0.1014	2.3000e- 004		3.7200e- 003	3.7200e- 003		3.4200e- 003	3.4200e- 003	0.0000	19.7565	19.7565	6.3900e- 003	0.0000	19.9162

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	'/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	4.0000e- 005	3.0000e- 005	3.9000e- 004	0.0000	1.3000e- 004	0.0000	1.3000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	0.1003	0.1003	0.0000	0.0000	0.1012
Total	4.0000e- 005	3.0000e- 005	3.9000e- 004	0.0000	1.3000e- 004	0.0000	1.3000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	0.1003	0.1003	0.0000	0.0000	0.1012

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.11 Building Construction (3164 Future St) - 2023

# **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.0561	0.5280	0.7652	1.1700e- 003		0.0252	0.0252	- 	0.0239	0.0239	0.0000	101.8581	101.8581	0.0217	0.0000	102.4016
Total	0.0561	0.5280	0.7652	1.1700e- 003		0.0252	0.0252		0.0239	0.0239	0.0000	101.8581	101.8581	0.0217	0.0000	102.4016

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.4000e- 004	1.9000e- 004	2.5900e- 003	1.0000e- 005	8.3000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	8.4000e- 004	2.2000e- 004	0.0000	2.3000e- 004	0.0000	0.6629	0.6629	2.0000e- 005	2.0000e- 005	0.6685
Total	2.4000e- 004	1.9000e- 004	2.5900e- 003	1.0000e- 005	8.3000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	8.4000e- 004	2.2000e- 004	0.0000	2.3000e- 004	0.0000	0.6629	0.6629	2.0000e- 005	2.0000e- 005	0.6685

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.11 Building Construction (3164 Future St) - 2023

### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.0561	0.5280	0.7652	1.1700e- 003		0.0252	0.0252	- 	0.0239	0.0239	0.0000	101.8579	101.8579	0.0217	0.0000	102.4015
Total	0.0561	0.5280	0.7652	1.1700e- 003		0.0252	0.0252		0.0239	0.0239	0.0000	101.8579	101.8579	0.0217	0.0000	102.4015

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	'/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.4000e- 004	1.9000e- 004	2.5900e- 003	1.0000e- 005	8.3000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	8.4000e- 004	2.2000e- 004	0.0000	2.3000e- 004	0.0000	0.6629	0.6629	2.0000e- 005	2.0000e- 005	0.6685
Total	2.4000e- 004	1.9000e- 004	2.5900e- 003	1.0000e- 005	8.3000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	8.4000e- 004	2.2000e- 004	0.0000	2.3000e- 004	0.0000	0.6629	0.6629	2.0000e- 005	2.0000e- 005	0.6685

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.12 Paving (3164 Future St) - 2023

### **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	2.6800e- 003	0.0280	0.0356	5.0000e- 005		1.2900e- 003	1.2900e- 003		1.2000e- 003	1.2000e- 003	0.0000	4.5894	4.5894	1.4000e- 003	0.0000	4.6244
Paving	0.0000		1 1 1 1 1			0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	2.6800e- 003	0.0280	0.0356	5.0000e- 005		1.2900e- 003	1.2900e- 003		1.2000e- 003	1.2000e- 003	0.0000	4.5894	4.5894	1.4000e- 003	0.0000	4.6244

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.8000e- 004	2.2000e- 004	3.0000e- 003	1.0000e- 005	9.6000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	9.7000e- 004	2.6000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	2.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.7676	0.7676	2.0000e- 005	2.0000e- 005	0.7740
Total	2.8000e- 004	2.2000e- 004	3.0000e- 003	1.0000e- 005	9.6000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	9.7000e- 004	2.6000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	2.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.7676	0.7676	2.0000e- 005	2.0000e- 005	0.7740

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.12 Paving (3164 Future St) - 2023

### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	2.6800e- 003	0.0280	0.0356	5.0000e- 005		1.2900e- 003	1.2900e- 003	1	1.2000e- 003	1.2000e- 003	0.0000	4.5894	4.5894	1.4000e- 003	0.0000	4.6244
Paving	0.0000					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	2.6800e- 003	0.0280	0.0356	5.0000e- 005		1.2900e- 003	1.2900e- 003		1.2000e- 003	1.2000e- 003	0.0000	4.5894	4.5894	1.4000e- 003	0.0000	4.6244

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.8000e- 004	2.2000e- 004	3.0000e- 003	1.0000e- 005	9.6000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	9.7000e- 004	2.6000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	2.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.7676	0.7676	2.0000e- 005	2.0000e- 005	0.7740
Total	2.8000e- 004	2.2000e- 004	3.0000e- 003	1.0000e- 005	9.6000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	9.7000e- 004	2.6000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	2.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.7676	0.7676	2.0000e- 005	2.0000e- 005	0.7740

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.13 Architectural Coatings (3164 Future St) - 2023

### **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Archit. Coating	0.0113	1 1 1	1 1 1			0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.0100e- 003	0.0137	0.0190	3.0000e- 005		7.4000e- 004	7.4000e- 004		7.4000e- 004	7.4000e- 004	0.0000	2.6809	2.6809	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	2.6849
Total	0.0133	0.0137	0.0190	3.0000e- 005		7.4000e- 004	7.4000e- 004		7.4000e- 004	7.4000e- 004	0.0000	2.6809	2.6809	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	2.6849

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	'/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.13 Architectural Coatings (3164 Future St) - 2023

### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Archit. Coating	0.0113					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.0100e- 003	0.0137	0.0190	3.0000e- 005		7.4000e- 004	7.4000e- 004		7.4000e- 004	7.4000e- 004	0.0000	2.6809	2.6809	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	2.6849
Total	0.0133	0.0137	0.0190	3.0000e- 005		7.4000e- 004	7.4000e- 004		7.4000e- 004	7.4000e- 004	0.0000	2.6809	2.6809	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	2.6849

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile

# 4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Mitigated	9.9000e- 003	0.0114	0.1033	2.3000e- 004	0.0240	1.7000e- 004	0.0241	6.3900e- 003	1.5000e- 004	6.5400e- 003	0.0000	20.9187	20.9187	1.4300e- 003	9.1000e- 004	21.2249
Unmitigated	9.9000e- 003	0.0114	0.1033	2.3000e- 004	0.0240	1.7000e- 004	0.0241	6.3900e- 003	1.5000e- 004	6.5400e- 003	0.0000	20.9187	20.9187	1.4300e- 003	9.1000e- 004	21.2249

### 4.2 Trip Summary Information

	Aver	age Daily Trip Ra	ite	Unmitigated	Mitigated
Land Use	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
Single Family Housing	18.88	19.08	17.10	63,745	63,745
Total	18.88	19.08	17.10	63,745	63,745

### 4.3 Trip Type Information

		Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpos	se %
Land Use	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
Single Family Housing	14.70	5.90	8.70	40.20	19.20	40.60	86	11	3

# 4.4 Fleet Mix

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Single Family Housing	0.542464	0.063735	0.188241	0.126899	0.023249	0.006239	0.010717	0.008079	0.000923	0.000604	0.024795	0.000702	0.003352

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

# 5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

Exceed Title 24

Install High Efficiency Lighting

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Electricity Mitigated						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	4.9498	4.9498	2.4000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	4.9642
Electricity Unmitigated	6,					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	4.9498	4.9498	2.4000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	4.9642
NaturalGas Mitigated	3.0000e- 004	2.5400e- 003	1.0800e- 003	2.0000e- 005		2.1000e- 004	2.1000e- 004		2.1000e- 004	2.1000e- 004	0.0000	2.9472	2.9472	6.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005	2.9647
NaturalGas Unmitigated	3.0000e- 004	2.5400e- 003	1.0800e- 003	2.0000e- 005		2.1000e- 004	2.1000e- 004		2.1000e- 004	2.1000e- 004	0.0000	2.9472	2.9472	6.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005	2.9647

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

**Unmitigated** 

	NaturalGa s Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Single Family Housing	55228	3.0000e- 004	2.5400e- 003	1.0800e- 003	2.0000e- 005		2.1000e- 004	2.1000e- 004		2.1000e- 004	2.1000e- 004	0.0000	2.9472	2.9472	6.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005	2.9647
Total		3.0000e- 004	2.5400e- 003	1.0800e- 003	2.0000e- 005		2.1000e- 004	2.1000e- 004		2.1000e- 004	2.1000e- 004	0.0000	2.9472	2.9472	6.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005	2.9647

# Mitigated

	NaturalGa s Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Single Family Housing	55228	3.0000e- 004	2.5400e- 003	1.0800e- 003	2.0000e- 005		2.1000e- 004	2.1000e- 004		2.1000e- 004	2.1000e- 004	0.0000	2.9472	2.9472	6.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005	2.9647
Total		3.0000e- 004	2.5400e- 003	1.0800e- 003	2.0000e- 005		2.1000e- 004	2.1000e- 004		2.1000e- 004	2.1000e- 004	0.0000	2.9472	2.9472	6.0000e- 005	5.0000e- 005	2.9647

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

5.3 Energy by Land Use - Electricity

Unmitigated

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kWh/yr		MT	/yr	
Single Family Housing	15769.9	4.9498	2.4000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	4.9642
Total		4.9498	2.4000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	4.9642

# Mitigated

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kWh/yr		MT	/yr	
Single Family Housing	15769.9	4.9498	2.4000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	4.9642
Total		4.9498	2.4000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	4.9642

# 6.0 Area Detail

6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

No Hearths Installed

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Mitigated	0.0148	2.4000e- 004	0.0206	0.0000		1.1000e- 004	1.1000e- 004		1.1000e- 004	1.1000e- 004	0.0000	0.0337	0.0337	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	0.0345
Unmitigated	0.0213	7.6000e- 004	0.0333	3.0000e- 005		2.0200e- 003	2.0200e- 003	 - - - -	2.0200e- 003	2.0200e- 003	0.2124	0.4419	0.6544	6.7000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	0.6753

# 6.2 Area by SubCategory

### **Unmitigated**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Architectural Coating	1.1300e- 003					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Consumer Products	0.0130		,			0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Hearth	6.5500e- 003	5.2000e- 004	0.0127	3.0000e- 005		1.9100e- 003	1.9100e- 003		1.9100e- 003	1.9100e- 003	0.2124	0.4082	0.6207	6.3000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	0.6408
Landscaping	6.2000e- 004	2.4000e- 004	0.0206	0.0000		1.1000e- 004	1.1000e- 004		1.1000e- 004	1.1000e- 004	0.0000	0.0337	0.0337	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	0.0345
Total	0.0213	7.6000e- 004	0.0333	3.0000e- 005		2.0200e- 003	2.0200e- 003		2.0200e- 003	2.0200e- 003	0.2124	0.4419	0.6544	6.6000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	0.6753

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

### 6.2 Area by SubCategory

### Mitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					ton	s/yr							MT	ſ/yr		
Architectural Coating	1.1300e- 003	, , ,	1			0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Consumer Products	0.0130					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Hearth	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Landscaping	6.2000e- 004	2.4000e- 004	0.0206	0.0000		1.1000e- 004	1.1000e- 004		1.1000e- 004	1.1000e- 004	0.0000	0.0337	0.0337	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	0.0345
Total	0.0148	2.4000e- 004	0.0206	0.0000		1.1000e- 004	1.1000e- 004		1.1000e- 004	1.1000e- 004	0.0000	0.0337	0.0337	3.0000e- 005	0.0000	0.0345

# 7.0 Water Detail

### 7.1 Mitigation Measures Water

Install Low Flow Bathroom Faucet

Install Low Flow Kitchen Faucet

Install Low Flow Toilet

Install Low Flow Shower

Use Water Efficient Landscaping

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category		MT	/yr	
Mitigated	0.7456	3.4300e- 003	8.0000e- 005	0.8565
Unmitigated	0.8604	4.2900e- 003	1.0000e- 004	0.9988

# 7.2 Water by Land Use <u>Unmitigated</u>

	Indoor/Out door Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	Mgal		MT	/yr	
Single Family Housing	0.130308/ 0.0821507	0.8604	4.2900e- 003	1.0000e- 004	0.9988
Total		0.8604	4.2900e- 003	1.0000e- 004	0.9988

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 7.2 Water by Land Use

# Mitigated

	Indoor/Out door Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	Mgal		MT	/yr	
Single Family Housing	0.104246 / 0.0821507	0.7456	3.4300e- 003	8.0000e- 005	0.8565
Total		0.7456	3.4300e- 003	8.0000e- 005	0.8565

# 8.0 Waste Detail

# 8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

### Category/Year

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e					
	MT/yr								
Mitigated	0.4994	0.0295	0.0000	1.2371					
Unmitigated	0.4994	0.0295	0.0000	1.2371					

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 8.2 Waste by Land Use

**Unmitigated** 

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	tons		МТ	/yr	
Single Family Housing	2.46	0.4994	0.0295	0.0000	1.2371
Total		0.4994	0.0295	0.0000	1.2371

### Mitigated

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	tons		МТ	/yr	
Single Family Housing	2.46	0.4994	0.0295	0.0000	1.2371
Total		0.4994	0.0295	0.0000	1.2371

# 9.0 Operational Offroad

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# **10.0 Stationary Equipment**

### Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
<u>Boilers</u>						
Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type	
User Defined Equipment						
Equipment Type	Number					
11.0 Vogotation						

APPENDIX A-3:

# CALEEMOD WORKSHEETS FOR CUMULATIVE PROJECT

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# Future Street Single Family Cumulative

Los Angeles-South Coast County, Summer

# **1.0 Project Characteristics**

### 1.1 Land Usage

Land	Uses	Size		Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population				
Single Fan	nily Housing	10.00		Dwelling Unit	3.25	18,000.00	29				
1.2 Other Proj	ect Characterist	ics									
Urbanization	Urban	Wind Speed (m/s)	2.2	Precipitation Freq (D	<b>ays)</b> 33						
Climate Zone	12			Operational Year	2026						
Utility Company	Los Angeles Departm	os Angeles Department of Water & Power									
CO2 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	691.98	CH4 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.033	N2O Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.004						
1.3 User Enter	ed Comments 8	Non-Default Data									
Project Characte	ristics -										
Land Use -											
Construction Pha	ase - Construction	times are estimated.									
Construction Off-	road Equipment N	litigation -									

Mobile Land Use Mitigation -

Area Mitigation -

Energy Mitigation -

Water Mitigation -

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblConstDustMitigation	WaterUnpavedRoadVehicleSpeed	0	15
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	18.00	109.00

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	230.00	761.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	8.00	88.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	18.00	86.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	5.00	41.00
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	1/26/2023	12/31/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	12/7/2022	5/31/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	1/19/2022	6/30/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	1/2/2023	7/29/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	1/7/2022	2/28/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	1/3/2023	8/1/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	1/20/2022	7/1/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	1/8/2022	3/1/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	12/8/2022	4/1/2025
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	88.00	8.00
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	61.50	7.50

2.0 Emissions Summary

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission)

### Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	lb/day									lb/d	day					
2022	3.2324	33.1290	20.4062	0.0399	18.4615	1.6139	20.0753	10.0050	1.4848	11.4897	0.0000	3,872.081 4	3,872.081 4	1.1972	4.5000e- 003	3,903.354 0
2023	1.5867	14.4322	16.4034	0.0275	0.0511	0.7002	0.7513	0.0137	0.6589	0.6726	0.0000	2,615.241 2	2,615.241 2	0.6095	3.8000e- 003	2,631.612 5
2024	1.4846	13.4902	16.3157	0.0275	0.0511	0.6138	0.6649	0.0137	0.5773	0.5910	0.0000	2,614.295 6	2,614.295 6	0.6059	3.7000e- 003	2,630.545 9
2025	2.2551	20.0829	29.0263	0.0483	0.2747	0.8816	1.1563	0.0730	0.8237	0.8967	0.0000	4,606.509 8	4,606.509 8	1.1738	7.6000e- 003	4,638.120 6
Maximum	3.2324	33.1290	29.0263	0.0483	18.4615	1.6139	20.0753	10.0050	1.4848	11.4897	0.0000	4,606.509 8	4,606.509 8	1.1972	7.6000e- 003	4,638.120 6

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission)

### Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
2022	3.2324	33.1290	20.4062	0.0399	7.3227	1.6139	8.9366	3.9345	1.4848	5.4193	0.0000	3,872.081 4	3,872.081 4	1.1972	4.5000e- 003	3,903.354 0
2023	1.5867	14.4322	16.4034	0.0275	0.0511	0.7002	0.7513	0.0137	0.6589	0.6726	0.0000	2,615.241 2	2,615.241 2	0.6095	3.8000e- 003	2,631.612 5
2024	1.4846	13.4902	16.3157	0.0275	0.0511	0.6138	0.6649	0.0137	0.5773	0.5910	0.0000	2,614.295 6	2,614.295 6	0.6059	3.7000e- 003	2,630.545 9
2025	2.2551	20.0829	29.0263	0.0483	0.2747	0.8816	1.1563	0.0730	0.8237	0.8967	0.0000	4,606.509 8	4,606.509 8	1.1738	7.6000e- 003	4,638.120 6
Maximum	3.2324	33.1290	29.0263	0.0483	7.3227	1.6139	8.9366	3.9345	1.4848	5.4193	0.0000	4,606.509 8	4,606.509 8	1.1972	7.6000e- 003	4,638.120 6

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	59.13	0.00	49.18	60.07	0.00	44.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 2.2 Overall Operational

### Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/c	lay		
Area	3.0324	0.2170	5.9098	0.0130		0.7685	0.7685		0.7685	0.7685	93.6692	181.4855	275.1547	0.2808	6.3600e- 003	284.0683
Energy	8.1600e- 003	0.0697	0.0297	4.5000e- 004		5.6400e- 003	5.6400e- 003		5.6400e- 003	5.6400e- 003		89.0057	89.0057	1.7100e- 003	1.6300e- 003	89.5346
Mobile	0.2718	0.2654	2.7196	6.1800e- 003	0.6864	4.3200e- 003	0.6908	0.1829	4.0100e- 003	0.1869		630.0446	630.0446	0.0411	0.0251	638.5580
Total	3.3124	0.5521	8.6590	0.0197	0.6864	0.7784	1.4649	0.1829	0.7781	0.9610	93.6692	900.5357	994.2049	0.3235	0.0331	1,012.160 9

### Mitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Area	0.4120	9.4900e- 003	0.8242	4.0000e- 005		4.5700e- 003	4.5700e- 003		4.5700e- 003	4.5700e- 003	0.0000	1.4855	1.4855	1.4200e- 003	0.0000	1.5211
Energy	8.1600e- 003	0.0697	0.0297	4.5000e- 004		5.6400e- 003	5.6400e- 003		5.6400e- 003	5.6400e- 003		89.0057	89.0057	1.7100e- 003	1.6300e- 003	89.5346
Mobile	0.2718	0.2654	2.7196	6.1800e- 003	0.6864	4.3200e- 003	0.6908	0.1829	4.0100e- 003	0.1869		630.0446	630.0446	0.0411	0.0251	638.5580
Total	0.6920	0.3446	3.5735	6.6700e- 003	0.6864	0.0145	0.7010	0.1829	0.0142	0.1971	0.0000	720.5357	720.5357	0.0442	0.0268	729.6136

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	79.11	37.58	58.73	66.06	0.00	98.13	52.15	0.00	98.17	79.49	100.00	19.99	27.53	86.34	19.21	27.92

# **3.0 Construction Detail**

#### **Construction Phase**

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Site Preparation	Site Preparation	1/1/2022	2/28/2022	5	41	
2	Grading	Grading	3/1/2022	6/30/2022	5	88	
3	Building Construction	Building Construction	7/1/2022	5/31/2025	5	761	
4	Paving	Paving	4/1/2025	7/29/2025	5	86	
5	Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	8/1/2025	12/31/2025	5	109	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 7.5

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 8

Acres of Paving: 0

Residential Indoor: 36,450; Residential Outdoor: 12,150; Non-Residential Indoor: 0; Non-Residential Outdoor: 0; Striped Parking Area: 0 (Architectural Coating – sqft)

### OffRoad Equipment

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48
Paving	Cement and Mortar Mixers	2	6.00	9	0.56
Building Construction	Cranes	1	7.00	231	0.29
Grading	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Building Construction	Forklifts	3	8.00	89	0.20
Building Construction	Generator Sets	1	8.00	84	0.74

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

Grading	Graders	1	8.00	187	0.41
Paving	Pavers	1	8.00	130	0.42
Paving	Paving Equipment	2	6.00	132	0.36
Paving	Rollers	2	6.00	80	0.38
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8.00	247	0.40
Site Preparation	Rubber Tired Dozers	3	8.00	247	0.40
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	7.00	97	0.37
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	8.00	97	0.37
Paving	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.00	97	0.37
Site Preparation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	4	8.00	97	0.37
Building Construction	Welders	1	8.00	46	0.45

### Trips and VMT

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Architectural Coating	1	1.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	9	4.00	1.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving	8	20.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Site Preparation	7	18.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

# **3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction**

Water Exposed Area

Reduce Vehicle Speed on Unpaved Roads

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.2 Site Preparation - 2022

### **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Fugitive Dust			1 1 1		18.2603	0.0000	18.2603	9.9516	0.0000	9.9516			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	3.1701	33.0835	19.6978	0.0380		1.6126	1.6126	1 1 1	1.4836	1.4836		3,686.061 9	3,686.061 9	1.1922		3,715.865 5
Total	3.1701	33.0835	19.6978	0.0380	18.2603	1.6126	19.8728	9.9516	1.4836	11.4352		3,686.061 9	3,686.061 9	1.1922		3,715.865 5

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0623	0.0455	0.7085	1.8400e- 003	0.2012	1.2900e- 003	0.2025	0.0534	1.1900e- 003	0.0545		186.0196	186.0196	5.0700e- 003	4.5000e- 003	187.4885
Total	0.0623	0.0455	0.7085	1.8400e- 003	0.2012	1.2900e- 003	0.2025	0.0534	1.1900e- 003	0.0545		186.0196	186.0196	5.0700e- 003	4.5000e- 003	187.4885

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.2 Site Preparation - 2022

### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Fugitive Dust			, , ,		7.1215	0.0000	7.1215	3.8811	0.0000	3.8811			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	3.1701	33.0835	19.6978	0.0380		1.6126	1.6126		1.4836	1.4836	0.0000	3,686.061 9	3,686.061 9	1.1922		3,715.865 5
Total	3.1701	33.0835	19.6978	0.0380	7.1215	1.6126	8.7341	3.8811	1.4836	5.3647	0.0000	3,686.061 9	3,686.061 9	1.1922		3,715.865 5

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e				lb/d	day						
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0623	0.0455	0.7085	1.8400e- 003	0.2012	1.2900e- 003	0.2025	0.0534	1.1900e- 003	0.0545		186.0196	186.0196	5.0700e- 003	4.5000e- 003	187.4885
Total	0.0623	0.0455	0.7085	1.8400e- 003	0.2012	1.2900e- 003	0.2025	0.0534	1.1900e- 003	0.0545		186.0196	186.0196	5.0700e- 003	4.5000e- 003	187.4885

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.3 Grading - 2022

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Fugitive Dust		, , ,			6.1185	0.0000	6.1185	3.3206	0.0000	3.3206			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	1.9486	20.8551	15.2727	0.0297		0.9409	0.9409		0.8656	0.8656		2,872.046 4	2,872.046 4	0.9289		2,895.268 4
Total	1.9486	20.8551	15.2727	0.0297	6.1185	0.9409	7.0594	3.3206	0.8656	4.1862		2,872.046 4	2,872.046 4	0.9289		2,895.268 4

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/				lb/d	day						
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0519	0.0379	0.5904	1.5300e- 003	0.1677	1.0700e- 003	0.1687	0.0445	9.9000e- 004	0.0455		155.0163	155.0163	4.2200e- 003	3.7500e- 003	156.2404
Total	0.0519	0.0379	0.5904	1.5300e- 003	0.1677	1.0700e- 003	0.1687	0.0445	9.9000e- 004	0.0455		155.0163	155.0163	4.2200e- 003	3.7500e- 003	156.2404

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.3 Grading - 2022

### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Fugitive Dust			1		2.3862	0.0000	2.3862	1.2951	0.0000	1.2951			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	1.9486	20.8551	15.2727	0.0297		0.9409	0.9409		0.8656	0.8656	0.0000	2,872.046 4	2,872.046 4	0.9289		2,895.268 4
Total	1.9486	20.8551	15.2727	0.0297	2.3862	0.9409	3.3271	1.2951	0.8656	2.1606	0.0000	2,872.046 4	2,872.046 4	0.9289		2,895.268 4

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e				lb/d	day						
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0519	0.0379	0.5904	1.5300e- 003	0.1677	1.0700e- 003	0.1687	0.0445	9.9000e- 004	0.0455		155.0163	155.0163	4.2200e- 003	3.7500e- 003	156.2404
Total	0.0519	0.0379	0.5904	1.5300e- 003	0.1677	1.0700e- 003	0.1687	0.0445	9.9000e- 004	0.0455		155.0163	155.0163	4.2200e- 003	3.7500e- 003	156.2404

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.4 Building Construction - 2022

### Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o			lb/d	day							
Off-Road	1.7062	15.6156	16.3634	0.0269		0.8090	0.8090	1 1 1	0.7612	0.7612		2,554.333 6	2,554.333 6	0.6120		2,569.632 2
Total	1.7062	15.6156	16.3634	0.0269		0.8090	0.8090		0.7612	0.7612		2,554.333 6	2,554.333 6	0.6120		2,569.632 2

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e				lb/d	day						
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.9700e- 003	0.0490	0.0168	2.0000e- 004	6.4100e- 003	4.7000e- 004	6.8700e- 003	1.8400e- 003	4.5000e- 004	2.2900e- 003		21.0462	21.0462	7.0000e- 004	3.0300e- 003	21.9675
Worker	0.0138	0.0101	0.1574	4.1000e- 004	0.0447	2.9000e- 004	0.0450	0.0119	2.6000e- 004	0.0121		41.3377	41.3377	1.1300e- 003	1.0000e- 003	41.6641
Total	0.0158	0.0591	0.1742	6.1000e- 004	0.0511	7.6000e- 004	0.0519	0.0137	7.1000e- 004	0.0144		62.3838	62.3838	1.8300e- 003	4.0300e- 003	63.6316

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.4 Building Construction - 2022

### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e			lb/d	day							
Off-Road	1.7062	15.6156	16.3634	0.0269		0.8090	0.8090	- 	0.7612	0.7612	0.0000	2,554.333 6	2,554.333 6	0.6120		2,569.632 2
Total	1.7062	15.6156	16.3634	0.0269		0.8090	0.8090		0.7612	0.7612	0.0000	2,554.333 6	2,554.333 6	0.6120		2,569.632 2

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e				lb/d	day						
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.9700e- 003	0.0490	0.0168	2.0000e- 004	6.4100e- 003	4.7000e- 004	6.8700e- 003	1.8400e- 003	4.5000e- 004	2.2900e- 003		21.0462	21.0462	7.0000e- 004	3.0300e- 003	21.9675
Worker	0.0138	0.0101	0.1574	4.1000e- 004	0.0447	2.9000e- 004	0.0450	0.0119	2.6000e- 004	0.0121		41.3377	41.3377	1.1300e- 003	1.0000e- 003	41.6641
Total	0.0158	0.0591	0.1742	6.1000e- 004	0.0511	7.6000e- 004	0.0519	0.0137	7.1000e- 004	0.0144		62.3838	62.3838	1.8300e- 003	4.0300e- 003	63.6316
## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.4 Building Construction - 2023

## Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Off-Road	1.5728	14.3849	16.2440	0.0269		0.6997	0.6997	1 1 1	0.6584	0.6584		2,555.209 9	2,555.209 9	0.6079		2,570.406 1
Total	1.5728	14.3849	16.2440	0.0269		0.6997	0.6997		0.6584	0.6584		2,555.209 9	2,555.209 9	0.6079		2,570.406 1

#### **Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	day							lb/c	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.1500e- 003	0.0384	0.0149	1.9000e- 004	6.4100e- 003	1.9000e- 004	6.6000e- 003	1.8400e- 003	1.8000e- 004	2.0300e- 003		20.0283	20.0283	6.7000e- 004	2.8800e- 003	20.9031
Worker	0.0128	8.9200e- 003	0.1446	4.0000e- 004	0.0447	2.7000e- 004	0.0450	0.0119	2.5000e- 004	0.0121		40.0030	40.0030	1.0100e- 003	9.2000e- 004	40.3033
Total	0.0140	0.0473	0.1594	5.9000e- 004	0.0511	4.6000e- 004	0.0516	0.0137	4.3000e- 004	0.0141		60.0313	60.0313	1.6800e- 003	3.8000e- 003	61.2065

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.4 Building Construction - 2023

## **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Off-Road	1.5728	14.3849	16.2440	0.0269		0.6997	0.6997	1 1 1	0.6584	0.6584	0.0000	2,555.209 9	2,555.209 9	0.6079		2,570.406 1
Total	1.5728	14.3849	16.2440	0.0269		0.6997	0.6997		0.6584	0.6584	0.0000	2,555.209 9	2,555.209 9	0.6079		2,570.406 1

#### **Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.1500e- 003	0.0384	0.0149	1.9000e- 004	6.4100e- 003	1.9000e- 004	6.6000e- 003	1.8400e- 003	1.8000e- 004	2.0300e- 003		20.0283	20.0283	6.7000e- 004	2.8800e- 003	20.9031
Worker	0.0128	8.9200e- 003	0.1446	4.0000e- 004	0.0447	2.7000e- 004	0.0450	0.0119	2.5000e- 004	0.0121		40.0030	40.0030	1.0100e- 003	9.2000e- 004	40.3033
Total	0.0140	0.0473	0.1594	5.9000e- 004	0.0511	4.6000e- 004	0.0516	0.0137	4.3000e- 004	0.0141		60.0313	60.0313	1.6800e- 003	3.8000e- 003	61.2065

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.4 Building Construction - 2024

## **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Off-Road	1.4716	13.4438	16.1668	0.0270		0.6133	0.6133	1 1 1	0.5769	0.5769		2,555.698 9	2,555.698 9	0.6044		2,570.807 7
Total	1.4716	13.4438	16.1668	0.0270		0.6133	0.6133		0.5769	0.5769		2,555.698 9	2,555.698 9	0.6044		2,570.807 7

#### Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.1200e- 003	0.0385	0.0146	1.8000e- 004	6.4100e- 003	1.9000e- 004	6.6000e- 003	1.8400e- 003	1.9000e- 004	2.0300e- 003		19.7275	19.7275	6.7000e- 004	2.8400e- 003	20.5904
Worker	0.0119	7.9700e- 003	0.1343	3.8000e- 004	0.0447	2.6000e- 004	0.0450	0.0119	2.4000e- 004	0.0121		38.8692	38.8692	9.1000e- 004	8.6000e- 004	39.1479
Total	0.0131	0.0464	0.1489	5.6000e- 004	0.0511	4.5000e- 004	0.0516	0.0137	4.3000e- 004	0.0141		58.5967	58.5967	1.5800e- 003	3.7000e- 003	59.7383

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.4 Building Construction - 2024

## **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/d	day		
Off-Road	1.4716	13.4438	16.1668	0.0270		0.6133	0.6133		0.5769	0.5769	0.0000	2,555.698 9	2,555.698 9	0.6044		2,570.807 7
Total	1.4716	13.4438	16.1668	0.0270		0.6133	0.6133		0.5769	0.5769	0.0000	2,555.698 9	2,555.698 9	0.6044		2,570.807 7

#### **Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.1200e- 003	0.0385	0.0146	1.8000e- 004	6.4100e- 003	1.9000e- 004	6.6000e- 003	1.8400e- 003	1.9000e- 004	2.0300e- 003		19.7275	19.7275	6.7000e- 004	2.8400e- 003	20.5904
Worker	0.0119	7.9700e- 003	0.1343	3.8000e- 004	0.0447	2.6000e- 004	0.0450	0.0119	2.4000e- 004	0.0121		38.8692	38.8692	9.1000e- 004	8.6000e- 004	39.1479
Total	0.0131	0.0464	0.1489	5.6000e- 004	0.0511	4.5000e- 004	0.0516	0.0137	4.3000e- 004	0.0141		58.5967	58.5967	1.5800e- 003	3.7000e- 003	59.7383

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.4 Building Construction - 2025

## **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Off-Road	1.3674	12.4697	16.0847	0.0270		0.5276	0.5276	1 1 1	0.4963	0.4963		2,556.474 4	2,556.474 4	0.6010		2,571.498 1
Total	1.3674	12.4697	16.0847	0.0270		0.5276	0.5276		0.4963	0.4963		2,556.474 4	2,556.474 4	0.6010		2,571.498 1

#### **Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/c	day							lb/c	lay		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.0800e- 003	0.0383	0.0143	1.8000e- 004	6.4100e- 003	1.9000e- 004	6.6000e- 003	1.8400e- 003	1.9000e- 004	2.0300e- 003		19.3723	19.3723	6.8000e- 004	2.7900e- 003	20.2207
Worker	0.0112	7.1500e- 003	0.1249	3.7000e- 004	0.0447	2.5000e- 004	0.0450	0.0119	2.3000e- 004	0.0121		37.5451	37.5451	8.2000e- 004	8.0000e- 004	37.8046
Total	0.0122	0.0454	0.1392	5.5000e- 004	0.0511	4.4000e- 004	0.0516	0.0137	4.2000e- 004	0.0141		56.9174	56.9174	1.5000e- 003	3.5900e- 003	58.0253

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.4 Building Construction - 2025

## **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/d	day		
Off-Road	1.3674	12.4697	16.0847	0.0270		0.5276	0.5276	- - - -	0.4963	0.4963	0.0000	2,556.474 4	2,556.474 4	0.6010		2,571.498 1
Total	1.3674	12.4697	16.0847	0.0270		0.5276	0.5276		0.4963	0.4963	0.0000	2,556.474 4	2,556.474 4	0.6010		2,571.498 1

#### **Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/d	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.0800e- 003	0.0383	0.0143	1.8000e- 004	6.4100e- 003	1.9000e- 004	6.6000e- 003	1.8400e- 003	1.9000e- 004	2.0300e- 003		19.3723	19.3723	6.8000e- 004	2.7900e- 003	20.2207
Worker	0.0112	7.1500e- 003	0.1249	3.7000e- 004	0.0447	2.5000e- 004	0.0450	0.0119	2.3000e- 004	0.0121		37.5451	37.5451	8.2000e- 004	8.0000e- 004	37.8046
Total	0.0122	0.0454	0.1392	5.5000e- 004	0.0511	4.4000e- 004	0.0516	0.0137	4.2000e- 004	0.0141		56.9174	56.9174	1.5000e- 003	3.5900e- 003	58.0253

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 3.5 Paving - 2025

**Unmitigated Construction On-Site** 

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/d	day		
Off-Road	0.8197	7.5321	12.1778	0.0189		0.3524	0.3524		0.3259	0.3259		1,805.392 6	1,805.392 6	0.5673		1,819.574 1
Paving	0.0000	1 1 1 1 1 1				0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Total	0.8197	7.5321	12.1778	0.0189		0.3524	0.3524		0.3259	0.3259		1,805.392 6	1,805.392 6	0.5673		1,819.574 1

## Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0557	0.0358	0.6247	1.8600e- 003	0.2236	1.2300e- 003	0.2248	0.0593	1.1300e- 003	0.0604		187.7255	187.7255	4.1100e- 003	4.0100e- 003	189.0231
Total	0.0557	0.0358	0.6247	1.8600e- 003	0.2236	1.2300e- 003	0.2248	0.0593	1.1300e- 003	0.0604		187.7255	187.7255	4.1100e- 003	4.0100e- 003	189.0231

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 3.5 Paving - 2025

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Off-Road	0.8197	7.5321	12.1778	0.0189		0.3524	0.3524	1	0.3259	0.3259	0.0000	1,805.392 6	1,805.392 6	0.5673		1,819.574 1
Paving	0.0000					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Total	0.8197	7.5321	12.1778	0.0189		0.3524	0.3524		0.3259	0.3259	0.0000	1,805.392 6	1,805.392 6	0.5673		1,819.574 1

#### **Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0557	0.0358	0.6247	1.8600e- 003	0.2236	1.2300e- 003	0.2248	0.0593	1.1300e- 003	0.0604		187.7255	187.7255	4.1100e- 003	4.0100e- 003	189.0231
Total	0.0557	0.0358	0.6247	1.8600e- 003	0.2236	1.2300e- 003	0.2248	0.0593	1.1300e- 003	0.0604		187.7255	187.7255	4.1100e- 003	4.0100e- 003	189.0231

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.6 Architectural Coating - 2025

## **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Archit. Coating	1.0333					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.1709	1.1455	1.8091	2.9700e- 003		0.0515	0.0515		0.0515	0.0515		281.4481	281.4481	0.0154		281.8319
Total	1.2042	1.1455	1.8091	2.9700e- 003		0.0515	0.0515		0.0515	0.0515		281.4481	281.4481	0.0154		281.8319

#### Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.7900e- 003	1.7900e- 003	0.0312	9.0000e- 005	0.0112	6.0000e- 005	0.0112	2.9600e- 003	6.0000e- 005	3.0200e- 003		9.3863	9.3863	2.1000e- 004	2.0000e- 004	9.4512
Total	2.7900e- 003	1.7900e- 003	0.0312	9.0000e- 005	0.0112	6.0000e- 005	0.0112	2.9600e- 003	6.0000e- 005	3.0200e- 003		9.3863	9.3863	2.1000e- 004	2.0000e- 004	9.4512

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.6 Architectural Coating - 2025

## **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	day		
Archit. Coating	1.0333	, , ,	1			0.0000	0.0000	1	0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.1709	1.1455	1.8091	2.9700e- 003		0.0515	0.0515		0.0515	0.0515	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0154		281.8319
Total	1.2042	1.1455	1.8091	2.9700e- 003		0.0515	0.0515		0.0515	0.0515	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0154		281.8319

#### **Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/d	day		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.7900e- 003	1.7900e- 003	0.0312	9.0000e- 005	0.0112	6.0000e- 005	0.0112	2.9600e- 003	6.0000e- 005	3.0200e- 003		9.3863	9.3863	2.1000e- 004	2.0000e- 004	9.4512
Total	2.7900e- 003	1.7900e- 003	0.0312	9.0000e- 005	0.0112	6.0000e- 005	0.0112	2.9600e- 003	6.0000e- 005	3.0200e- 003		9.3863	9.3863	2.1000e- 004	2.0000e- 004	9.4512

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile

# 4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/o	day							lb/c	lay		
Mitigated	0.2718	0.2654	2.7196	6.1800e- 003	0.6864	4.3200e- 003	0.6908	0.1829	4.0100e- 003	0.1869		630.0446	630.0446	0.0411	0.0251	638.5580
Unmitigated	0.2718	0.2654	2.7196	6.1800e- 003	0.6864	4.3200e- 003	0.6908	0.1829	4.0100e- 003	0.1869		630.0446	630.0446	0.0411	0.0251	638.5580

## 4.2 Trip Summary Information

	Aver	age Daily Trip Ra	te	Unmitigated	Mitigated
Land Use	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
Single Family Housing	94.40	95.40	85.50	318,723	318,723
Total	94.40	95.40	85.50	318,723	318,723

## 4.3 Trip Type Information

		Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpos	se %
Land Use	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
Single Family Housing	14.70	5.90	8.70	40.20	19.20	40.60	86	11	3

## 4.4 Fleet Mix

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Single Family Housing	0.537891	0.065289	0.189998	0.126515	0.023567	0.006518	0.011114	0.008084	0.000933	0.000591	0.025474	0.000708	0.003318

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

# 5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

Install High Efficiency Lighting

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/e	day							lb/d	lay		
NaturalGas Mitigated	8.1600e- 003	0.0697	0.0297	4.5000e- 004		5.6400e- 003	5.6400e- 003		5.6400e- 003	5.6400e- 003		89.0057	89.0057	1.7100e- 003	1.6300e- 003	89.5346
NaturalGas Unmitigated	8.1600e- 003	0.0697	0.0297	4.5000e- 004		5.6400e- 003	5.6400e- 003		5.6400e- 003	5.6400e- 003		89.0057	89.0057	1.7100e- 003	1.6300e- 003	89.5346

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

#### 5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

**Unmitigated** 

	NaturalGa s Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr					lb/e	day							lb/d	lay		
Single Family Housing	756.548	8.1600e- 003	0.0697	0.0297	4.5000e- 004		5.6400e- 003	5.6400e- 003		5.6400e- 003	5.6400e- 003		89.0057	89.0057	1.7100e- 003	1.6300e- 003	89.5346
Total		8.1600e- 003	0.0697	0.0297	4.5000e- 004		5.6400e- 003	5.6400e- 003		5.6400e- 003	5.6400e- 003		89.0057	89.0057	1.7100e- 003	1.6300e- 003	89.5346

## Mitigated

	NaturalGa s Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr					lb/e	day							lb/c	lay		
Single Family Housing	0.756548	8.1600e- 003	0.0697	0.0297	4.5000e- 004		5.6400e- 003	5.6400e- 003		5.6400e- 003	5.6400e- 003		89.0057	89.0057	1.7100e- 003	1.6300e- 003	89.5346
Total		8.1600e- 003	0.0697	0.0297	4.5000e- 004		5.6400e- 003	5.6400e- 003		5.6400e- 003	5.6400e- 003		89.0057	89.0057	1.7100e- 003	1.6300e- 003	89.5346

# 6.0 Area Detail

#### 6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

No Hearths Installed

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					lb/	day							lb/d	day		
Mitigated	0.4120	9.4900e- 003	0.8242	4.0000e- 005		4.5700e- 003	4.5700e- 003		4.5700e- 003	4.5700e- 003	0.0000	1.4855	1.4855	1.4200e- 003	0.0000	1.5211
Unmitigated	3.0324	0.2170	5.9098	0.0130		0.7685	0.7685	 - - - -	0.7685	0.7685	93.6692	181.4855	275.1547	0.2808	6.3600e- 003	284.0683

# 6.2 Area by SubCategory

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					lb/d	day							lb/c	day		
Architectural Coating	0.0309					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Consumer Products	0.3564					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Hearth	2.6204	0.2075	5.0855	0.0130		0.7639	0.7639		0.7639	0.7639	93.6692	180.0000	273.6692	0.2793	6.3600e- 003	282.5472
Landscaping	0.0248	9.4900e- 003	0.8242	4.0000e- 005		4.5700e- 003	4.5700e- 003		4.5700e- 003	4.5700e- 003		1.4855	1.4855	1.4200e- 003		1.5211
Total	3.0324	0.2170	5.9098	0.0130		0.7685	0.7685		0.7685	0.7685	93.6692	181.4855	275.1547	0.2808	6.3600e- 003	284.0683

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 6.2 Area by SubCategory

#### Mitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory					lb/	day							lb/o	day		
Architectural Coating	0.0309					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Consumer Products	0.3564					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Hearth	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Landscaping	0.0248	9.4900e- 003	0.8242	4.0000e- 005		4.5700e- 003	4.5700e- 003		4.5700e- 003	4.5700e- 003		1.4855	1.4855	1.4200e- 003		1.5211
Total	0.4120	9.4900e- 003	0.8242	4.0000e- 005		4.5700e- 003	4.5700e- 003		4.5700e- 003	4.5700e- 003	0.0000	1.4855	1.4855	1.4200e- 003	0.0000	1.5211

# 7.0 Water Detail

## 7.1 Mitigation Measures Water

Install Low Flow Bathroom Faucet

Install Low Flow Kitchen Faucet

Install Low Flow Toilet

Install Low Flow Shower

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 8.0 Waste Detail

## 8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

## 9.0 Operational Offroad

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type

# **10.0 Stationary Equipment**

#### Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	-----------	------------	-------------	-------------	-----------

#### **Boilers**

Equipment Type Number Heat Input/Day Heat Input/Year Boiler Rating Fuel Type	Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type
--	----------------	--------	----------------	-----------------	---------------	-----------

#### **User Defined Equipment**

Equipment Type

Number

# **11.0 Vegetation**

APPENDIX A-4:

# CALEEMOD WORKSHEETS FOR CUMULATIVE PROJECTS (ANNUAL EMISSIONS)

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## Future Street Single Family Cumulative

Los Angeles-South Coast County, Annual

# **1.0 Project Characteristics**

# 1.1 Land Usage

Land	Uses	Size		Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Single Far	nily Housing	10.00		Dwelling Unit	3.25	18,000.00	29
1.2 Other Proje	ect Characterist	ics					
Urbanization	Urban	Wind Speed (m/s)	2.2	Precipitation Freq (D	<b>ays)</b> 33		
Climate Zone	12			Operational Year	2026		
Utility Company	Los Angeles Departn	nent of Water & Power					
CO2 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	691.98	CH4 Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.033	N2O Intensity (Ib/MWhr)	0.004		
1.3 User Enter	ed Comments 8	& Non-Default Data					
Project Characte	ristics -						
Land Use -							
Construction Pha	se - Construction	times are estimated.					
Construction Off-	road Equipment M	litigation -					
Mobile Land Use	Mitigation -						
Area Mitigation -							

Energy Mitigation -

Water Mitigation -

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	18.00	109.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	230.00	761.00

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	8.00	88.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	18.00	86.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	5.00	41.00
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	1/26/2023	12/31/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	12/7/2022	5/31/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	1/19/2022	6/30/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	1/2/2023	7/29/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	1/7/2022	2/28/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	1/3/2023	8/1/2025
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	1/20/2022	7/1/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	1/8/2022	3/1/2022
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	12/8/2022	4/1/2025
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	88.00	8.00
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	61.50	7.50

# 2.0 Emissions Summary

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 2.1 Overall Construction

#### **Unmitigated Construction**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
2022	0.2670	2.6257	2.1966	3.9900e- 003	0.6581	0.1276	0.7857	0.3540	0.1185	0.4725	0.0000	347.8576	347.8576	0.0960	5.0000e- 004	350.4057
2023	0.2063	1.8766	2.1314	3.5800e- 003	6.5200e- 003	0.0910	0.0975	1.7500e- 003	0.0857	0.0874	0.0000	308.2455	308.2455	0.0719	4.6000e- 004	310.1792
2024	0.1945	1.7676	2.1364	3.6000e- 003	6.5700e- 003	0.0804	0.0870	1.7600e- 003	0.0756	0.0774	0.0000	310.5098	310.5098	0.0720	4.5000e- 004	312.4438
2025	0.1779	1.0641	1.5249	2.5400e- 003	0.0127	0.0465	0.0593	3.3900e- 003	0.0437	0.0471	0.0000	219.7842	219.7842	0.0526	3.6000e- 004	221.2057
Maximum	0.2670	2.6257	2.1966	3.9900e- 003	0.6581	0.1276	0.7857	0.3540	0.1185	0.4725	0.0000	347.8576	347.8576	0.0960	5.0000e- 004	350.4057

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 2.1 Overall Construction

#### **Mitigated Construction**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
2022	0.2670	2.6257	2.1966	3.9900e- 003	0.2655	0.1276	0.3931	0.1404	0.1185	0.2589	0.0000	347.8572	347.8572	0.0960	5.0000e- 004	350.4053
2023	0.2063	1.8766	2.1314	3.5800e- 003	6.5200e- 003	0.0910	0.0975	1.7500e- 003	0.0857	0.0874	0.0000	308.2452	308.2452	0.0719	4.6000e- 004	310.1789
2024	0.1945	1.7676	2.1364	3.6000e- 003	6.5700e- 003	0.0804	0.0870	1.7600e- 003	0.0756	0.0774	0.0000	310.5094	310.5094	0.0720	4.5000e- 004	312.4434
2025	0.1779	1.0641	1.5249	2.5400e- 003	0.0127	0.0465	0.0593	3.3900e- 003	0.0437	0.0471	0.0000	219.7840	219.7840	0.0526	3.6000e- 004	221.2055
Maximum	0.2670	2.6257	2.1966	3.9900e- 003	0.2655	0.1276	0.3931	0.1404	0.1185	0.2589	0.0000	347.8572	347.8572	0.0960	5.0000e- 004	350.4053

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	57.40	0.00	38.13	59.18	0.00	31.21	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Quarter	Start Date	End Date	Maximum Unmitigated ROG + NOX (tons/quarter)	Maximum Mitigated ROG + NOX (tons/quarter)
1	1-1-2022	3-31-2022	1.0199	1.0199
2	4-1-2022	6-30-2022	0.7440	0.7440
3	7-1-2022	9-30-2022	0.5716	0.5716
4	10-1-2022	12-31-2022	0.5717	0.5717
5	1-1-2023	3-31-2023	0.5150	0.5150
6	4-1-2023	6-30-2023	0.5206	0.5206
7	7-1-2023	9-30-2023	0.5263	0.5263
8	10-1-2023	12-31-2023	0.5265	0.5265

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

9	1-1-2024	3-31-2024	0.4868	0.4868
10	4-1-2024	6-30-2024	0.4867	0.4867
11	7-1-2024	9-30-2024	0.4920	0.4920
12	10-1-2024	12-31-2024	0.4921	0.4921
13	1-1-2025	3-31-2025	0.4467	0.4467
14	4-1-2025	6-30-2025	0.5771	0.5771
15	7-1-2025	9-30-2025	0.1387	0.1387
		Highest	1.0199	1.0199

# 2.2 Overall Operational

## Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Area	0.1065	3.7800e- 003	0.1666	1.7000e- 004		0.0101	0.0101		0.0101	0.0101	1.0622	2.2096	3.2718	3.3300e- 003	7.0000e- 005	3.3765
Energy	1.4900e- 003	0.0127	5.4100e- 003	8.0000e- 005		1.0300e- 003	1.0300e- 003		1.0300e- 003	1.0300e- 003	0.0000	39.4849	39.4849	1.4600e- 003	4.1000e- 004	39.6446
Mobile	0.0468	0.0517	0.4788	1.0600e- 003	0.1198	7.7000e- 004	0.1205	0.0320	7.1000e- 004	0.0327	0.0000	98.4781	98.4781	6.7700e- 003	4.2500e- 003	99.9147
Waste	n		,			0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	2.4136	0.0000	2.4136	0.1426	0.0000	5.9795
Water	n		1			0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.2067	4.0952	4.3019	0.0214	5.2000e- 004	4.9940
Total	0.1548	0.0682	0.6508	1.3100e- 003	0.1198	0.0119	0.1317	0.0320	0.0119	0.0438	3.6825	144.2678	147.9503	0.1756	5.2500e- 003	153.9094

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## 2.2 Overall Operational

## Mitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	'/yr		
Area	0.0738	1.1900e- 003	0.1030	1.0000e- 005		5.7000e- 004	5.7000e- 004		5.7000e- 004	5.7000e- 004	0.0000	0.1685	0.1685	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.1725
Energy	1.4900e- 003	0.0127	5.4100e- 003	8.0000e- 005		1.0300e- 003	1.0300e- 003		1.0300e- 003	1.0300e- 003	0.0000	39.4849	39.4849	1.4600e- 003	4.1000e- 004	39.6446
Mobile	0.0468	0.0517	0.4788	1.0600e- 003	0.1198	7.7000e- 004	0.1205	0.0320	7.1000e- 004	0.0327	0.0000	98.4781	98.4781	6.7700e- 003	4.2500e- 003	99.9147
Waste	n					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	2.4136	0.0000	2.4136	0.1426	0.0000	5.9795
Water						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.1654	3.5626	3.7280	0.0172	4.2000e- 004	4.2825
Total	0.1220	0.0656	0.5872	1.1500e- 003	0.1198	2.3700e- 003	0.1221	0.0320	2.3100e- 003	0.0343	2.5789	141.6941	144.2730	0.1682	5.0800e- 003	149.9938

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N20	CO2e
Percent Reduction	21.16	3.80	9.77	12.21	0.00	80.12	7.25	0.00	80.52	21.79	29.97	1.78	2.49	4.24	3.24	2.54

# **3.0 Construction Detail**

## **Construction Phase**

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Site Preparation	Site Preparation	1/1/2022	2/28/2022	5	41	
2	Grading	Grading	3/1/2022	6/30/2022	5	88	
3	Building Construction	Building Construction	7/1/2022	5/31/2025	5	761	

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

4	Paving	Paving	4/1/2025	7/29/2025	5	86	
5	Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	8/1/2025	12/31/2025	5	109	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 7.5

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 8

#### Acres of Paving: 0

Residential Indoor: 36,450; Residential Outdoor: 12,150; Non-Residential Indoor: 0; Non-Residential Outdoor: 0; Striped Parking Area: 0 (Architectural Coating – sqft)

#### OffRoad Equipment

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48
Paving	Cement and Mortar Mixers	2	6.00	9	0.56
Building Construction	Cranes	1	7.00	231	0.29
Grading	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Building Construction	Forklifts	3	8.00	89	0.20
Building Construction	Generator Sets	1	8.00	84	0.74
Grading	Graders	1	8.00	187	0.41
Paving	Pavers	1	8.00	130	0.42
Paving	Paving Equipment	2	6.00	132	0.36
Paving	Rollers	2	6.00	80	0.38
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8.00	247	0.40
Site Preparation	Rubber Tired Dozers	3	8.00	247	0.40
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	7.00	97	0.37
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	8.00	97	0.37
Paving	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.00	97	0.37
Site Preparation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	4	8.00	97	0.37
Building Construction	Welders	1	8.00	46	0.45

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

## Trips and VMT

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Architectural Coating	1	1.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	9	4.00	1.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving	8	20.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Site Preparation	7	18.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

#### **3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction**

Water Exposed Area

## 3.2 Site Preparation - 2022

#### Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Fugitive Dust	11 11 41 41	4 T		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	0.3743	0.0000	0.3743	0.2040	0.0000	0.2040	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0650	0.6782	0.4038	7.8000e- 004		0.0331	0.0331		0.0304	0.0304	0.0000	68.5508	68.5508	0.0222	0.0000	69.1050
Total	0.0650	0.6782	0.4038	7.8000e- 004	0.3743	0.0331	0.4074	0.2040	0.0304	0.2344	0.0000	68.5508	68.5508	0.0222	0.0000	69.1050

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.2 Site Preparation - 2022

## Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.2600e- 003	1.0500e- 003	0.0137	4.0000e- 005	4.0400e- 003	3.0000e- 005	4.0700e- 003	1.0700e- 003	2.0000e- 005	1.1000e- 003	0.0000	3.3256	3.3256	1.0000e- 004	9.0000e- 005	3.3551
Total	1.2600e- 003	1.0500e- 003	0.0137	4.0000e- 005	4.0400e- 003	3.0000e- 005	4.0700e- 003	1.0700e- 003	2.0000e- 005	1.1000e- 003	0.0000	3.3256	3.3256	1.0000e- 004	9.0000e- 005	3.3551

## **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Fugitive Dust					0.1460	0.0000	0.1460	0.0796	0.0000	0.0796	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0650	0.6782	0.4038	7.8000e- 004		0.0331	0.0331		0.0304	0.0304	0.0000	68.5507	68.5507	0.0222	0.0000	69.1049
Total	0.0650	0.6782	0.4038	7.8000e- 004	0.1460	0.0331	0.1791	0.0796	0.0304	0.1100	0.0000	68.5507	68.5507	0.0222	0.0000	69.1049

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.2 Site Preparation - 2022

## **Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	7/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.2600e- 003	1.0500e- 003	0.0137	4.0000e- 005	4.0400e- 003	3.0000e- 005	4.0700e- 003	1.0700e- 003	2.0000e- 005	1.1000e- 003	0.0000	3.3256	3.3256	1.0000e- 004	9.0000e- 005	3.3551
Total	1.2600e- 003	1.0500e- 003	0.0137	4.0000e- 005	4.0400e- 003	3.0000e- 005	4.0700e- 003	1.0700e- 003	2.0000e- 005	1.1000e- 003	0.0000	3.3256	3.3256	1.0000e- 004	9.0000e- 005	3.3551

## 3.3 Grading - 2022

# Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	'/yr		
Fugitive Dust		1 1 1			0.2692	0.0000	0.2692	0.1461	0.0000	0.1461	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0857	0.9176	0.6720	1.3000e- 003		0.0414	0.0414		0.0381	0.0381	0.0000	114.6410	114.6410	0.0371	0.0000	115.5679
Total	0.0857	0.9176	0.6720	1.3000e- 003	0.2692	0.0414	0.3106	0.1461	0.0381	0.1842	0.0000	114.6410	114.6410	0.0371	0.0000	115.5679

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.3 Grading - 2022

#### **Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.2600e- 003	1.8800e- 003	0.0245	6.0000e- 005	7.2300e- 003	5.0000e- 005	7.2800e- 003	1.9200e- 003	4.0000e- 005	1.9600e- 003	0.0000	5.9482	5.9482	1.7000e- 004	1.6000e- 004	6.0009
Total	2.2600e- 003	1.8800e- 003	0.0245	6.0000e- 005	7.2300e- 003	5.0000e- 005	7.2800e- 003	1.9200e- 003	4.0000e- 005	1.9600e- 003	0.0000	5.9482	5.9482	1.7000e- 004	1.6000e- 004	6.0009

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Fugitive Dust					0.1050	0.0000	0.1050	0.0570	0.0000	0.0570	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0857	0.9176	0.6720	1.3000e- 003		0.0414	0.0414		0.0381	0.0381	0.0000	114.6408	114.6408	0.0371	0.0000	115.5678
Total	0.0857	0.9176	0.6720	1.3000e- 003	0.1050	0.0414	0.1464	0.0570	0.0381	0.0951	0.0000	114.6408	114.6408	0.0371	0.0000	115.5678

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.3 Grading - 2022

#### Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.2600e- 003	1.8800e- 003	0.0245	6.0000e- 005	7.2300e- 003	5.0000e- 005	7.2800e- 003	1.9200e- 003	4.0000e- 005	1.9600e- 003	0.0000	5.9482	5.9482	1.7000e- 004	1.6000e- 004	6.0009
Total	2.2600e- 003	1.8800e- 003	0.0245	6.0000e- 005	7.2300e- 003	5.0000e- 005	7.2800e- 003	1.9200e- 003	4.0000e- 005	1.9600e- 003	0.0000	5.9482	5.9482	1.7000e- 004	1.6000e- 004	6.0009

#### 3.4 Building Construction - 2022

## Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.1118	1.0228	1.0718	1.7600e- 003		0.0530	0.0530	1 1 1	0.0499	0.0499	0.0000	151.7800	151.7800	0.0364	0.0000	152.6891
Total	0.1118	1.0228	1.0718	1.7600e- 003		0.0530	0.0530		0.0499	0.0499	0.0000	151.7800	151.7800	0.0364	0.0000	152.6891

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.4 Building Construction - 2022

## Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.3000e- 004	3.3700e- 003	1.1200e- 003	1.0000e- 005	4.1000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	4.4000e- 004	1.2000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	1.2508	1.2508	4.0000e- 005	1.8000e- 004	1.3056
Worker	9.0000e- 004	7.5000e- 004	9.7100e- 003	3.0000e- 005	2.8700e- 003	2.0000e- 005	2.8900e- 003	7.6000e- 004	2.0000e- 005	7.8000e- 004	0.0000	2.3613	2.3613	7.0000e- 005	6.0000e- 005	2.3822
Total	1.0300e- 003	4.1200e- 003	0.0108	4.0000e- 005	3.2800e- 003	5.0000e- 005	3.3300e- 003	8.8000e- 004	5.0000e- 005	9.3000e- 004	0.0000	3.6120	3.6120	1.1000e- 004	2.4000e- 004	3.6878

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.1118	1.0228	1.0718	1.7600e- 003		0.0530	0.0530	1 1 1	0.0499	0.0499	0.0000	151.7799	151.7799	0.0364	0.0000	152.6889
Total	0.1118	1.0228	1.0718	1.7600e- 003		0.0530	0.0530		0.0499	0.0499	0.0000	151.7799	151.7799	0.0364	0.0000	152.6889

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.4 Building Construction - 2022

## **Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.3000e- 004	3.3700e- 003	1.1200e- 003	1.0000e- 005	4.1000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	4.4000e- 004	1.2000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	1.5000e- 004	0.0000	1.2508	1.2508	4.0000e- 005	1.8000e- 004	1.3056
Worker	9.0000e- 004	7.5000e- 004	9.7100e- 003	3.0000e- 005	2.8700e- 003	2.0000e- 005	2.8900e- 003	7.6000e- 004	2.0000e- 005	7.8000e- 004	0.0000	2.3613	2.3613	7.0000e- 005	6.0000e- 005	2.3822
Total	1.0300e- 003	4.1200e- 003	0.0108	4.0000e- 005	3.2800e- 003	5.0000e- 005	3.3300e- 003	8.8000e- 004	5.0000e- 005	9.3000e- 004	0.0000	3.6120	3.6120	1.1000e- 004	2.4000e- 004	3.6878

## 3.4 Building Construction - 2023

# **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.2045	1.8700	2.1117	3.5000e- 003		0.0910	0.0910	1 1 1	0.0856	0.0856	0.0000	301.3462	301.3462	0.0717	0.0000	303.1383
Total	0.2045	1.8700	2.1117	3.5000e- 003		0.0910	0.0910		0.0856	0.0856	0.0000	301.3462	301.3462	0.0717	0.0000	303.1383

## EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.4 Building Construction - 2023

## Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.5000e- 004	5.2400e- 003	1.9600e- 003	2.0000e- 005	8.2000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	8.4000e- 004	2.4000e- 004	2.0000e- 005	2.6000e- 004	0.0000	2.3637	2.3637	8.0000e- 005	3.4000e- 004	2.4670
Worker	1.6500e- 003	1.3100e- 003	0.0177	5.0000e- 005	5.7000e- 003	3.0000e- 005	5.7300e- 003	1.5100e- 003	3.0000e- 005	1.5500e- 003	0.0000	4.5357	4.5357	1.2000e- 004	1.2000e- 004	4.5739
Total	1.8000e- 003	6.5500e- 003	0.0197	7.0000e- 005	6.5200e- 003	6.0000e- 005	6.5700e- 003	1.7500e- 003	5.0000e- 005	1.8100e- 003	0.0000	6.8994	6.8994	2.0000e- 004	4.6000e- 004	7.0409

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.2045	1.8700	2.1117	3.5000e- 003		0.0910	0.0910	1 1 1	0.0856	0.0856	0.0000	301.3458	301.3458	0.0717	0.0000	303.1380
Total	0.2045	1.8700	2.1117	3.5000e- 003		0.0910	0.0910		0.0856	0.0856	0.0000	301.3458	301.3458	0.0717	0.0000	303.1380

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.4 Building Construction - 2023

## Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	7/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.5000e- 004	5.2400e- 003	1.9600e- 003	2.0000e- 005	8.2000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	8.4000e- 004	2.4000e- 004	2.0000e- 005	2.6000e- 004	0.0000	2.3637	2.3637	8.0000e- 005	3.4000e- 004	2.4670
Worker	1.6500e- 003	1.3100e- 003	0.0177	5.0000e- 005	5.7000e- 003	3.0000e- 005	5.7300e- 003	1.5100e- 003	3.0000e- 005	1.5500e- 003	0.0000	4.5357	4.5357	1.2000e- 004	1.2000e- 004	4.5739
Total	1.8000e- 003	6.5500e- 003	0.0197	7.0000e- 005	6.5200e- 003	6.0000e- 005	6.5700e- 003	1.7500e- 003	5.0000e- 005	1.8100e- 003	0.0000	6.8994	6.8994	2.0000e- 004	4.6000e- 004	7.0409

#### 3.4 Building Construction - 2024

# **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.1928	1.7611	2.1179	3.5300e- 003		0.0803	0.0803	1 1 1	0.0756	0.0756	0.0000	303.7223	303.7223	0.0718	0.0000	305.5179
Total	0.1928	1.7611	2.1179	3.5300e- 003		0.0803	0.0803		0.0756	0.0756	0.0000	303.7223	303.7223	0.0718	0.0000	305.5179

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.4 Building Construction - 2024

## Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.4000e- 004	5.2900e- 003	1.9300e- 003	2.0000e- 005	8.3000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	8.5000e- 004	2.4000e- 004	2.0000e- 005	2.6000e- 004	0.0000	2.3461	2.3461	8.0000e- 005	3.4000e- 004	2.4489
Worker	1.5500e- 003	1.1800e- 003	0.0166	5.0000e- 005	5.7400e- 003	3.0000e- 005	5.7800e- 003	1.5300e- 003	3.0000e- 005	1.5600e- 003	0.0000	4.4413	4.4413	1.1000e- 004	1.1000e- 004	4.4770
Total	1.6900e- 003	6.4700e- 003	0.0185	7.0000e- 005	6.5700e- 003	6.0000e- 005	6.6300e- 003	1.7700e- 003	5.0000e- 005	1.8200e- 003	0.0000	6.7875	6.7875	1.9000e- 004	4.5000e- 004	6.9259

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.1928	1.7611	2.1179	3.5300e- 003		0.0803	0.0803		0.0756	0.0756	0.0000	303.7220	303.7220	0.0718	0.0000	305.5175
Total	0.1928	1.7611	2.1179	3.5300e- 003		0.0803	0.0803		0.0756	0.0756	0.0000	303.7220	303.7220	0.0718	0.0000	305.5175

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.4 Building Construction - 2024

## Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	7/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.4000e- 004	5.2900e- 003	1.9300e- 003	2.0000e- 005	8.3000e- 004	3.0000e- 005	8.5000e- 004	2.4000e- 004	2.0000e- 005	2.6000e- 004	0.0000	2.3461	2.3461	8.0000e- 005	3.4000e- 004	2.4489
Worker	1.5500e- 003	1.1800e- 003	0.0166	5.0000e- 005	5.7400e- 003	3.0000e- 005	5.7800e- 003	1.5300e- 003	3.0000e- 005	1.5600e- 003	0.0000	4.4413	4.4413	1.1000e- 004	1.1000e- 004	4.4770
Total	1.6900e- 003	6.4700e- 003	0.0185	7.0000e- 005	6.5700e- 003	6.0000e- 005	6.6300e- 003	1.7700e- 003	5.0000e- 005	1.8200e- 003	0.0000	6.7875	6.7875	1.9000e- 004	4.5000e- 004	6.9259

#### 3.4 Building Construction - 2025

## Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.0738	0.6734	0.8686	1.4600e- 003		0.0285	0.0285	1 1 1	0.0268	0.0268	0.0000	125.2365	125.2365	0.0294	0.0000	125.9725
Total	0.0738	0.6734	0.8686	1.4600e- 003		0.0285	0.0285		0.0268	0.0268	0.0000	125.2365	125.2365	0.0294	0.0000	125.9725

#### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

# 3.4 Building Construction - 2025

## Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	6.0000e- 005	2.1700e- 003	7.8000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	3.4000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	3.5000e- 004	1.0000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	1.1000e- 004	0.0000	0.9497	0.9497	3.0000e- 005	1.4000e- 004	0.9913
Worker	6.0000e- 004	4.4000e- 004	6.3700e- 003	2.0000e- 005	2.3700e- 003	1.0000e- 005	2.3800e- 003	6.3000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	6.4000e- 004	0.0000	1.7686	1.7686	4.0000e- 005	4.0000e- 005	1.7823
Total	6.6000e- 004	2.6100e- 003	7.1500e- 003	3.0000e- 005	2.7100e- 003	2.0000e- 005	2.7300e- 003	7.3000e- 004	2.0000e- 005	7.5000e- 004	0.0000	2.7183	2.7183	7.0000e- 005	1.8000e- 004	2.7736

#### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.0738	0.6734	0.8686	1.4600e- 003		0.0285	0.0285	1 1 1	0.0268	0.0268	0.0000	125.2364	125.2364	0.0294	0.0000	125.9723
Total	0.0738	0.6734	0.8686	1.4600e- 003		0.0285	0.0285		0.0268	0.0268	0.0000	125.2364	125.2364	0.0294	0.0000	125.9723
### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

### 3.4 Building Construction - 2025

### **Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	7/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	6.0000e- 005	2.1700e- 003	7.8000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	3.4000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	3.5000e- 004	1.0000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	1.1000e- 004	0.0000	0.9497	0.9497	3.0000e- 005	1.4000e- 004	0.9913
Worker	6.0000e- 004	4.4000e- 004	6.3700e- 003	2.0000e- 005	2.3700e- 003	1.0000e- 005	2.3800e- 003	6.3000e- 004	1.0000e- 005	6.4000e- 004	0.0000	1.7686	1.7686	4.0000e- 005	4.0000e- 005	1.7823
Total	6.6000e- 004	2.6100e- 003	7.1500e- 003	3.0000e- 005	2.7100e- 003	2.0000e- 005	2.7300e- 003	7.3000e- 004	2.0000e- 005	7.5000e- 004	0.0000	2.7183	2.7183	7.0000e- 005	1.8000e- 004	2.7736

### 3.5 Paving - 2025

### Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.0353	0.3239	0.5237	8.1000e- 004		0.0152	0.0152	1 1 1	0.0140	0.0140	0.0000	70.4265	70.4265	0.0221	0.0000	70.9797
Paving	0.0000		1 1 1 1			0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	0.0353	0.3239	0.5237	8.1000e- 004		0.0152	0.0152		0.0140	0.0140	0.0000	70.4265	70.4265	0.0221	0.0000	70.9797

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

### 3.5 Paving - 2025

### **Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.3800e- 003	1.7300e- 003	0.0254	8.0000e- 005	9.4200e- 003	5.0000e- 005	9.4800e- 003	2.5000e- 003	5.0000e- 005	2.5500e- 003	0.0000	7.0415	7.0415	1.6000e- 004	1.7000e- 004	7.0961
Total	2.3800e- 003	1.7300e- 003	0.0254	8.0000e- 005	9.4200e- 003	5.0000e- 005	9.4800e- 003	2.5000e- 003	5.0000e- 005	2.5500e- 003	0.0000	7.0415	7.0415	1.6000e- 004	1.7000e- 004	7.0961

### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Off-Road	0.0353	0.3239	0.5236	8.1000e- 004		0.0152	0.0152		0.0140	0.0140	0.0000	70.4264	70.4264	0.0221	0.0000	70.9796
Paving	0.0000		1			0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	0.0353	0.3239	0.5236	8.1000e- 004		0.0152	0.0152		0.0140	0.0140	0.0000	70.4264	70.4264	0.0221	0.0000	70.9796

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

### 3.5 Paving - 2025

### **Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.3800e- 003	1.7300e- 003	0.0254	8.0000e- 005	9.4200e- 003	5.0000e- 005	9.4800e- 003	2.5000e- 003	5.0000e- 005	2.5500e- 003	0.0000	7.0415	7.0415	1.6000e- 004	1.7000e- 004	7.0961
Total	2.3800e- 003	1.7300e- 003	0.0254	8.0000e- 005	9.4200e- 003	5.0000e- 005	9.4800e- 003	2.5000e- 003	5.0000e- 005	2.5500e- 003	0.0000	7.0415	7.0415	1.6000e- 004	1.7000e- 004	7.0961

### 3.6 Architectural Coating - 2025

### **Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Archit. Coating	0.0563	1 1 1				0.0000	0.0000	, , ,	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	9.3100e- 003	0.0624	0.0986	1.6000e- 004		2.8100e- 003	2.8100e- 003		2.8100e- 003	2.8100e- 003	0.0000	13.9152	13.9152	7.6000e- 004	0.0000	13.9342
Total	0.0656	0.0624	0.0986	1.6000e- 004		2.8100e- 003	2.8100e- 003		2.8100e- 003	2.8100e- 003	0.0000	13.9152	13.9152	7.6000e- 004	0.0000	13.9342

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

### 3.6 Architectural Coating - 2025

### Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.5000e- 004	1.1000e- 004	1.6100e- 003	0.0000	6.0000e- 004	0.0000	6.0000e- 004	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.4462	0.4462	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4497
Total	1.5000e- 004	1.1000e- 004	1.6100e- 003	0.0000	6.0000e- 004	0.0000	6.0000e- 004	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.4462	0.4462	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4497

### **Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Archit. Coating	0.0563					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	9.3100e- 003	0.0624	0.0986	1.6000e- 004		2.8100e- 003	2.8100e- 003		2.8100e- 003	2.8100e- 003	0.0000	13.9152	13.9152	7.6000e- 004	0.0000	13.9342
Total	0.0656	0.0624	0.0986	1.6000e- 004		2.8100e- 003	2.8100e- 003		2.8100e- 003	2.8100e- 003	0.0000	13.9152	13.9152	7.6000e- 004	0.0000	13.9342

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

### 3.6 Architectural Coating - 2025

### **Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							MT	/yr		
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.5000e- 004	1.1000e- 004	1.6100e- 003	0.0000	6.0000e- 004	0.0000	6.0000e- 004	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.4462	0.4462	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4497
Total	1.5000e- 004	1.1000e- 004	1.6100e- 003	0.0000	6.0000e- 004	0.0000	6.0000e- 004	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.4462	0.4462	1.0000e- 005	1.0000e- 005	0.4497

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

### 4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile

### 4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category					ton	s/yr							МТ	/yr		
Mitigated	0.0468	0.0517	0.4788	1.0600e- 003	0.1198	7.7000e- 004	0.1205	0.0320	7.1000e- 004	0.0327	0.0000	98.4781	98.4781	6.7700e- 003	4.2500e- 003	99.9147
Unmitigated	0.0468	0.0517	0.4788	1.0600e- 003	0.1198	7.7000e- 004	0.1205	0.0320	7.1000e- 004	0.0327	0.0000	98.4781	98.4781	6.7700e- 003	4.2500e- 003	99.9147

### 4.2 Trip Summary Information

	Aver	age Daily Trip Ra	ite	Unmitigated	Mitigated
Land Use	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
Single Family Housing	94.40	95.40	85.50	318,723	318,723
Total	94.40	95.40	85.50	318,723	318,723

### **4.3 Trip Type Information**

	Miles				Trip %			Trip Purpos	e %
Land Use	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
Single Family Housing	14.70	5.90	8.70	40.20	19.20	40.60	86	11	3

### 4.4 Fleet Mix

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Single Family Housing	0.537891	0.065289	0.189998	0.126515	0.023567	0.006518	0.011114	0.008084	0.000933	0.000591	0.025474	0.000708	0.003318

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

### 5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

### 5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

Install High Efficiency Lighting

	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	Category tons/yr											MT	'/yr			
Electricity Mitigated						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	24.7490	24.7490	1.1800e- 003	1.4000e- 004	24.8211
Electricity Unmitigated	,		,	,	,	0.0000	0.0000	,	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	24.7490	24.7490	1.1800e- 003	1.4000e- 004	24.8211
NaturalGas Mitigated	1.4900e- 003	0.0127	5.4100e- 003	8.0000e- 005	,	1.0300e- 003	1.0300e- 003	,	1.0300e- 003	1.0300e- 003	0.0000	14.7359	14.7359	2.8000e- 004	2.7000e- 004	14.8235
NaturalGas Unmitigated	1.4900e- 003	0.0127	5.4100e- 003	8.0000e- 005		1.0300e- 003	1.0300e- 003	,	1.0300e- 003	1.0300e- 003	0.0000	14.7359	14.7359	2.8000e- 004	2.7000e- 004	14.8235

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

### 5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

**Unmitigated** 

	NaturalGa s Use	ROG	NOx	СО	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr		tons/yr										МТ	/yr			
Single Family Housing	276140	1.4900e- 003	0.0127	5.4100e- 003	8.0000e- 005		1.0300e- 003	1.0300e- 003		1.0300e- 003	1.0300e- 003	0.0000	14.7359	14.7359	2.8000e- 004	2.7000e- 004	14.8235
Total		1.4900e- 003	0.0127	5.4100e- 003	8.0000e- 005		1.0300e- 003	1.0300e- 003		1.0300e- 003	1.0300e- 003	0.0000	14.7359	14.7359	2.8000e- 004	2.7000e- 004	14.8235

### Mitigated

	NaturalGa s Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr	tons/yr											MT	/yr			
Single Family Housing	276140	1.4900e- 003	0.0127	5.4100e- 003	8.0000e- 005		1.0300e- 003	1.0300e- 003		1.0300e- 003	1.0300e- 003	0.0000	14.7359	14.7359	2.8000e- 004	2.7000e- 004	14.8235
Total		1.4900e- 003	0.0127	5.4100e- 003	8.0000e- 005		1.0300e- 003	1.0300e- 003		1.0300e- 003	1.0300e- 003	0.0000	14.7359	14.7359	2.8000e- 004	2.7000e- 004	14.8235

Page 28 of 34

Future Street Single Family Cumulative - Los Angeles-South Coast County, Annual

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

5.3 Energy by Land Use - Electricity

<u>Unmitigated</u>

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e				
Land Use	kWh/yr	MT/yr							
Single Family Housing	78849.4	24.7490	1.1800e- 003	1.4000e- 004	24.8211				
Total		24.7490	1.1800e- 003	1.4000e- 004	24.8211				

### Mitigated

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e					
Land Use	kWh/yr	MT/yr								
Single Family Housing	78849.4	24.7490	1.1800e- 003	1.4000e- 004	24.8211					
Total		24.7490	1.1800e- 003	1.4000e- 004	24.8211					

### 6.0 Area Detail

6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

No Hearths Installed

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	gory tons/yr											МТ	/yr			
Mitigated	0.0738	1.1900e- 003	0.1030	1.0000e- 005		5.7000e- 004	5.7000e- 004		5.7000e- 004	5.7000e- 004	0.0000	0.1685	0.1685	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.1725
Unmitigated	0.1065	3.7800e- 003	0.1666	1.7000e- 004	<b></b>	0.0101	0.0101	<b></b>     	0.0101	0.0101	1.0622	2.2096	3.2718	3.3300e- 003	7.0000e- 005	3.3765

### 6.2 Area by SubCategory

**Unmitigated** 

	ROG	NOx	со	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory		tons/yr											МТ	/yr		
Architectural Coating	5.6300e- 003					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Consumer Products	0.0650					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Hearth	0.0328	2.5900e- 003	0.0636	1.6000e- 004		9.5500e- 003	9.5500e- 003		9.5500e- 003	9.5500e- 003	1.0622	2.0412	3.1034	3.1700e- 003	7.0000e- 005	3.2040
Landscaping	3.0900e- 003	1.1900e- 003	0.1030	1.0000e- 005		5.7000e- 004	5.7000e- 004		5.7000e- 004	5.7000e- 004	0.0000	0.1685	0.1685	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.1725
Total	0.1065	3.7800e- 003	0.1666	1.7000e- 004		0.0101	0.0101		0.0101	0.0101	1.0622	2.2096	3.2718	3.3300e- 003	7.0000e- 005	3.3765

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

### 6.2 Area by SubCategory

#### Mitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory		tons/yr											MT	/yr		
Architectural Coating	5.6300e- 003	, , ,	1	, , ,		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Consumer Products	0.0650					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Hearth	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Landscaping	3.0900e- 003	1.1900e- 003	0.1030	1.0000e- 005		5.7000e- 004	5.7000e- 004		5.7000e- 004	5.7000e- 004	0.0000	0.1685	0.1685	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.1725
Total	0.0738	1.1900e- 003	0.1030	1.0000e- 005		5.7000e- 004	5.7000e- 004		5.7000e- 004	5.7000e- 004	0.0000	0.1685	0.1685	1.6000e- 004	0.0000	0.1725

### 7.0 Water Detail

### 7.1 Mitigation Measures Water

Install Low Flow Bathroom Faucet

Install Low Flow Kitchen Faucet

Install Low Flow Toilet

Install Low Flow Shower

EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category		ī/yr		
Mitigated	3.7280	0.0172	4.2000e- 004	4.2825
Unmitigated	4.3019	0.0214	5.2000e- 004	4.9940

# 7.2 Water by Land Use <u>Unmitigated</u>

	Indoor/Out door Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e				
Land Use	Mgal	MT/yr							
Single Family Housing	0.65154 / 0.410754	4.3019	0.0214	5.2000e- 004	4.9940				
Total		4.3019	0.0214	5.2000e- 004	4.9940				

Page 32 of 34

Future Street Single Family Cumulative - Los Angeles-South Coast County, Annual

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

### 7.2 Water by Land Use

### Mitigated

	Indoor/Out door Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e					
Land Use	Mgal	MT/yr								
Single Family Housing	0.521232/ 0.410754	3.7280	0.0172	4.2000e- 004	4.2825					
Total		3.7280	0.0172	4.2000e- 004	4.2825					

### 8.0 Waste Detail

### 8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

### Category/Year

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e		
	MT/yr					
Mitigated	2.4136	0.1426	0.0000	5.9795		
Unmitigated	2.4136	0.1426	0.0000	5.9795		

Page 33 of 34

Future Street Single Family Cumulative - Los Angeles-South Coast County, Annual

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

### 8.2 Waste by Land Use

**Unmitigated** 

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e	
Land Use	tons	MT/yr				
Single Family Housing	11.89	2.4136	0.1426	0.0000	5.9795	
Total		2.4136	0.1426	0.0000	5.9795	

### Mitigated

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e	
Land Use	tons	MT/yr				
Single Family Housing	11.89	2.4136	0.1426	0.0000	5.9795	
Total		2.4136	0.1426	0.0000	5.9795	

### 9.0 Operational Offroad

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type

### EMFAC Off-Model Adjustment Factors for Gasoline Light Duty Vehicle to Account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule Not Applied

### **10.0 Stationary Equipment**

### Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
Boilers						
Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type	
User Defined Equipment						
Equipment Type	Number					
11.0 Vegetation						

APPENDIX B - BIOLOGICAL REPORT



### **BIOLOGICAL REPORT**

### 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152 AND 3164 FUTURE STREET PROJECT

### CITY OF LOS ANGELES, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Highrise Incorporated

Prepared For:

**Highrise Incorporated** 10955 Penrose Street Sun Valley, CA 91352 Contact: Andre Ohanian

Prepared By:

**Environmental Intelligence** 1590 South Coast Highway, Suite 17 Laguna Beach, CA 92651 Contact: Travis Tolliver

Date:

September 10, 2020

### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

EXECUTIV	VE SUMMARY IV	Ι
1.0 INTR	RODUCTION	1
1.1	Project Location and Description	1
2.0 REG	ULATORY FRAMEWORK	1
2.1	Federal	1
2.1.1	Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA)	1
2.1.2	Migratory Birds	1
2.1.3	Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act	1
2.1.4	Clean Water Act	2
2.2	State of California	2
2.2.1	California Endangered Species Act (CESA)	2
2.2.2	California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)	3
2.2.3	Fish and Game Code and Title 14 Laws and Regulations	3
2.3	Local	3
2.3.1	City of Los Angeles General Plan	3
2.3.2	Mount Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan	1
3.0 MET	HODS	4
3.1	Database Search and Literature Review	1
3.2	Field Surveys	1
4.0 RESU	ULTS	5
4.1	Physical Environment	5
4.2	Water Resources	5
4.3	Vegetation Communities / Land Cover Types	5
4.3.1	Non-Sensitive Vegetation Communities	5
4.3.2	Land Cover	5
4.4	General Plants and Wildlife	5
4.5	Special-Status Biological Resources	5
4.5.1	Sensitive Vegetation Communities	7
4.5.2	Special-Status Plant Species	7
4.5.3	Special-Status Wildlife Species	7
4.5.4	Migratory and Nesting Birds	7
5.0 CON	CLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	3
5.1	Special Status Plant Species	3
5.2	Migratory and Nesting Birds	3
6.0 REFI	ERENCES	9



### TABLES

### APPENDICES

### A. EXHIBITS

- 1. **PROJECT VICINITY**
- 2. SITE LOCATION
- 3. BIOLOGICAL SURVEY RESULTS
- B. SITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- C. FLORAL AND FAUNAL COMPENDIA
- D. SPECIAL-STATUS BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES OCCURRING OR POTENTIALLY OCCURRING ON OR IN THE VICINITY (WITHIN 3 MILES) OF THE FUTURE STREET PROJECT



iii

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Environmental Intelligence, LLC (EI) was retained by Highrise Incorporated to conduct a habitat assessment for special-status plant and wildlife species in support of the Future Street Project (Proposed Project) located at 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152, and 3164 Future Street in the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California (Exhibit 1). The results of the habitat assessment (1) document existing site conditions; (2) identify vegetation/habitat communities; (3) identify suitable habitat for sensitive species; and (4) provide recommendations for proposed activities.

The Proposed Project consists of grading and construction activities, including removal of trees and vegetation, for 10 new single-family homes on a vacant lot on the northeast side of Future Street.

Two non-sensitive vegetation communities and two land cover types were identified during the habitat assessment.

One special-status plant species, southern California black walnut (*Juglans californica;* CRPR 4.2), was observed during the habitat assessment.

No special-status wildlife species were detected during the habitat assessment.

Trees, shrubs, and buildings on-site and adjacent to the Proposed Project site provide suitable nesting habitat for bird species. Proposed Project impacts will be less than significant with implementation of BIO Mitigation Measure 1.



### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Environmental Intelligence, LLC (EI) was retained by Highrise Incorporated to conduct a habitat assessment for special-status plant and wildlife species in support of the Future Street Project (Proposed Project) located at 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152, and 3164 Future Street in the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California (Exhibit 1). The results of the habitat assessment (1) document existing site conditions; (2) identify vegetation/habitat communities; (3) identify suitable habitat for sensitive species; and (4) provide recommendations for proposed activities.

### 1.1 **Project Location and Description**

The Proposed Project is located at 3110, 3114, 3118, 3122, 3126, 3134, 3138, 3144, 3152 and 3164 Future Street in the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California. The Proposed Project is within Township 01 South, Range 13 West of the Los Angeles United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute quadrangle.

The Proposed Project is located within the Mount Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan area. Land use near the Proposed Project is primarily residential within the Cypress Park community. Cypress Park is a densely populated neighborhood with areas of open hillsides near the Proposed Project.

The Proposed Project consists of grading and construction activities, including removal of trees and vegetation, for 10 new single-family homes on a vacant lot on the northeast side of Future Street.

### 2.0 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

The Proposed Project will comply with applicable federal, state, and local laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards (LORS) throughout Project construction. Potentially applicable LORS are discussed below.

### 2.1 Federal

### 2.1.1 FEDERAL ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT (FESA)

This 1973 law, administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), is designed to minimize impacts to imperiled plants and animals, as well as facilitate recovery of such species. Declining plant and animal species are listed as "endangered" or "threatened" based on a variety of factors. Applicants for projects requiring federal agency action that could adversely affect listed species are required to consult with and mitigate impacts in consultation with the USFWS. Adverse impacts are defined as "take" (defined as "to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, collect, or attempt to engage in such conduct"), which is prohibited except as authorized through consultation under Section 7 or through issuance of an Incidental Take Permit under Section 10.

### 2.1.2 MIGRATORY BIRDS

The protection of birds is regulated by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA). Any activity, intentional or unintentional, resulting in take of migratory birds, including eagles, is prohibited unless otherwise permitted by the USFWS (50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668[a]).

The MBTA makes it illegal for anyone to take, possess, import, export, transport, sell, purchase, barter, or offer for sale, purchase, or barter, any migratory bird, or the parts, nests, or eggs of such a bird except under the terms of a valid permit issued pursuant to federal regulations. The migratory bird species protected by the MBTA are listed in 50 CFR 10.13.

### 2.1.3 BALD AND GOLDEN EAGLE PROTECTION ACT

The BGEPA (16 U.S.C. 668-668c), enacted in 1940, and amended several times since then, prohibits anyone, without a permit issued by the Secretary of the Interior, from "taking" bald and golden eagles, including their parts, nests, or eggs. The BGEPA provides criminal penalties for persons who "take, possess, sell, purchase, barter, offer to sell, purchase or barter, transport, export or import, at any time or any manner, any bald eagle...or any golden eagle, alive or dead, or any part, nest, or egg thereof." The BGEPA defines "take" as "pursue, shoot, shoot at, poison, wound, kill, capture, trap, collect, molest or disturb." Disturb is



defined under the BGEPA as to agitate or bother an eagle to a degree that causes, or is likely to cause, based on the best scientific information available, (1) injury to an eagle, (2) a decrease in its productivity, by substantially interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior, or (3) nest abandonment, by substantially interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior (Pagel et al. 2010). In addition to immediate impacts, this definition also covers impacts that result from human-induced alterations around a previously used nest site during a time when eagles are not present, if, upon the eagle's return, such alterations agitate or bother an eagle to a degree that interferes with or interrupts normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering habits, and causes injury, death or nest abandonment.

### 2.1.4 CLEAN WATER ACT

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA, 33 USC 1251 et seq.) regulates the discharge of dredged or filled material into 'waters of the U.S.', including wetlands. Waters of the U.S. include navigable coastal and inland waters, lakes, rivers, streams, and their tributaries; interstate waters and their tributaries; wetlands adjacent to such waters; intermittent streams; and other waters that could affect interstate commerce. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is the designated regulatory agency responsible for administering the 404 permit program and for making jurisdictional determinations. This permitting authority applies to all waters of the U.S. where the material has the effect of (1) replacing any portion of waters of the U.S. These fill materials would include sand, rock, clay, construction debris, wood chips, and materials used to create any structure or infrastructure in waters of the U.S. Dredge and fill activities are typically associated with development projects; water-resource related projects; infrastructure development and wetland conversion to farming; forestry; and urban development.

Under Section 401 of the CWA, an activity requiring a USACE Section 404 permit must obtain a State Water Quality Certification (or waiver thereof) to ensure that the activity will not violate established State water quality standards. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) is the federal regulatory agency responsible for implementing the CWA. However, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), in conjunction with the nine California Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs), has been delegated the responsibility for administering the Section 401 water quality certification program.

### 2.2 State of California

### 2.2.1 CALIFORNIA ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT (CESA)

The California Endangered Species Act (CESA) states that all native species of fishes, amphibians, reptiles, birds, mammals, invertebrates, and plants, and their habitats, threatened with extinction and those experiencing a significant decline which, if not halted, would lead to a threatened or endangered designation, will be protected or preserved. This state law prohibits the "take" (defined as to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill) of state-listed species except as otherwise provided in state law. CESA, administered by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), is similar to the federal ESA, although unlike the federal law, CESA applies incidental take prohibitions to species currently petitioned for state-listing status (i.e., candidate species). State lead agencies are required to consult with the CDFW to ensure that their authorized actions are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any state-listed species or result in the degradation of occupied habitat. Under Section 2081, CDFW authorizes "take" of state-listed endangered, threatened, or candidate species through incidental take permits or memoranda of understanding. These acts, which are otherwise prohibited, may be authorized through permits or memoranda of understanding if (1) the take is incidental to otherwise lawful activities, (2) impacts of the take are minimized and fully mitigated, (3) the permit is consistent with regulations adopted in accordance with any recovery plan for the species in question, and (4) the applicant ensures suitable funding to implement the measures required by the CDFW. Should a species be both federally and state-listed, and if the federal ESA authorization fulfills CESA requirements, CDFW may streamline the CESA permitting process by adopting a Consistency Determination (Section 2081.1), that concurs with the federal authorization.



### 2.2.2 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

CEQA applies to "projects" proposed to be undertaken or requiring approval by state and/or local governmental agencies. "Projects" are activities that have the potential to have a physical impact on the environment. The purpose of CEQA is to: (1) disclose to the public the significant environmental effects of a proposed discretionary project, through the preparation of an Initial Study (IS), Negative Declaration (ND), or Environmental Impact Report (EIR); (2) prevent or minimize damage to the environment through development of project alternatives, mitigation measures, and mitigation monitoring; (3) disclose to the public the agency decision-making process utilized to approve discretionary projects through findings and statements of overriding consideration; (4) enhance public participation in the environmental review process through scoping meetings, public notice, public review, hearings, and the judicial process; and (5) improve interagency coordination through early consultations, scoping meetings, notices of preparation, and State Clearinghouse review.

### 2.2.3 FISH AND GAME CODE AND TITLE 14 LAWS AND REGULATIONS

Fish and Game Code (FGC) Section 3503 states that it is unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird, except as otherwise provided by the Code or any associated regulation. Section 3503.5 makes it unlawful to take, possess, or destroy birds of prey. It also prohibits the take, possession, or destruction of nests or eggs of any bird of prey. Section 3511 describes bird species, primarily raptors that are "fully protected." Fully protected species may not be taken or possessed, except under specific permit requirements. No incidental take permit may be issued for a fully protected species.

Sections 4700, 5050, and 5515 list mammal, reptile and amphibian, and fish species, respectively, that are classified as fully protected in California.

Section 1900 *et seq.* describes the Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA). The NPPA was enacted in 1977 and allows the Fish and Game Commission to designate plants as rare or endangered. There are 64 species, subspecies, and varieties of plants that are protected as rare under the NPPA. The NPPA prohibits take of endangered or rare native plants, but includes some exceptions for agricultural and nursery operations, emergencies, and after properly notifying CDFW, for vegetation removal from canals, roads, and other sites, changes in land use, and in certain other situations.

Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR) lists plant and animal species designated as threatened and endangered in California. California Species of Special Concern (SSC) is a category applied by CDFW to those species that are indicators of regional habitat changes or are considered potential future protected species. SSCs do not have any special legal status, but are intended by CDFW for use as a management tool to take these species into special consideration when decisions are made concerning the future of any land parcel.

Pursuant to Sections 1600 through 1616 of the California Fish and Game Code, all diversions, obstructions, or changes to the natural flow or bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake in California that support wildlife resources and/or riparian vegetation are subject to CDFW regulations. Under Section 1602, it is unlawful for any person to substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake designated by CDFW as waters within their jurisdiction without first notifying CDFW of such activity. Additionally, a person cannot use any material from the streambeds without first notifying the CDFW of such activity. For a project that may affect stream channels and/or riparian vegetation regulated under Sections 1600 through 1616 of the California Fish and Game Code, CDFW authorization is required in the form of a Streambed Alteration Agreement.

### 2.3 Local

### 2.3.1 CITY OF LOS ANGELES GENERAL PLAN

The Proposed Project is subject to the requirements and authority of the City of Los Angeles General Plan (2001), governed by the City of Los Angeles Community Development Department. The City of Los Angeles is committed to balancing the need of a property owner desiring to develop his or her property, with the City's desire to protect plants and wildlife. The Proposed Project shall be in compliance with all

3



applicable goals and actions as designated within the City General Plan to preserve plant and wildlife resources to encourage the preservation and conservation of plant and wildlife resources in the City.

### 2.3.2 MOUNT WASHINGTON/GLASSELL PARK SPECIFIC PLAN

The Proposed Project is subject to the requirements of the Mount Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan (1993). The Mount Washington and Glassell Park community is characterized by distinctive hills and canyons, mature and native vegetation and wildlife habitats, natural open space and panoramic vistas, and pedestrian walking trails. The Specific Plan focuses on preserving, maintaining, and improving single-family residential neighborhoods. The Proposed Project shall be in compliance with all applicable goals and actions as designated within the Specific Plant to preserve plant and wildlife resources.

### 3.0 METHODS

### 3.1 Database Search and Literature Review

Prior to the initiation of field work, a review of pertinent literature was performed to determine which species/habitats identified as special-status by state, federal, and local resources agencies have the potential to occur within the Proposed Project area or immediate vicinity (within 3 miles). This included a review of the following pertinent databases and documents:

- USFWS Species Occurrence Data (USFWS 2018),
- Federal Register listing package and critical habitat determination for each federally listed Endangered or Threatened species potentially occurring within the Project vicinity (USFWS 2018),
- California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) RareFind application (CDFW 2018),
- Electronic Inventory of the California Native Plant Society (CNPS 2018) and Consortium of California Herbaria (CCH 2018),
- County of Los Angeles General Plan (2001)
- Mount Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan (1993)

Special-status species with the potential to occur within the Proposed Project site were evaluated based on (1) age of recorded observations, (2) the species' range, (3) habitat requirements of the species versus the major plant community/habitat within the site's vicinity, and (4) previous records or observations during field surveys. These species were classified as one of the following:

- Occurs: the species and/or positive sign was observed on-site during the habitat assessment.
- **High potential for occurrence**: all site features indicate this species is very likely present and should be expected. Criteria include (1) project site within geographic range; (2) suitable habitat present (e.g., soils, vegetation communities, elevation); and (3) age of historical record(s) within 3 miles are less than 25 years old.
- Low potential for occurrence: species could occur, but records of the species are not locally common. Criteria include (1) Project site within geographic range; (2) suitable/marginal habitat present (e.g., soils, vegetation communities, elevation); and (3) age of historical records(s) within 3 miles are over 25 years old.
- **Does Not Occur**: species would not occur because the Proposed Project site is outside known or current geographic/elevation range, lacks habitat or suitable conditions, and/or there is reasonable certainty to assume absent based on age or distance of historical records.

Results of the database and literature review are included as Appendix D.

### 3.2 Field Surveys

EI biologist Travis Tolliver conducted a habitat assessment survey on July 2, 2018 to determine the potential effects of the Proposed Project on any protected resources that may be present in and around the site. The



Environmental Intelligence, LLC

survey area included a 100-foot buffer around the Proposed Project site; however, adjacent private residential yards were not surveyed. Mr. Tolliver walked slowly through the survey area to document existing site conditions, map vegetation/habitat communities, identify wildlife species and avian nests present, and identify areas that provide suitable habitat (e.g., vegetation communities, potential bat roosts, raptor nests, burrow complexes, etc.) for any special-status species. Particular focus during the survey was given to trees in the area that could provide suitable habitat for nesting birds. Mr. Tolliver stopped periodically to listen and watch for potential nesting behavior. During the survey, binoculars were used to view all structures and trees, and photographs were taken to document the site conditions (Appendix A). Special-status plant and wildlife species or sign were recorded with a Global Positional System (GPS) handheld unit (Garmin recreational model) when observed. Vegetation/habitat communities were described to the alliance level in accordance with A Manual of California Vegetation 2nd Edition (Sawyer et al. 2009).

### 4.0 RESULTS

### 4.1 Physical Environment

The Proposed Project is located on a vacant hillside lot surrounded by residential development (Exhibit 2). Elevation ranges from approximately 535 to 640 feet above mean sea level. Topography within the Proposed Project area is moderate to steep hills and consists of undeveloped land with native, ornamental, and non-native vegetation.

### 4.2 Water Resources

No ephemeral, intermittent, or perennial water resources were identified within the Proposed Project area during the habitat assessment or during desktop review of the National Hydrography Dataset (USGS 2018). The nearest drainage is an ephemeral drainage located approximately 1,300 feet northeast in Elyria Canyon Park. No impacts to water resources would occur as a result of the Proposed Project.

### 4.3 Vegetation Communities / Land Cover Types

Two non-sensitive vegetation communities and two land cover types were identified during the habitat assessment. General descriptions of the communities can be found in *A Manual of California Vegetation Online Edition* (CNPS 2020). Site-specific descriptions of the vegetation communities and land cover types are provided below.

Vegetation Community / Land Cover Type	Rarity Ranking <sup>1</sup>	Acres		
Non-Sensitive Vegetation Communities				
Avena (barbata, fatua; Wild oats grasslands) Herbaceous Semi-Natural Alliance	NA (Non-	0.72		
44.150.00	native)	0.75		
Malosma laurina (Laurel sumac scrub) Shrubland Alliance 45.455.00	G4 / S4	0.29		
Land Cover				
Developed	NA	0.31		
Ornamental / Landscaped	NA	0.50		

### TABLE 1. VEGETATION COMMUNITY / LAND COVER TYPE AND LOCATION

<sup>1</sup>Rarity and Global/State Ranks: One purpose of the vegetation classification is to assist in determining the level of rarity and imperilment of vegetation types. Ranking of alliances according to their degree of imperilment (as measured by rarity, trends, and threats) follows NatureServe's Heritage Methodology, in which all alliances are listed with a G (global) and S (state) rank. Alliances with State ranks of S1-S3 are considered to be highly imperiled.

5



### 4.3.1 NON-SENSITIVE VEGETATION COMMUNITIES

### Avena (barbata, fatua) Herbaceous Semi-Natural Alliance

Wild oats grassland is dominant in the herbaceous layer with over 75% relative cover. Other species present within the herbaceous layer include red brome (*Bromus madritensis* ssp. *rubens*) and black mustard (*Brassica nigra*). This vegetation community was recently mowed, occupies 0.73 acre of the Proposed Project site, and occurs predominately near existing residential development and paved roads.

### Malosma laurina Shrubland Alliance

Laurel sumac scrub is dominant in the shrub canopy with over 50% relative cover. Other species present in the shrub canopy include southern California black walnut (*Juglans californica*), coast prickly pear (*Opuntia littoralis*), San Pedro cactus (*Echinopsis pachanoi*), tree tobacco (*Nicotiana glauca*) and California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*). Southern California black walnuts are present as emergent trees within the shrub canopy, have very low cover, and would not meet *A Manual of California Vegetation Online Edition* (CNPS 2020) definition for a California Walnut Groves Woodland Alliance. The laurel sumac vegetation community occupies 0.29 acre along the northern Proposed Project boundary and extends off-site.

### 4.3.2 LAND COVER

### Developed

Developed lands include urban or built-up areas with much of the land covered by structures or roads, and roads are lined with ornamental trees. Such areas include parks, cities, transportation, power and communications facilities, mills, shopping centers, and other buildings that may, in some cases, be separate from urban areas. Urban or built-up land may contain a wide variety of native and non-native, ruderal, and ornamental plant species. This land cover type consists of paved Future Street along the south and west Proposed Project boundary.

### Ornamental / Landscaped

Ornamental or landscaped areas include plants that are grown for decorative purposes and require cultivation to maintain their aesthetic value. Such areas are usually near urban, recreational, industrial, commercial or agricultural areas. This land cover type consists of predominately Chinese elm (*Ulmus parvifolia*) and occupies 0.50 acre on the western half of the Proposed Project boundary.

### 4.4 General Plants and Wildlife

Eighteen plant species were identified during surveys. Nine vertebrates were either directly observed or detected through presence of sign during surveys. These included eight birds and one reptile. A full list of plant and wildlife species observed is included as Appendix C.

It should be noted that short-term inventories of this nature are limited in their scope by the seasonality, timing and duration of surveys, plant blooming periods, and the nocturnal and fossorial habits of many animals. Therefore, the lists of species in Appendix C do not necessarily reflect all the plants and animals that potentially occupy the Survey Area.

### 4.5 Special-Status Biological Resources

Plant or animal taxa may be considered "sensitive" or "special-status" due to declining populations, vulnerability to habitat change or loss, or because of restricted distributions. Some of these species have been listed as threatened or endangered by the USFWS and/or CDFW, and are thus protected by the federal and state ESAs, respectively. Other species have been identified as sensitive or special-status by the USFWS and CDFW. Still others have been designated as special-status species by private conservation organizations. The regulatory protection provided by these various agencies is discussed in Section 2.0 of this document.

The database search and literature review described in Section 3.1 identified special-status biological resources occurring or having the potential to occur in the vicinity (within 3 miles) of the Proposed Project.



Appendix D provides a complete list of these special-status biological resources, their respective conservation status, and occurrence potential. No USFWS designated critical habitat occurs on or within the vicinity of the Proposed Project.

The following sections describe the special-status vegetation communities and special-status plant and wildlife species occurring or with potential to occur on or within the immediate vicinity of the Proposed Project. Exhibit 3 provides the locations of special-status biological resources, including special-status species, sign, and bird nests, recorded within the Survey Area.

### 4.5.1 SENSITIVE VEGETATION COMMUNITIES

Sensitive vegetation communities are plant associations sometimes afforded special legislative protection. Such vegetation communities are normally considered a management priority because of their rarity or imperilment, the sensitivity of the species that they support, or because these areas serve multiple functions, as is often the case with wetlands. No sensitive vegetation communities were identified within the Proposed Project Survey Area.

### 4.5.2 SPECIAL-STATUS PLANT SPECIES

Based upon the literature search and habitat assessment, no special-status plant species have a high potential for occurrence within the vicinity of the Proposed Project. One special-status plant species, Robinson's pepper-grass (*Lepidium virginicum* var. *robinsonii*; California Rare Plant Rank [CRPR] 4.3), has a low potential for occurrence based on the presence of marginal habitat; however, the nearest record (CNDDB 1950) is 2.9 miles from the Proposed Project and over 70 years old.

One special-status plant species, southern California black walnut (CRPR 4.2), was observed within the Proposed Project Survey Area during the habitat assessment.

### 4.5.3 SPECIAL-STATUS WILDLIFE SPECIES

Based upon the literature search and habitat assessment, two wildlife species have a low potential for occurrence based the presence of marginal habitat onsite and nearby, recent historic records: southern California legless lizard (*Anniella stebbinsi*; California Department of Fish and Wildlife [CFDW] Species of Special Concern [SSC]) and American peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*; CDFW Fully Protected).

### Southern California Legless Lizard

The southern California legless lizard is a CDFW SSC found on beach dunes, chaparral, pine-oak woodlands, desert scrub, sandy washes, and stream terraces. This species prefers moist, loose soils with plant cover. CNDDB records from 2008 and 2013 were mapped to a nonspecific area in the vicinity of Elyria Canyon Park; however, potential for occurrence within this residential area is low due to the Proposed Project site being fragmented from Elyria Canyon Park and having a history of landscaping and vegetation management (mowing).

### American Peregrine Falcon

The American peregrine falcon is a CDFW Fully Protected species. This species prefers cliffs for nesting with nearby, open landscapes for foraging. This species sometimes uses man-made structures such as towers or buildings for nesting. The Proposed Project vicinity does not contain cliffs suitable for nesting. There are nearby buildings, however, potential for nesting within this residential area is low and no impacts to American peregrine falcon are anticipated with implementation of a nesting bird survey (see Section 5.3 for more details).

### 4.5.4 MIGRATORY AND NESTING BIRDS

Migratory birds, including raptors, may nest at or within close proximity to the Proposed Project site. Nesting birds may be found in native habitats, developed areas containing structures, ornamental plantings, and ruderal areas. Trees and shrubs on-site and adjacent to the Proposed Project area provide suitable nesting habitat for many bird species. One inactive house finch nest was identified during the habitat



assessment in a laurel sumac bush on the southern Proposed Project boundary along Future Street (Exhibit 3).

### 5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 Special Status Plant Species

Southern California black walnuts were detected onsite during the habitat assessment. The Future Street Arborist Report (McKinley & Associates 2019) identifies seven southern California black walnuts within the Proposed Project site, and two that require removal. Removals would be mitigated through a Permit from the Urban Forestry Department, and no anticipated impacts to southern California black walnuts would occur with implementation of Mitigation Measures 1-5 as stated within the Tree Preservation Plan section of the Future Street Arborist Report.

### 5.2 Migratory and Nesting Birds

Trees and shrubs throughout the site provide suitable habitat for nesting birds. Project construction may include vegetation removal that could result in direct loss of nests, eggs, and/or fledglings. Indirect impacts could occur from construction noise and human presence during nesting season and cause disruption of foraging or nest abandonment. The degree of sensitivity to disturbances varies by species and is influenced by the nesting stage (e.g., nest building, incubation, feeding chicks).

The following mitigation measure would reduce impacts to nesting birds and would ensure compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and Section 3503 of the California Fish and Game Code. Prior to the start of tree/shrub removal and grading activities associated with the Proposed Project, implementation of the following mitigation measure is recommended:

BIO Mitigation Measure 1 - Highrise Incorporated shall retain a qualified biologist (with at least 2 years of avian experience and knowledge of local bird species) to conduct a directed clearance survey to locate any active bird nests prior to any tree/shrub removal or grading/construction activities during the bird or raptor breeding season (general breeding and nesting bird season is February 1 through September 1; raptor nesting season is January 1 through June 30). This survey shall be conducted no more than three (3) days prior to the start of ground disturbing activities. If the qualified biologist determines there are active nests, a construction buffer will be implemented to avoid impacts to the nest. The qualified biologist shall determine the appropriate standard buffer distance for nests based on the sensitivity levels of specific avian species. The determination of the standard buffer widths shall be site- and species-specific, data-driven, and shall not be based on generalized assumptions regarding all nesting birds. If warranted, the qualified biologist will identify feasible measures to avoid any potential adverse effects on nesting birds.

No impacts to migratory or nesting birds are anticipated to occur with implementation of the above mitigation measure.



### 6.0 REFERENCES

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2018. California Natural Diversity Database. RareFind 5. https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB/Maps-and-Data. Accessed June, 2018.
- California Native Plant Society (CNPS), Rare Plant Program. 2018. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (online edition, v8-02). California Native Plant Society, Sacramento, CA. Website http://www.rareplants.cnps.org. Accessed June, 2018.
- California Native Plant Society (CNPS). 2020. A Manual of California Vegetation, Online Edition, California Native Plant Society: Sacramento, CA. Website http://vegetation.cnps.org/search?
- California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). 2018. Records of occurrence for USGS 7.5-minute Quadrangle maps within the Project area. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, State of California Resources Agency. Sacramento, California.
- City of Los Angeles. 2001. General Plan. Adopted September 26, 2001.
- City of Los Angeles. 1993. Mount Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan. Adopted May 10, 1993.
- Consortium of California Herbaria (CCH). 2018. Website http://ucjeps.berkeley.edu/consortium/. Accessed June, 2018.
- McKinley & Associates. 2019. Arborist Report 3110-3164 Future Street, Los Angeles, California. Prepared for Highrish Inc.
- Pagel, J.E., D.M. Whittington, and G.T. Allen. 2010. Interim Golden Eagle Inventory and Monitoring Protocols; and Other Recommendations. Division of Migratory Bird Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Sawyer, J.O., T. Keeler-Wolf and J. M. Evens. 2009. A Manual of California Vegetation, Second Edition. California Native Plant Society, Sacramento, California.
- United States Geological Survey (USGS). 2018. National Hydrography Dataset. Website https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/usgs-national-hydrography-dataset-nhd-downloadable-datacollection-national-geospatial-data-as



APPENDIX A: Exhibits





EXHIBIT 1: PROJECT VICINITY FUTURE STREET PROJECT | LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA

Ð





EXHIBIT 2: SITE LOCATION FUTURE STREET PROJECT | LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA





EXHIBIT 3: BIOLOGICAL SURVEY RESULTS FUTURE STREET PROJECT | LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA **APPENDIX B:** SITE PHOTOGRAPHS





## Рното 2:

OVERVIEW OF SITE FROM MIDDLE OF PROJECT, FACING EAST. PHOTO SHOWS BLACK WALNUT SAPLINGS ON THE LEFT AND ORNAMENTAL TREES ON THE EASTERN PROJECT BOUNDARY.



Рното 4:

VIEW OF LAUREL SUMAC ON THE SOUTHERN PROJECT BOUNDARY ALONG FUTURE STREET. PHOTO SHOWS AN INACTIVE HOUSE FINCH NEST WITHIN THE LAUREL SUMAC. Рното 1:

OVERVIEW OF SITE FROM EASTERN PROJECT BOUNDARY, FACING WEST. PHOTO SHOWS NON-NATIVE WILD OAT GRASSLAND WITH ORNAMENTAL TREES IN THE BACKGROUND.



Рното З:

OVERVIEW OF SITE FROM NORTHEAST CORNER, FACING WEST. PHOTO SHOWS LAUREL SUMAC ON THE RIGHT AND SPARSE CACTUS AND EMERGENT BLACK WALNUT AS THE COMMUNITY TRANSITIONS TO NON-NATIVE GRASSLAND.





PHOTO LOG: BIOLOGICAL REPORT (PAGE 1 OF 1) FUTURE STREET PROJECT | LOS ANGELES, CA Appendix C: Floral and Faunal Compendia


### **FLORA** SCIENTIFIC NAME (\* introduced/nonnative species) **COMMON NAME** AGAVACEAE - AGAVE FAMILY \*Agave americana \*American century plant ANACARDIACEAE - SUMAC/CASHEW FAMILY Malosma laurina Laurel sumac \*Schinus mole \*Peruvian peppertree APIACEAE – CARROT FAMILY \*Foeniculum vulgare \*Fennel **ARECACEAE – PALM FAMILY** Washingtonia filifera California fan palm **ASTERACEAE – SUNFLOWER FAMILY** Malacothrix saxatilis Cliff aster **BRASSICACEAE – MUSTARD FAMILY** \*Brassica nigra \*Black mustard **CACTACEAE - CACTUS FAMILY** \*San Pedro cactus \*Echinopsis pachanoi **Opuntia** littoralis Coastal prickly pear **CHENOPODIACEAE – GOOSEFOOT FAMILY** \*Russian thistle \*Salsola tragus **CONVOLVULACEAE – MORNING GLORY FAMILY** Calystegia sp. Morning glory species JUGLANDACEAE - WALNUT FAMILY Southern California black walnut Juglans californica (CRPR 4.2) POACEAE (GRAMINEAE) - GRASS FAMILY \*Wild oat \*Avena fatua \*Bromus madritensis ssp. rubens \*Red brome \*Pennisetum setaceum \*Fountaingrass **POLYGONACEAE – BUCKWHEAT FAMILY** Eriogonum fasciculatum California buckwheat SOLANACEAE - NIGHTSHADE FAMILY \*Nicotiana glauca \*Tree tobacco ULMACEAE - ELM FAMILY

- 2 -

\*Ulmus parvifolia



\*Chinese elm

### Reptiles SCIENTIFIC NAME

### **PHRYNOSOMATIDAE - LIZARDS**

Uta sp.

### **BIRDS**

### ACCIPITRIDAE - EAGLES, HAWKS, KITS, OSPREY Buteo jamaicensis

### **CATHARTIDAE - NEW WORLD VULTURES** Cathartes aura

### **COLUMBIDAE – PIGEONS AND DOVES**

Zenaida macroura

### **CORVIDAE - CROWS, MAGPIES, JAYS**

Aphelocoma californica Corvus corax

### FRINGILLIDAE – TRUE FINCHES

Haemorhous mexicanus

### **ICTERIDAE - NEW WORLD PASSERINES**

Sturnella neglecta

### **TROCHILIDAE – HUMMINGBIRD FAMILY**

Calypte anna

Anna's hummingbird

Western meadowlark

**COMMON NAME** 

Side blotched lizard

red-tailed hawk

Turkey vulture

Mourning dove

Common raven

House finch

California scrub jay

### **LEGEND:**

Federal (USFWS)	State (CDFW)
FE Endangered	SE Endangered
FT Threatened	ST Threatened
FC Candidate	SR Rare
	SC Candidate

### California Native Plant Society (CNPS) List Categories

List 1A	Plants Presumed Extinct in California
List 1B	Plants Rare, Threatened, or Endangered in California and Elsewhere
List 2	Plants Rare, Threatened, or Endangered in California but More Common Elsewhere
List 3	Plants about Which We Need More Information — A Review List
List 4	Plants of Limited Distribution – A Watch List

### California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Threat Rank Extensions

- Seriously threatened in California (high degree/immediacy of threat) .1
- .2 .3 Fairly threatened in California (moderate degree/immediacy of threat)
- Not very threatened in California (low degree/immediacy of threat or no current threats known



### APPENDIX D:

### Special-Status Biological Resources Occurring or Potentially Occurring on or in the Vicinity (within 3 Miles) of the Future Street Project



Cracics Norms	Status <sup>1</sup>			Distribution Habitat and Occurrence Datasticl <sup>2</sup>	Activity /	
Species Name	USFWS	CDFW	CNPS/HCP	Distribution, Habitat, and Occurrence Potential-	Period	
SENSITIVE VEGETATION COMMUNIT	IES					
<i>Juglans californica</i> (California walnut groves) Woodland Alliance	G2 S2.1		-	Juglans californica is dominant or co-dominant in the tree canopy with Alnus rhombifolia, Fraxinus dipetala, Heteromeles arbutifolia, Quercus agrifolia, Quercus lobata, Salix laevigata, Salix lasiolepis, Sambucus nigra and Umbellularia californica. Trees < 15 m tall; canopy is open to continuous. Shrub layer is sparse to intermittent. Herbaceous layer is sparse or grassy.	-	
				<b>Occurs.</b> This habitat type was detected onsite during the habitat assessment. Closest record (CNDDB 1985) is approximately 1.6 miles from Project.		
PLANTS						
				An annual herb found on alkaline soil in coastal bluff scrub and coastal scrub. 10 – 200 meters.		
<i>Atriplex serenana</i> var. <i>davidsonii</i> Davidson's saltscale	-	-	1B.2	<b>Does Not Occur.</b> No suitable coastal scrub habitat is present on or near the project site. The closest record (CNDDB 1902) is approximately 2.7 miles from Project and listed as "possibly extirpated".	Apr-Oct	
<i>Calystegia felix</i> Lucky morning-glory			An annual rhizomatous herb found in measures (sometimes alkaline) and riparian scrub $30 - 215$ meters.			
			1B.1	<b>Does Not Occur.</b> No suitable wetlands or marshes are present on or near the project site. The closest record (CNDDB 1899) is over 75 years old and approximately 2.5 miles from Project.	Mar-Sep	



Cracica Norra		Status <sup>1</sup>			Activity /	
Species Name	USFWS	CDFW	CNPS/HCP	Distribution, Habitat, and Occurrence Potential <sup>2</sup>	Bloom Period	
<i>Centromadia parryi</i> ssp. <i>australis</i> Southern tarplant			10 1	An annual herb found in marshes and swamps, valley and foothill grassland (vernally mesic), and vernal pools. 0 – 480 meters.	May-Nov	
	-	-	16.1	<b>Does Not Occur.</b> No suitable wetland or vernal pool habitat are present on or near the project site. The closest record (CNDDB 1930) is 1.9 miles from Project.		
<i>Horkelia cuneata</i> var. <i>puberula</i> Mesa horkelia			1B.1	A perennial herb found on dry, sandy soils in coastal chaparral. $70 - 870$ meters.	Mar-Jul	
	-	-		<b>Does Not Occur.</b> The closest records (CNDDB 1902 and 1906) are over 75 years old and listed as "extirpated".		
Lepidium virginicum var. robinsonii Robinson's pepper-grass				An annual herb found in chaparral and coastal scrub. $70 - 870$ meters.	Jan-Jul	
	-	-	4.3	<b>Low Potential for Occurrence.</b> Suitable habitat is found onsite; however, the closest record (CNDDB 1950) is over 25 years old and 2.9 miles from Project.		
<i>Navarretia prostrata</i> Prostrate vernal pool navarretia				An annual herb found on alkaline floodplains and vernal pools. < 700 meters.		
	-	-	1B.1	<b>Does Not Occur.</b> No suitable wetland or vernal pool habitat is present on or near the project site. The closest record (CNDDB 1907) is over 75 years old and listed as "possibly extirpated".	Apr-Jul	



Cracics Norms	Status <sup>1</sup>				Activity /	
Species Name	USFWS	CDFW	CNPS/HCP	Distribution, Habitat, and Occurrence Potential-	Period	
<i>Sidalcea neomexicana</i> Salt Spring checkerbloom				A perennial herb found on alkaline springs and marshes. < 1,500 meters.		
	-	-	2B.2	<b>Does Not Occur.</b> No suitable alkaline spring or marsh habitat is present on or near the project site. The closest record (CNDDB 1902) is over 75 years old and listed as "possibly extirpated".	Apr-Jun	
Symphyotrichum greatae Greata's aster			1B.3	A perennial herb found on damp soils in canyons. 300 – 2,000 meters.		
	-	-		<b>Does Not Occur.</b> No suitable mesic soils are present on or near the project site. The closest records (CNDDB 1902 and 1932) are over 75 years old and listed as "possibly extirpated".	Aug-Oct	
Birds						
Athene cunicularia Burrowing Owl				Inhabits relatively flat and open areas such as grasslands, coastal dunes, and agricultural areas; requires the presence of burrows for nesting and roosting activities. An uncommon to locally common resident in California.	Year-round	
	- SSC		-	<b>Does Not Occur</b> . The habitat on the project site is sloped, no small mammal burrows were detected during the habitat assessment, and is not the species' preferred habitat. The closest record (CNDDB 1921) is over 75 years old and mapped as best guess.	Breeding: Mar-Sep	



Succion Nome	Status <sup>1</sup>			Distribution Habitat and Occurrence Datasticl <sup>2</sup>	Activity /	
Species Name	USFWS	CDFW	CNPS/HCP	Distribution, Habitat, and Occurrence Potential	Period	
Empidonax traillii extimus Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (nesting)	FE SE		-	Riparian obligates, typically nesting in relatively dense riparian vegetation where surface water is present or soil moisture is high enough to maintain the appropriate vegetation characteristics.	Breeding:	
				<b>Does Not Occur.</b> No suitable riparian habitat is present on or near the project site. The closest record (CNDDB 1894) is over 75 years old and mapped as best guess.	Apr-Aug	
<i>Falco peregrinus anatum</i> American Peregrine Falcon (nesting)				Most commonly occupied habitats contain cliffs for nesting and generally open landscapes for foraging. In addition to natural habitats, many artificial habitats now used (towers, buildings, etc.).	Year-round	
	DL	DL/FP	-	<b>Low Potential for Occurrence.</b> The habitat on the project site is not the species' preferred habitat. Closest record is approximately 1.6 miles from the Project (CNDDB 2005).	Breeding: Feb-Aug	
Vireo bellii pusillus		Typically found in dense, low and shrubby vegetation in riparian areas, riparian woodlands, scrub oak, and coastal chaparral. Nests are usually located in dense shrubs, small trees, and occasionally herbaceous vegetation.	Breeding:			
Least Bell's Vireo (nesting)	FE SE		-	<b>Does Not Occur.</b> No suitable riparian habitat is present on or near the project site. CNDDB lists the species as "possibly extirpated". The closest record (CNDDB 1914) is over 75 years old and mapped as best guess.	Apr-Aug	
REPTILES						



Sweet or Norma	Status <sup>1</sup>			Distribution Habitat and Occurrence Datasticl <sup>2</sup>	Activity /	
Species Name	USFWS CDFW CNPS/HCP		CNPS/HCP	Distribution, Habitat, and Occurrence Potential	Bloom Period	
Anniella stebbinsi	500			Found in moist, loose soils with plant cover. Occurs in sparsely vegetated areas of beach dunes, chaparral, pine- oak woodlands, desert scrub, sandy washes, and stream terraces with sycamores, cottonwoods, or oaks.	Y I	
Southern California legless lizard	-	330	-	<b>Low Potential for Occurrence.</b> The habitat on the project site is not the species' preferred habitat. Species was detected adjacent to the Project site (CNDDB 2013) within Elyria Canyon Park.		
MAMMALS						
Nyctinomops macrotis		200		Found in rugged and rocky terrain. Prefers rocky cliffs i weathered rock fissures and crevices. Roosts in building and ponderosa pines, Douglas firs, and desert shrubs.		
Big free-tailed bat	- 550		_	<b>Does Not Occur.</b> The habitat on the project site is not the species' preferred habitat. Closest record (CNDDB 1985) is approximately 1.7 miles from Project.	mai-Dec	



	<sup>1</sup> Status	CNPS	<sup>2</sup> Occurrence Potential			
	USFWS	1A: Plants presumed extirpated in California and	Occurs: the species and/or positive sign was observed on-site			
	FE: Federally Endangered	either rare or extinct elsewhere	survey.			
	FT: Federally Threatened	1B: Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere	<b>Absent</b> : the species and/or positive sign was not observed survey(s) during the appropriate blooming/activity period (an			
	DL: Delisted	2A: Plants presumed extirpated in California, but	a reference population).			
	CDFW	common elsewhere	High Potential for Occurrence: all site features indicate the			
	SE: State Endangered	2B: Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in	present and should be expected.			
	ST: State Threatened	California, but more common elsewhere	• The habitat on the project site is the species' preferre			
	S1: State Threatened	3: Plants about which more information is needed	condition (has not been degraded by human disturband			
	SR: State Rare	- a review list	There is record of the species occurring on or adjacent			
	CE: State Candidate Endangered	4: Plants of limited distribution - a watch list	Moderate Potential for Occurrence:			
	SSC: California Species of Special Concern	0.1: Seriously threatened in California (over 80%	• The habitat on the project site is the species' preferred			
	FP: Fully Protected	of occurrences threatened / high degree and immediacy of threat)	disturbed or disturbance encompasses the project site the habitat to below a high likelihood that the species			
	DL: Delisted	0.2: Moderately threatened in California (20-80%	• The habitat on the project site is not the species' prefer			
	Vegetation Communities: Ranks are based on a one to five scale, ranging from critically imperiled (S1) to demonstrably secure (S5). S1-S3 communities considered rare.	occurrences threatened / moderate degree and immediacy of threat)	a similar structure to the preferred habitat and the speed this habitat type.			
		0.3: Not very threatened in California (less than 20% of occurrences threatened / low degree and	Low Potential for Occurrence:			
		immediacy of threat or no current threats known)	<ul> <li>The species and/or positive sign was not observed</li> </ul>			

CBR: Considered But Rejected

te during site visit or field

ed on-site during focused nd, for plants, observed at

his species is very likely

- ed habitat and is in good ce).
- to the project site.
- d habitat, but it has been e, reducing the quality of would inhabit it.
- red habitat, but it contains cies has been observed in
- on-site during focused survey(s) during the appropriate blooming/activity period.
- The habitat on the project site is not the species' preferred habitat. ٠
- The habitat is highly disturbed. ٠
- There are no records of the species occurring on or near the project site. ٠

Does Not Occur: species would not occur because the Project site is outside known or current geographic/elevation range, lacks habitat or suitable conditions, and/or there is reasonable certainty to assume absent based on historical records.



APPENDIX C – PROTECTED TREE REPORT

### PROTECTED TREE REPORT FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT AT

### 3164, 3152, 3144, 3138, 3134, 3126, 3122, 3118, 3114 and 3110 EAST FUTURE STREET LOS ANGELES, CA 90065

(APN: 5454-006-015, 5454-006-047, 5454-006-017, 5454-006-018, 5454-006-019, 5454-006-048, 5454-006-022, 5454-006-023, 5454-006-024 and 5454-006-025)

Prepared for:

### Mr. Andre Ohanian Highrise Inc. 10955 Penrose Ave. Sun Valley, CA 91352 818 636 1594 Highriseinc@att.net

October 30, 2021

Prepared by:

### Arsen Margossian, MS, Consulting Arborist Bardez Landscape Services, Inc.

International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) Certified Arborist # WE-7233A Member, American Society of Consulting Arborists (ASCA) ASCA Academy Graduate (2007) ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualified (TRAQ) California Licensed Pest Control Adviser #071429 California Licensed Forestry Pesticide Applicator #121525 3512 Rosemary Avenue Glendale, CA 91208 818 669 6469 arsenm@pacbell.net

© Copyright Arsen Margossian, Consulting Arborist, 2021

By II/23/22 Bryan Ramirez, St. Tree Superintendent Urban Forestry Division Reviewing Tree Report Only Review of report does not indicate UFD approval for

any tree removal

REVIEWED

### **Table of Contents**

Summary	1
Introduction	2
Background	2
Assignment	2
Limits of the Assignment	2
Purpose and Use of the Report	2
Observations	
General Site Observations	3-4
Tree Evaluation	5
At 3164 E Future St (#3 - #5, #24 & #25, #16 - #21 and #26)	6-8
At 3152 E Future St (#2)	9
At 3144 E Future St (#1 and #27)	9-10
At 3138 E Future St (#23 and #6)	10-11
At.3134 E Future St (#7)	12
At 3126 E Future St (#9 - #13 and # 22)	12-13
At 3122 E Future St (#8, #14, #15 and #28)	13-14
At 3118 E Future St (#29 and #30)	14
At 3114 E Future St (No Trees)	14
At 3110 E Future St (#31, #32 and #33)	
Construction Impact	16
Tree Preservation Plan	16-17
Mitigation for the Removed Trees	18
Conclusion	18
Appendix I: Protected Tree Survey According to Lot Address	19-23
Appendix II: Protected Tree Survey According to Tree Number	24-27
Appendix III: Survey of Protected Trees to be Removed	28-29
Appendix IV: Photographs	30-61
Appendix V: Site Plan	62
Glossary	63
Assumptions and Limiting Conditions	64
Certificate of Performance	65
Copies of Licenses	66-67

Protected Tree Report 3110-3164 E. Future St., Los Angeles, CA

### SUMMARY

I was contacted by Mr. Andre Ohanian, from Highrise Inc., to prepare a Protected Tree Report (PTR), for a ten-lot vacant land construction project, located at E. Future St., in Los Angeles, CA.

It has been planned to build a single-family dwelling on each lot. And the purpose of the PTR is to assess the protected trees on site and the impact of the construction project to the protected trees.

Based on the provided survey and site plan, and my own survey and observations, there are thirty-three various protected trees and shrubs on site, which are in various conditions. And based on the prepared site plan for the ten lots, a total of two protected and 14 significant trees are in conflict and have to be removed. Mitigation trees can be planted on site.

The remaining sixteen trees and shrubs can be retained, and must be protected.

### INTRODUCTION

### Background

Mr. Andre Ohanian inquired if I could prepare a Protected Tree Report (PTR) for a vacant land, consisting of ten lots, located at 3110-3164 E. Future St. in City of Los Angeles, California.

He indicated that plans have been made to build a single-family residence on each lot. All ten lots are adjacent on a hill and there are protected trees and shrubs on most of them.

After discussing my fees, I agreed to prepare the PTR.

### **Assignment**

I agreed to perform the following:

- Inspect and evaluate the protected trees and shrubs.
- Submit a written report of my observations and findings.
- Make appropriate recommendations if needed, based on my findings.

### Limits of the Assignment

This report and the observations included herein are based on my visits to the site on July 29, August 3 and 10, and September 27, 2021.

This arborist report was performed entirely at ground level. The inspection and evaluation of the trees and shrubs were limited to visual examination of accessible items without dissection, probing or coring. There is no warranty or guarantee, expressed or implied, that problems or deficiencies of the trees or property in question may not arise in the future.

### Purpose and Use of the Report

Mr. Andre Ohanian, on behalf of Highrise Inc., indicated that he is planning to proceed with the building of new single-family dwelling on each of the adjacent ten vacant lots.

The purpose of this report is to present the evaluation of the protected trees and shrubs on the lot, and the impact of the proposed construction project on these trees and shrubs.

This report is intended for the exclusive use of Mr. Ohanian, his associates and representatives.

Upon submission, this report will become their property and its use will be at their discretion.

### **OBSERVATIONS**

### **General Site Observations**

The ten abutting vacant lots are located in an R1-1 residential zoning area and at the following addresses with their respective Assessor Parcel Number (APN):

- <u>3164 E. Future St.</u> <u>5454-006-015</u>
- <u>3152 E. Future St.</u> <u>5454-006-047</u>
- <u>3144 E. Future St.</u> <u>5454-006-017</u>
- <u>3138 E. Future St.</u> <u>5454-006-018</u>
- <u>3134 E. Future St.</u> <u>5454-006-019</u>
- <u>3126 E. Future St.</u> <u>5454-006-048</u>
- <u>3122 E. Future St.</u> <u>5454-006-022</u>
- <u>3118 E. Future St.</u> <u>5454-006-023</u>
- <u>3114 E. Future St.</u> <u>5454-006-024</u>
- <u>3110 E. Future St.</u> <u>5454-006-025</u>

The ten lots are in the Mt. Washington-Glassell Park area of the City of Los Angeles. Access is from the Arroyo Seco Parkway (110 Freeway), off from Ave.26 exit, or from Glendale (2) Freeway, off from San Fernando Rd. exit.

The nearest cross-streets are Cliff Dr. and Kilbourn St. and the nearby major streets are Cypress Ave. and San Fernando Rd.

The lots are located on a natural steep hill, in the northeast to southwest direction. There is almost 100 feet difference between the highest and lowest grades on the ten combined lots.

It is being proposed to build a single-family dwelling on each of the ten lots. Below is the matrix of the proposed house characteristics and lot area for each lot:

				Floor	
APN	Address	Lot Area	Stories	Area	Footprint
5454-006-015	3164	6,626.1	3	2,766.5	1,248.0
5454-006-047	3152	6,470.2	3	2,756.5	1,248.0
5454-006-017	3144	6,993.9	3	2,756.5	1,350.0
5454-006-018	3138	5,288.4	3	2,756.5	1,248.0
5454-006-019	3134	5,840.0	3	2,756.5	1,248.0
5454-006-048	3126	7,917.3	3	2,756.5	1,248.0
5454-006-022	3122	7,053.9	3	2,756.5	1,248.0
5454-006-023	3118	5,605.5	3	2,756.5	1,144.0
5454-006-024	3114	5,776.5	3	2,756.5	1,144.0
5454-006-025	3110	5,910.0	3	2,756.5	1,144.0

The natural hill is covered with different tree and shrub species, such as Southern California black walnut (*Juglans californica* var. *californica*) trees, two Toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*) shrubs, other non-indigenous trees, some native Sugar Sumac (*Rhus ovata*) bushes, and annual weeds. The native trees and shrubs and bushes are naturally occurring, and the others must be volunteers or planted by humans.

I took photographs of the trees, shrubs and the site (**Appendix IV**). Photographs are referenced and sequenced according to the lot number.

I took measurements and used the surveyor's and architect's plans for the location of the trees. I located some of the trees and shrubs/bushes that were missing from the provided survey.

All the trees, shrubs, native plants are located (per color code) on the Site Plan (Appendix V).

A Lufkin diameter tape and Drescher Tree Caliper were used to measure the trunk diameter of the trees and shrubs, and a DEWALT measuring tape was used for other measurements. Tree height was estimated.

Twenty-three of these trees did have existing tags, numbered #1 to #23. Some trees and Native Plants were missed, and the two Toyons are added because of the recent change in the Tree Ordinance. I installed new numbered tags, numbered from #24 to #33 on their trunks, at six feet height and where possible, on the north side. So, the total number of protected trees and shrubs on site is thirty-three.

There are on site other smaller non-protected size trees and shrubs, and they are not included in this Protected Tree Report.

### Tree Evaluation.

As specified by Section 17.02 of City of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 186873, Protected Tree is "Any of the following Southern California indigenous species, which measures four inches or more cumulative diameter, four and one-half feet above the ground level at the base of the tree (DBH): a) Indigenous Oak tree excluding the Scrub Oak, b) Southern California Black Walnut, c) Western Sycamore and d) California Bay, and Protected Shrub is Mexican Elderberry and Toyon. Furthermore, the Mount Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan defines as Native Trees: Any single trunk Native Plant which measures four inches or more in diameter, four and one-half feet above the ground level at the base of the plant; or any multiple trunk Native Plant which measures 12 inches or more in diameter immediately below the lowest branch; or any plant planted pursuant to a permit to relocate or remove trees. Furthermore, a "Native Plant" is defined as "any (plant) species listed in Philip A. Munz' "A Flora of Southern California" and identified as indigenous to the Los Angeles Area. Also, a "Significant" Tree is any tree which measures 12 inches or more in diameter at four and one-half feet above the average natural grade at the base of the tree and/or is more than 35 feet in height.

According to this ordinance, the lot at 3114 E. Future St. does not have any City of Los Angeles Protected Tree or Shrub, or Mt. Washington /Glassell Park Specific Plan designated "Significant Tree or "Native Plant". The remaining nine lots have a total of the following protected trees, shrubs or "Significant Tree" and "Native Plant":

- Eight (8) Southern California Black Walnut (*Juglans californica*) Protected Trees
- Two (2) Toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*) Protected Shrubs.
- Sixteen (16) Chinese Elm (Ulmus parvifolia) Significant Trees.
- One (1) California Pepper (Schinus molle) Significant Tree.

- Two (2) Arizona Ash (*Fraxinus velutina*) Significant Trees.
- Four (4) Sugar Sumac (*Rhus ovata*) Native Plants.

Based on the proposed site plan, because of their location within the footprint of the driveway, house, or grading of the hill, the following protected indigenous and Significant trees will have to be removed:

- Two (2) Southern California Black Walnut (Juglans californica) Protected Trees.
  - Twelve (12) Chinese Elm (Ulmus parvifolia) Significant Trees.
  - One (1) Arizona Ash (*Fraxinus velutina*) Significant Tree.
  - One (1) Sugar Sumac (*Rhus ovata*) Native Plant.

Physical characteristics and health evaluation of the trees are given below. Their characteristics are summarized in the Protected Tree Survey (**Appendix I**). As mentioned, all the trees are tagged on site.

Diameter of the trees/shrubs is expressed as **DBH** (Diameter at Breast Height, or at 54 inches from grade.) **Canopy** spread of the native trees and shrubs is drawn to scale on the Site Plan (**Appendix V**).

Below are discussed the existing protected trees, shrubs and native plants at each lot.

### 3164 E. Future Street

On this lot, there are four Significant Chinese elm (*Ulmus parvifolia*) trees, one Significant California Pepper (*Schinus molle*) tree, two native Toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*) shrubs, four native Southern California black walnut (*Juglans californica*) trees, and one Sugar Sumac (*Rhus ovata*) native plant.

### Tree # 3

This is a young Chinese elm tree, located closer to the street compared to the other on-site trees.

Nine stems start emerging from grade, and they respectively have: five with four inches DBH, and the others respectively with 5, 6, 7 and 8 inches DBH. The cumulative DBH of this tree is 46 inches.

The **crown** is quite even, with branches extending from 8 to 15 feet in various directions. The longest canopy spread is of 30 feet, in the east-west directions.

The height of this tree is about 25 feet.

The tree is characteristic of the species; no known structural defects so far, and in acceptable health.

Overall, the tree looks healthy and its **vigor** is average.

On a 0 to 5 scale (0 being dead and 5 being excellent), the **condition rating** for this tree is 3 (Average).

This tree is within the footprint of the proposed house; it should be removed.



Another young Chinese elm tree, located uphill from the previous tree.

It too is a multi-stem tree, dividing from grade and with respectively 2, 2, 3, 3, 4,5, 4.5, 4.5 and 5 inches DBH. The cumulative DBH is 28.5 inches.

Because of the proximity of Tree #5 on its north, the crown is uneven, with branches extending only five feet toward the north side, while they reach a distance of 15 feet toward the east side.

The height of this tree is also 15 feet.

The overall condition of this tree is identical to the above tree, and it looks healthy and its vigor is average.

On a 0 to 5 scale (0 being dead and 5 being excellent), the condition rating for this tree is 3 (Average).

This tree also is within the footprint of the proposed house; it should be removed.

### Tree #5

Another Chinese elm tree, located very close and on the north side of Tree #4. This tree has five stems, respectively with 2, 2, 4.5, 4.5 and 6 inches DBH. The cumulative DBH is 19 inches.

The height of the tree is about 20 feet, and the average canopy spread is of 30 feet. The overall condition of this tree is identical to the previous two trees; it looks healthy, no structural defects yet and its vigor is average.

On a 0 to 5 scale (0 being dead and 5 being excellent), the condition rating for this tree is 3 (Average).

This tree also is within the footprint of the proposed house; it should be removed.

### Shrub #24

This is a small Toyon shrub, located close to the property line on the north side. It is somehow a young shrub, with five small stems, ranging in DBH from 1 to 2.5

inches. Its cumulative DBH is 7 inches.

It is representative of its species, with dark green/grayish **foliage**, compact structure and overall, with no apparent health issues.

Its height is about 10 feet, and the longest branches extend to about 12 feet, in the southwest direction. The longest canopy spread is of 17 feet.

This tree also looks average in vigor.

On a 0 to 5 scale (0 being dead and 5 being excellent), the condition rating for this tree is 3 (Average).

This tree is outside but close to the footprint of the proposed dwelling; some crown reduction might be needed on the south side, and it can be retained.

### Shrub #25

This is also a small Toyon shrub, located close to the property line on the north side. It too is a young shrub, with six small stems, ranging in DBH from 1 to 3 inches. Its cumulative DBH is 14 inches.

It too is representative of its species, with dark same foliage as the above shrub, compact structure and overall, with no apparent health issues.

Its height is about 10 feet, and the branches reach from 8 to 10 feet away from the trunks base. The average canopy spread is of 18 feet.

This tree also looks average in vigor.

On a 0 to 5 scale (0 being dead and 5 being excellent), the condition rating for this tree is 3 (Average).

This tree also is outside the footprint of the proposed dwelling; some crown reduction might be needed on the south side, and it can be retained.

### *Trees #16 - #21 and #26*

These seven trees are quite far from the construction footprint, located uphill, toward the far east end side of the property.

Trees **#16**, **#18**, **#19** and **#21** are Southern California black walnut (*Juglans californica*) trees, two of them quite young but of protected size.

Tree #17 is a California Pepper (*Schinus molle*) and #20 is a Chinese elm tree. And #26 is a Sugar Sumac (*Rhus ovata*), quite mature, with a canopy spreading up to 40 feet in the east-west direction.

All seven trees are in various conditions; Tree #21 is a black walnut tree with substantial **decay** and **deadwood**. The others are in fair or average condition. The characteristics of these seven trees are included in the Tree Survey.

These seven trees should not be impacted. They will be protected.



### 3152 E. Future Street

On this lot, there is only one tree, an Arizona ash (*Fraxinus velutina*) tree, a Mt. Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan designated "Significant Tree". There are no native trees, native shrubs, native plants or other "significant" trees.

### *Tree* **#** 2

This is a mature Arizona ash tree, located on the hill overlooking the street, and recessed from the edge of the street by only 12 feet. The main trunk divides to three stems at about one foot above grade, respectively with 9, 11 and 12 inches DBH. The cumulative DBH is 32 inches. The three stems further divide to a total of main six **scaffold branches**, which extend upward, and dividing to smaller branches, form the overall crown of the tree, that has an approximate height of 35 feet, and a longest canopy spread of 30 feet, in the north-south direction.

The tree has healthy foliage, with no signs of disease or insect infestation.

There is no **included bark** at the crotch of the main trunk division, an indication that the union is strong and not prone to failure because of extreme wind or excess lever length and additional weight.

Buttress roots are not visible at the trunk base, an indication that soil has eroded over the years and settled around the trunk. No decay cavities are seen.

Overall, the tree looks healthy and its vigor is good.

On a 0 to 5 scale (0 being dead and 5 being excellent), the condition rating for this tree is 4 (Good).

Although this tree is not exactly within the footprint of the proposed house nor the garage, but the excavation for the construction of the house will impact significantly this tree, and its stability on the hill will be jeopardized. Therefore, it should be removed.

### 3144 E. Future Street

On this lot, there is one native Southern California black walnut (*Juglans californica*) tree (Tree #1) on the property line abutting the public right-of way, and another Sugar sumac (*Rhus ovata*) native plant (Tree #27), on the public right-of-way. There are no other native trees, native shrubs, native plants or other "significant" trees on the lot. In the immediate vicinity of its property line toward the east side, there is a "Significant Tree" (#6) on 3138 Future St. and it will be discussed below.



This∺is somehow a mature Southern California black walnut tree, located on the property line, that abuts the public right-of-way.

It is located on the hill cut over the road.

The main trunk divides to five stems at about two feet over grade; they respectively have the following DBH: 4, 5, 7, 7 and 14 inches. The cumulative DBH is 37 inches. The tree height is about 15 feet, and branches extend from 10 to 15 feet in various directions away from the trunk base. The longest canopy spread is of 27 feet, in the north-south directions.

This tree has some **dieback** of branches, most probably caused by the Thousand Canker disease affecting these trees in the past years. New stems have emerged and foliage looks healthy, with no disease symptoms.

Overall, the tree looks healthy and its vigor is Average.

On a 0 to 5 scale (0 being dead and 5 being excellent), the condition rating for this tree is 3 (Average).

This tree will be impacted by the proposed grading for the house pad; it should be removed.

### **Tree #27**

This is a mature Mt. Washington designated "Native Plant", a Sugar Sumac (*Rhus ovata*), located on the public right-of-way area, at the far south side of the lot.

It has some thirteen significant stems, with the following DBH: five of 3", four of 4", two of 5", one of 8" and another one of 9". The cumulative DBH is 58 inches.

This is characteristic of its species, with evergreen foliage, multi-stem, crown spreading from eight to 20 feet into various directions.

The height is of 15 feet.

There is some decay at the base of the stems.

Overall, the tree looks acceptable condition and its vigor is Fair.

On a 0 to 5 scale (0 being dead and 5 being excellent), the condition rating for this tree is 2 (Fair).

This tree also should not be impacted by the proposed construction, and can be retained. It should be protected.

### 3138 E. Future Street

On this lot, there are two Chinese elm (*Ulmus parvifolia*) trees, Mt. Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan designated "Significant" trees.

There are no other native trees, native shrubs, native plants or other significant trees in the immediate vicinity of the property lines, except for native plant (Tree #27), discussed above.

### Tree # 23

This is a young Chinese elm tree, located uphill, past the building pad.

At one foot over grade, the main trunk divides to four, and they further divide to a total of nine small stems, with the following DBH: four with 1.5", two with 2", two with 2.5" and one with 3.5". The cumulative DBH of this tree is 18.5 inches.

The crown is quite even, with branches extending from 7 to 10 feet in various directions. The longest canopy spread is of 20 feet, in the east-west direction. The height of this tree is about 10 feet.

The tree is characteristic of the species; no known structural defects, and in acceptable health.

Overall, the tree looks healthy and its vigor is average.

On a 0 to 5 scale (0 being dead and 5 being excellent), the condition rating for this tree is 3 (Average).

This tree is within the footprint of the grading for the proposed house; it should be removed.

### Tree #6

Another Chinese elm tree, located south of the previous tree and closer to the property line along the west side.

It too is identical in characteristics to the other tree; four stems emerge from the trunk at one foot over grade, and some divide and eventually seven stems extend upward and into various directions. The seven stems have respectively the following DBH: two with 2.5", three with 3" and two with four inches. The cumulative DBH is 22 inches.

The canopy spread for this tree is also similar to the other tree, with the longest spread in the east-west direction, reaching 30 feet.

Tree height is 15 feet.

This tree also has all the characteristics of its species, over all a resilient tree with no disease symptoms or visible decay. Being multi-stem, that could lead to some failures, as the trees mature.

Overall, this tree also looks healthy and its vigor is average.

On a 0 to 5 scale (0 being dead and 5 being excellent), the condition rating for this tree is 3 (Average).

This tree is within the footprint of the grading on the west side of the proposed house; it should be removed.

### 3134 E. Future Street

On this lot, there is only one native Southern California black walnut (*Juglans californica*) tree (Tree #7). Another Chinese elm tree is close to its property line on 3126 E. Future St. The latter is discussed below and it will be removed. There are no other native trees or shrubs, native plants or other significant trees on this lot.

### Tree #7

This is a mature Southern California black walnut tree, located up the hill, in the middle of the lot.

Five stems emerge from grade, and some further divide, and there are a total of ten stems, with the following DBH: four with 2", two with 4", and 5", 7",8" and 11.5". The cumulative DBH is 47.5 inches.

The height of the tree is about 15 feet, and branches extend from five to 20 feet away from the base of the stems. The longest canopy spread is of 25 feet, in the east-west direction.

Similar to the other Southern California black walnut trees, this one also has substantial dieback, but new foliage has emerged, and the tree is recovering. Overall, this tree also looks healthy and its vigor is average. On a 0 to 5 scale (0 being dead and 5 being excellent), the condition rating for this tree is 3 (Average). This tree is very close to the retaining wall at the back side of the proposed house, and it is within the footprint of the grading; it should be removed.

### 3126 E. Future Street

On this lot, there are five young Chinese elm (*Ulmus parvifolia*) trees, located past the proposed retaining wall at the back side of the proposed house, and one Southern California black walnut (*Juglans californica*) tree, at the far north side of the lot. There are no other native trees and shrubs, native plants or significant trees.

### *Trees #9 - #13*

The five Chinese elm trees are multi-stem; only one tree has one of its stems with a DBH of 7", all the other trees have stems with DBH readings of 2 to 4.5 inches.

But because their cumulative DBH is more than 12 inches, they are considered "Significant Trees".

All five trees are in average condition. The characteristics of these five trees are included in the Tree Survey. Trees #9, #12 and #13 should be removed, because they will be impacted by the drainage channel grading. Trees #10 and #11 can be retained.

### Tree #22

This Southern California black walnut tree apparently had all its main three stems die and subsequently removed, resulting from the Thousand Cankers disease. But new stems have emerged from the **stumps**, and at present, it has a total of 14 young stems, measuring from one to 2.5 inches. The cumulative DBH of this tree is 19 inches. The height of this tree is about 15 feet, and the average canopy spread is of 20 feet.

On a 0 to 5 scale (0 being dead and 5 being excellent), the condition rating for this tree is 2 (Fair).

This tree is quite far from the construction footprint, and should not be impacted. It should be protected.

### 3122 E. Future Street

On this lot, there are three Chinese elm (*Ulmus parvifolia*) trees, and one Sugar sumac (*Rhus ovata*) native plant. There are no other native trees and shrubs, native plants or significant trees.

### *Trees #8, #14 and #15*

These three trees are young Chinese elm trees. Because of their size, they are considered Mt. Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan designated Significant Trees.

Two of them, Trees #14 and #15 are located in the vicinity of Trees #9 to #13, while Tree #8 is further downhill.

They all have the same characteristics: multi-stem, averaging 15 feet in height and 20 feet in canopy spread. All three trees are in acceptable structure and health.

On a 0 to 5 scale (0 being dead and 5 being excellent), the condition rating for this tree is 3 (Average). The individual characteristics of each tree

All three should be removed; Tree #8 is within the footprint of the house pad, while Trees #14 and #15 will be impacted by the hill grading and drainage channel.

### Tree # 28

This is a mature Sugar sumac, a "Native Plant", located close to the road. Characteristic to the species, it has about 14 stems of three to eight inches DBH. Its cumulative DBH is 69 inches.

It has a crown height of 15 feet, and a canopy spread of 30 feet, in the east-west directions. Overall, this tree also looks healthy and its vigor is average.

On a 0 to 5 scale (0 being dead and 5 being excellent), the condition rating for this tree is 3 (Average).

It is located within the footprint of the proposed driveway; therefore, it should be removed.

### 3118 E. Future Street

On this lot, there are only two Chinese elm (*Ulmus parvifolia*) trees. There are no other native trees and shrubs, native plants or significant trees.

### Trees #29 and #30

These two Chinese elm trees are located up the hill, close to the property line.

These are more mature trees, compared to the other so far discussed Chinese elm trees.

They both are multi-stem, with crown height respectively of 18 and 30 feet, and canopy spread of 28-30 feet.

Overall, they both look healthy and their vigor is average.

On a 0 to 5 scale (0 being dead and 5 being excellent), the condition rating for this tree is 3 (Average).

Based on the grading plan, Tree #30 is within the proposed area to be graded; therefore, it should be removed. Tree #29 is outside the grading plan, and it can be retained.

### 3114 E. Future St.

There are no native trees or shrubs, Significant Trees or Native Plants on this lot.

### 3110 E. Future St.

On this lot, there is one mature Southern California black walnut (*Juglans californica*) tree, one Arizona ash (*Fraxinus velutina*) Significant Tree, and one Sugar sumac (*Rhus ovata*), a "Native Plant".

All three are located at the far north side of the lot, close to the property line.

### Tree #31

This is a mature Southern California black walnut tree, located at the far northwest corner of the lot, close to the property line.

It has lost some of its stems, and at present, it has six stems with the following DBH: two with 5", one with 6", two with 7" and one with 8". The cumulative DBH of this tree is 38 inches.

The height of the tree is about 15 feet, and branches extend from eight to 15 feet away from the base of the stems. The longest canopy spread is of 30 feet, in the east-west direction.

Similar to the other Southern California black walnut trees, this one also has substantial dieback and deadwood present, but new much smaller sprouts are emerging from the stem bases, and overall, the tree has substantial new foliage; the tree is in recovery mode. This tree also looks healthy and its vigor is average.

On a 0 to 5 scale (0 being dead and 5 being excellent), the condition rating for this tree is 3 (Average).

Although this tree is close to the proposed grading, but it should not be impacted. However, it should be protected.

### Tree #32

This is a mature Arizona ash tree, located at the far northeast corner of the lot, away from any possible construction activity.

It has a single trunk, with a DBH of 13 inches, and an overall crown height of 35 feet. The tree has good structure, with alternating scaffold branches, that extend from 12 to 18 feet from the trunk base, and the longest canopy spread is of 33 feet, in the east-west directions. Buttress roots are not visible at the trunk base, an indication that soil has eroded over the years and settled around the trunk. No decay cavities are seen. Overall, the tree looks healthy and its vigor is good.

On a 0 to 5 scale (0 being dead and 5 being excellent), the condition rating for this tree is 4 (Good). As indicated above, this tree is far from any construction footprint and will be retained.

### Tree #33

This is a mature Sugar sumac, a "Native Plant", located close to Tree #32. Characteristic to the species, it has about 15 stems of average three inches DBH.

Its cumulative DBH is 45 inches. It has a crown height of 10 feet, and its longest canopy spread is of 35 feet, in the east-west directions.

Overall, this tree also looks healthy and its vigor is average.

On a 0 to 5 scale (0 being dead and 5 being excellent), the condition rating for this tree is 3 (Average).

This tree is far from any construction footprint and will be retained.

### CONSTRUCTION IMPACT

As discussed above, 33 various protected trees and shrubs are on the entire property. And for this ten-lot construction project, it is being proposed to remove the following: two native Southern California black walnut trees (Trees #1 and #7), twelve Chinese elm "Significant" trees (Trees #3, #4, #5, #6, #8, #9, #12, #13, #14, #15, #23 and #30), one Arizona ash tree (#2) and one Sugar sumac (#28). The remaining seventeen trees and shrubs can be retained and should be protected.

### TREE PRESERVATION PLAN

To secure the survival of the retained and protected-in-place trees and shrubs, the following guidelines should be adopted and executed during the entire period of the construction:

- **Tree Protection Zone (TPZ)**: Before and during the construction phase, a Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) should be established as far possible away from the trunk of each tree. Plastic orange colored fencing must be erected along the perimeter of the protection zone to prevent access. A "WARNING Tree Protection Zone" sign will be prominently displayed on each fence. This will apply to the two shrubs close to the footprint of the construction. For all the remaining trees, a single fencing across the property will separate them from the construction activity. See illustration on the Site Plan.
- Storage and Disposal: Supplies and materials, including paint, lumber, concrete overflow, etc., shall not be stored or discarded within the tree protection zone. All foreign debris within the protection zone should be removed; it is important to leave duff, mulch, chips, and leaves around the retained tree for water retention and nutrients. Draining or leakage of equipment fluids, i.e., oils, hydraulics, gasoline, paint, paint thinners, etc., shall be avoided.

- **Grade Changes:** Grade changes, including adding fill, shall not be permitted within the tree protection zone, without special written authorization and under supervision by the certified arborist. Lowering the grade would necessitate cutting main support and feeder roots, jeopardizing the health and structural integrity of the tree. Adding soil, even temporarily, on top of the existing grade, would compact the soil further, and decrease both water and air availability to the tree's roots.
- **Pruning**: In case some cutting-back of some branches will be necessary to accommodate the structures. All pruning shall be done under the direction of an ISA Certified Arborist and using ISA guidelines.
- **Root Pruning**: All trenching should be done by hand or an air spade. If root pruning will be necessary, they should be pruned using a Dosko root pruner or equivalent. All cuts shall be clean and sharp, to minimize ripping, tearing, and fracturing of the root system. If trenching within the tree protection zone is unavoidable, an air spade shall be used rather than mechanical trenching equipment. Any underground line within the tree protection zone shall curve so that no roots are impacted.
- **Irrigation:** Approximately 48 hours before root pruning, the soil shall be irrigated to a depth of three feet. The liquid root stimulant "Root Concentrate" shall be added to the irrigation water prior to root pruning. This product helps the tree to regenerate root growth.
- **Chemical Treatment**: If insects or other organisms are present, a licensed pest control adviser should direct the treatment by a licensed applicator.
- **Inspection**: During construction, an ISA Certified Arborist shall inspect the oak trees on a monthly basis. A report comparing tree health and condition to the original, pre-construction baseline shall be submitted following each inspection. The inclusion of photographs is advised. After construction is done, the inspection of the tree should continue for at least the next six months and even more, if the tree shows signs of stress.

Any mitigation procedures proposed by the Certified Arborist, i.e., fertilizing, spraying, washing the foliage, mulching, etc., should be performed without any delay.

### MITIGATION FOR THE REMOVED TREES

Because the location of the trees on site is such that without their removal, the properties cannot be reasonably developed; therefore, it is being proposed to remove the following from the nine lots (3114 E. Future St. has no trees or shrubs):

- Fourteen (14) Mt. Washington/Glassell Park Specific Plan designated "Significant" tree and "Native Plant". For the removal of these trees, the mitigation is 1:1; therefore, fourteen trees should be planted on site.
- Also, two indigenous Southern California black walnut trees are in conflict and must be removed. For the removal of these trees, the mitigation is 4:1; therefore, eight Southern California black walnut trees should be planted, four on 3134 and four on 3144 E. Future St. lot.
- All the above trees must be planted in their respective lots.

This Protected Tree Report will be reviewed by the Urban Forestry Department of the Bureau of Street Services of City of Los Angeles. The Department will decide the size of the mitigation trees.

### CONCLUSION

It is necessary that the preserved-in-place trees and shrubs be protected during the entire construction phase, and monitored regularly, so that their survival is being secured. Retaining the services of a Certified Arborist throughout the project will ensure a successful outcome.

	ARSEN M	ARGOSSIAN, CONSULTING ARBO	RIST (WE-723	BA), 818-669-6469, A	ARSENM	@PACBE	LL.NET, OC	TOBER 30, 2021	
Address	Tree #	Species	Designation	DBH (Inches)	Height (Feet)	Spread (Feet)	Condition Rating	Status	Impact
3164 E	3	Chinese Elm (Uimus	Significant	46 (5x4, 5, 6, 7 & 8)	25	30	3	Impacted/ Remove	House Pad
Future St 3164 E		Chinese Elm (Ulmus	Significant	28.5 (2x2, 2x3,	15	25	3	Impacted/ Remove	House
Future St 3164 F	4	parvifolia ) Chinese Elm (Ulmus	Tree	3x4.5 & 5)			-	In sector of the Democratic	House
Future St	5	parvifolia )	Tree	19 (2x2, 2x4.5 & 6)	20	30	3	Not Impacted	Pad
Future St	16	(Juglans californica)	Native Tree	Zr4)	10	27	2	Retain	N/A:
3164 E Future St	17	California Pepper (Schinus molle)	Significant Tree	48 (10, 2x12 & 14)	25	25	2	Not Impacted/ Retain	N/A
3164 E	18	Southern California Black Walnut	Native Tree	6 5 (210.75, 2x1 B 2x1.5)	.7	9	3	Not Impacted/ Retain	N/A
3164 E	19	Southern California Black Walnut	Native Tree	16 (2x1, 4x2 & 2x3)	12	17		Not Impacted/	N/A
3164 E	20	Chinese Elm (Uimus	Significant	22.5 (3x2, 3x3, 3.5	20	19	3	Not Impacted/	N/A
3164 E	21	Southern California Black Walnut	Native Tree	18 (8 & 10)		14	3	Not Impacted/	N/A
Future St 3164 E		(Juglans californica) Toyon (Neteromeies	Native Shrub	7(0x1.154.7.5)	10	12	3	Impacted/Retain	Trim Back
Future St 3164 E		arbutifolia   Toyon (Heterometes		TATEL & And	10	18		Impacted /Itetalo	Trim Back
Fetture St 3164 F	臣	arbuti/olio ] Laurel Sumac	PHILING STITLED	98 (5x2, 8x3, 4x4,	AW			Not Impacted/	
Future St	26	(Malosma laurinø )	Native Plant	6x5 & 3x6)	8	40	3	Retain	N/A
3152 E	,	Arizona Ash	Significant	32 (9, 11 & 12)	35	30	4	Impacted/ Remove	House
Future St	2	(Fraxinus velutina )	Tree						Pag
3144 E	1	Southern California Black Walnut	Native Tree	37 (4. 5. 7. 7 & 14)	15	27	3	impacted/ Remove	House Fail
S144 E	27	Laurel Sumac	Native Plant	58 (5x3, 4x4, 2x5, 8	15	20	2	Not Impacted/	N/A
Future St	_	(Malosma laurin <i>o</i> )		8 9)				Actain	
3138 E Euturo St	6	Chinese Elm (Ulmus	Significant Tree	22 (2x2.5, 3x3 & 2x4)	15	30	3	Impacted/ Remove	Grading
3138 E	23	Chinese Elm (Ulmus	Significant	18.5 (4x1.5, 2x2, 2x2.5 & 3.5)	10	20	3	Impacted/ Remove	Grading
Fature St		parvijana j	nee						
3134 E Fisture St	7	Southern California Black Walnut (Jugians californica)	Native Tree	47.5 (4x2, 2x4, 5, 7, 8 8 11 5	15	30	3	Impacted/ Remove	Grading
3126 F		Chinese Elm (Ulmus	Significant	39.5 (2x2, 5x3, 4x4				In marked / Demons	Crading
Future St	9	parvifolia )	Tree	& 4.5)	15	30	3	Not impacted/	Graung
3126 E Future St	10	chinese Lim (Ulmus parvifolia )	Tree	25 (2X2, 2X5, 2X4 of 7)	15	27	3	Retain	N/A
3126 E Future St	11	Chinese Elm (Ulmus parvifolia )	Significant Tree	11 (2x3 & 3x2.5)	15	18	3	Not Impacted/ Retain	N/A
3126 E	12	Chinese Elm (Ulmus	Significant Tree	17.5 (2x2, 3x3 & 4.5)	15	18	3	impacted/ Remove	Grading
3126 E	13	Chinese Elm (Ulmus	Significant	42.5 (2x2, 3x3, 4x4	15	25	3	Impacted/ Remove	Grading
3126 E	22	Southern California Black Walnut	Native Tree	19 (8x1, 4x1.5 &	15	20	2	Not Impacted/	N/A
Future St		(Juglans californica)		2x2.5				Receito	
3122 E	8	Chinese Elm (Ulmus	Significant Tree	17.5 (2.5, 7 & 8)	15	27	3	Impacted/ Remove	House Pad
3122 E	14	Chinese Elm (Ulmus	Significant	24.5 (4.5, 5, 7 & 8)	22	35	3	Impacted/ Remove	Grading
Future St 3122 E	15	Chinese Elm (Ulmus	Significant	24.5 (2x2, 3x2.5,	10	20	3	Impacted/ Remove	Grading
Future 5t 3122 E		parvifolia ) Laurel Sumac	Tree	3x3 & 4) 69 (3x3, 4x4, 3x5,	15	30	3	Impacted/ Remove	House
Future St	28	(Malosma laurinø )	reauve Plant	3x7 & 8)	13	50		puetas, nemore	Pad
3118 E	29	Chinese Elm (Ulmus	Significant	22.5 (2x4, 4.5 & 6)	18	28	3	Not Impacted/	N/A
Future St 3118 E	30	Chinese Elm (Ulmus	Significant	15.5 (5.5 & 10)	30	30	3	Impacted/ Remove	Grading
Future St		parvifolia )	Tree	,					
3114 E		There a	re no protect	ed trees or shrubs	or plan	ts on th	is lot.		
Future St									
3110 E Fature St	31	Southern California Black Walnut (Juglans californica)	Native Tree	38 (2x5, 6, 2x7 & 8)	15	30	3	Not Impacted/ Retain	N/A
3110 E	32	Arizona Ash	Significant	13	35	33	4	Not Impacted/ Retain	N/A
Buture St 3110 E	33	Laurel Sumac	Native Plant	45 (15x3)	10	35	3	Not Impacted/	N/A
Future St		(Malosma lauring)					_	Ketain	

TREE SURVEY	
3164, 3152, 3144, 3138, 3134, 3126, 3122, 3118, 3114 & 3110 E. FUTURE ST., LOS ANGELES, CA 90065	
SEN MARGOSSIAN, CONSULTING ARBORIST (WE-7233A), 818-669-6469, ARSENM@PACBELL.NET, OCTOBER 30, 2021	

Protected Tree Report 3110-3164 E. Future St., Los Angeles, CA

### Appendix I

# **TREE SURVEY ACCORDING TO LOT ADDRESS**

	Address	Tree #	Species	Designation	DBH (Inches)	Height (Feet)	Spread (Feet)	Condition Rating	Status	Impact
	3164 E Future St	21	Southern California Black Walnut (Juglans californica)	Native Tree/ Protected	18 (8 & 10)	8	14	1	Not Impacted/ Retain	N/A
	3164 E Future St	24	Toyon (Heteromeles arbutifolia)	Native Shrub/ Protected	7(3x1, 1.5 & 2.5)	10	12	3	Impacted/Retain	Trim Back
1	3164 E Future St	25	Toyon (Heteromeles arbutifolia)	Native Shrub/ Protected	14 (2x1 & 4x3)	10	18	3	Impacted/Retain	Trim Back
	3164 E Future St	26	Sugar Sumac (Rhus ovata)	Native Plant/ Significant	98 (5x2, 8x3, 4x4, 6x5 & 3x6)	8	40	3	Not Impacted/ Retain	N/A
	3152 E Future St	2	Arizona Ash ( <i>Fraxinus velutina</i> )	Significant Tree	32 (9, 11 & 12)	35	30	4	Impacted/ Remove	House Pad
*	3144 E Future St	1	Southern California Black Walnut (Juglans californica)	Native Tree/ Protected	37 (4, 5, 7, 7 & 14)	15	27	3	Impacted/ Remove	House Pad
	3144 E Future St	27	Sugar Sumac (Rhus ovata)	Native Plant/ Significant	58 (5x3, 4x4, 2x5, 8 & 9)	15	20	2	Not Impacted/ Retain	N/A
			\$73622092022929292977777777782222222222							

Condition Rating: 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2=Fair, 1=Poor, 0=Dead

Significant Tree: Any tree which measures 12 inches or more in DBH and or is more than 35 feet in height. Native Plant: Any species listed in Philip A. Munz' "A Flora of Southern California and identified as indigenous to Los Angeles area. Native Tree: Any of the six plant species (Native oak, Western Sycamore, SoCal black walnut, California bay, Toyon and Mexican elderberry) with a DBH of four inches or more.

Arsen Margossian, Consulting Arborist

Page 20

Protected Tree Report 3110-3164 E. Future St., Los Angeles, CA

### Appendix I TREE SURVEY ACCORDING TO LOT ADDRESS

Impact	House Pad	House House House Pad		N/A	NA	N/A N/A		N/A	
Status	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/ Remove	Not Impacted/ Retain	Not Impacted/ Retain Not Impacted/ Retain		Not Impacted/ Retain	Not Impacted/ Retain	
Condition Rating	3	3	3	2	2	3	4	m	
Spread (Feet)	30	25	30	27	25	Ð	11	19	
Height (Feet)	25	25 15		10	25	7	12	50	
DBH (Inches)	46 (5x4, 5, 6, 7 & 8)	46 (5x4, 5, 6, 7 & 8) 28.5 (2x2, 2x3, 3x4.5 & 5)		22 (2x2.5, 3x3 & 2x4) 48 (10, 2x12 & 14)		6.5 (2x0.75, 2x1 & 2x1.5)	16 (2x1, 4x2 & 2x3)	22.5 (3x2, 3x3, 3.5 & 4)	
Designation	Significant Tree	Significant Tree Significant Tree		Native Tree/ Protected Significant Tree		Native Tree/ Protected	Native Tree/ Protected	Significant Tree	
Species	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Southern California Black Walnut (Juglans californica)	California Pepper (Schinus molle)	Southern California Black Walnut (Juglans californica)	Southern California Black Walnut (Juglans californica)	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvitolia</i> )	
Tree #	3	4	5	16	17	18	19	20	
Address	Address . 3164 E Future St 3164 E		3164 E Future St	3164 E Future St	3164 E Future St	3164 E Future St	3164 E Future St	3164 E Future St	
		12						,	

Condition Rating: 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2=Fair, 1=Poor, 0=Dead

Significant Tree: Any tree which measures 12 inches or more in DBH and or is more than 35 feet in height.

Native Tree: Any of the six plant species (native oak, Western Sycamore, SoCal black walnut, California bay, Toyon and Mexican elderberry) with a DBH of four inches or more. Native Plant: Any species listed in Philip A. Munz' "A Flora of Southern California and identified as indigenous to Los Angeles area.

Arsen Margossian, Consulting Arborist

Page 19

Protected Tree Report 3110-3164 E. Future St., Los Angeles, CA

# Appendix II TREE SURVEY ACCORDING TO TREE NUMBER

		Tree			DBH	Height	Spread	Condition		
	Address	#	Species	Designation	(Inches)	(Feet)	(Feet)	Rating	Status	Impact
×	3144 E Future St		Southern California Black Walnut (Juglans californica)	Native Tree/ Protected	37 (4, 5, 7, 7 & 14)	15	27	3	Impacted/ Remove	House Pad
	3152 E Future St	2	Arizona Ash (Fraxinus velutina)	Significant Tree	32 (9, 11 & 12)	35	30	4	Impacted/ Remove	House Pad
	3164 E Future St	e	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Significant Tree	46 (5x4, 5, 6, 7 & 8)	25	30	3	Impacted/ Remove	House Pad
	3164 E Future St	4	Chinese Elm (Ulmus parvifolia)	Significant Tree	28.5 (2x2, 2x3, 3x4.5 & 5)	15	25	3	Impacted/ Remove	House Pad
	3164 E Future St	5	Chinese Elm (Ulmus parvifolia)	Significant Tree	19 (2x2, 2x4.5 & 6)	20	30	3	Impacted/ Remove	House Pad
	3138 E Future St	9	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Significant Tree	22 (2x2.5, 3x3 & 2x4)	15	30	3	Impacted/ Remove	Grading
he	3134 E Future St	7	Southern California Black Walnut (Juglans californica)	Native Tree/ Protected	47.5 (4x2, 2x4, 5, 7, 8 & 11.5)	15	30	3	Impacted/ Remove	Grading
F	3122 E Future St	œ	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Significant Tree	17.5 (2.5, 7 & 8)	15	27	3	impacted/ Remove	House Pad
	3126 E Future St	െ	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Significant Tree	39.5 (2x2, 5x3, 4x4 & 4.5)	15	30	3	Impacted/ Remove	Grading
			بد بر میں یہ ہے۔ اور اور اور اور اور اور اور اور اور اور	يا هاي يبد عن شي ي عند مدر إد بي هوي خان .	0 2211 84 - Frank San			و ک شهر که که که که در در در د	يمر به و وه و و و و و و و و و و و و و و و	

×

Condition Rating: 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2=Fair, 1=Poor, 0=Dead Significant Tree: Any tree which measures 12 inches or more in DBH and or is more than 35 feet in height. Native Plant: Any species listed in Philip A. Munz' "A Flora of Southern California and identified as indigenous to Los Angeles area. Native Tree: Any of the six plant species (Native oak, Western Sycamore, Socal black walnut, California bay, Toyon and Mexican elderberry) with a DBH of four inches or more.

Arsen Margossian, Consulting Arborist

### Appendix I

## **TREE SURVEY ACCORDING TO LOT ADDRESS**

pact
Ē

N/A	N/A	N/A			
Not Impacted/ Retain	Not Impacted/ Retain	Not Impacted/ Retain			
e	4	3			
30	33	10 35			
15	35				
38 (2x5, 6, 2x7 & 8)	13	45 (15x3)			
Native Tree/ Protected	Significant Tree	Native Plant/ Significant			
Southern California Black Walnut (Juglans californica)	Arizona Ash (Fraxinus velutina)	Sugar Sumac (Rhus ovata)			
31	32	33			
3110 E Future St	3110 E Future St	3110 E Future St			

Condition Rating: 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2=Fair, 1=Poor, 0=Dead

Significant Tree: Any tree which measures 12 inches or more in DBH and or is more than 35 feet in height. Native Plant: Any species listed in Philip A. Munz' "A Flora of Southern California and identified as indigenous to Los Angeles area. Native Tree: Any of the six plant species (Native oak, Western Sycamore, SoCal black walnut, California bay, Toyon and Mexican elderberry) with a DBH of four inches or more.

Arsen Margossian, Consulting Arborist

Page 23

October 30, 2021

3126 E Future St 22	3126 E Future St 13	3126 E Future St 12	3126 E 11 Future St 11	3126 E Future St 10	3126 E 9 Future St 9	3134 E 7 Future St 7	3138 E Future St 23	3138 E Future St 6	Address Tree #	
Southern California Black Walnut (Juglans californica)	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Southern California Black Walnut (Juglans californica)	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	# Species					
Native Tree/ Protected	Significant Tree	Native Tree/ Protected	Significant Tree	Significant Tree	Designation	<b>FREE SURVEY</b>				
19 (8x1, 4x1.5 & 2x2.5)	42.5 (2x2, 3x3, 4x4 & 3x4.5)	17.5 (2x2, 3x3 & 4.5)	11 (2x3 & 3x2.5)	25 (2x2, 2x3, 2x4 & 7)	39.5 (2x2, 5x3, 4x4 & 4.5)	47.5 (4x2, 2x4, 5, 7, 8 & 11.5)	18.5 (4x1.5, 2x2, 2x2.5 & 3.5)	22 (2x2.5, 3x3 & 2x4)	DBH (Inches)	Appendix I ACCORDING TO
15	15	15	15	15	15	15	10	15	Height (Feet)	LOT ADD
20	25	18	18	27	30	30	20	30	Spread (Feet)	RESS
2	ω	ω	ω	ω	з	ω	ω	ω	Condition Rating	
Not Impacted/ Retain	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/ Remove	Not Impacted/ Retain	Not Impacted/ Retain	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/ Remove	Status	
NIA	Grading	Grading	N/A	N/A	Grading	Grading	Grading	Grading	Impact	

Arsen Margossian, Consulting Arborist

Significant Tree: Any tree which measures 12 inches or more in DBH and or is more than 35 feet in height. Native Plant: Any species listed in Philip A. Munz' "A Flora of Southern California and identified as indigenous to Los Angeles area.

Native Tree: Any of the six plant species (Native oak, Western Sycamore, SoCal black walnut, California bay, Toyon and Mexican elderberry) with a DBH of four inches or more.

Condition Rating: 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2=Fair, 1=Poor, 0=Dead

Page 21
Arsen Margossian, Consulting Arborist

Significant Tree: Any tree which measures 12 inches or more in DBH and or is more than 35 feet in height. Native Plant: Any species listed in Philip A. Munz' "A Flora of Southern California and identified as indigenous to Los Angeles area. Native Tree: Any of the six plant species (Native oak, Western Sycamore, SoCal black walnut, California bay, Toyon and Mexican elderberry) with a DBH of four inches or more.

Condition Rating: 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2=Fair, 1=Poor, 0=Dead

Page 22

L MIME O	3118 E	3118 E Future S	3122 E Future S	3122 E Future S	3122 E Future S	3122 E Future S	Addres	
	30	t 29	t 28	t 15	t 14	8	s #	Tree
(onnus parvnona)	Chinese Elm	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Sugar Sumac (Rhus ovata)	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Species	
	Significant Tree	Significant Tree	Native Plant/ Significant	Significant Tree	Significant Tree	Significant Tree	Designation	
	15.5 (5.5 & 10)	22.5 (2x4, 4.5 & 6)	69 (3x3, 4x4, 3x5, 3x7 & 8)	24.5 (2x2, 3x2.5, 3x3 & 4)	24.5 (4.5, 5, 7 & 8)	17.5 (2.5, 7 & 8)	(Inches)	DBH
	30	18	15	10	22	15	(Feet)	Height
	30	28	30	20	35	27	(Feet)	Spread
	ω	S	ω	ω	ω	ω	Rating	Condition
Nelline	Impacted/	Not Impacted/ Retain	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/ Remove	Status	
	Grading	N/A	House Pad	Grading	Grading	House Pad	Impact	

Appendix I

# TREE SURVEY ACCORDING TO LOT ADDRESS

October 30, 2021

Protected Tree Report 3110-3164 E. Future St., Los Angeles, CA

### Appendix II

# TREE SURVEY ACCORDING TO TREE NUMBER

Impact	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Grading	Trim Back	Trim Back	NA
Status	Not Impacted/ Retain	Not Impacted/ Retain	Not Impacted/ Retain	Not Impacted/ Retain	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/Retain	Impacted/Retain	Not Impacted/ Retain
Condition Rating	4	3	ų	2	3	8	3	e
Spread (Feet)	17	19	14	20	20	12	18	40
Height (Feet)	12	20	8	15	10	10	10	œ
DBH (Inches)	16 (2x1, 4x2 & 2x3)	22.5 (3x2, 3x3, 3.5 & 4)	18 (8 & 10)	19 (8x1, 4x1.5 & 2x2.5)	18.5 (4x1.5, 2x2, 2x2.5 & 3.5)	7(3x1, 1.5 & 2.5)	14 (2x1 & 4x3)	98 (5x2, 8x3, 4x4, 6x5 & 3x6)
Designation	Native Tree/ Protected	Significant Tree	Native Tree/ Protected	Native Tree/ Protected	Significant Tree	Native Shrub/ Protected	Native Shrub/ Protected	Native Plant/ Significant
Species	Southern California Black Walnut ( <i>Juglans californica</i> )	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Southern California Black Walnut (Juglans californica)	Southern California Black Walnut (Juglans californica)	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Toyon (Heteromeles arbutifolia)	Toyon (Heteromeles arbutifolia)	Sugar Sumac (Rhus ovata)
Tree #	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
Address	3164 E Future St	3164 E Future St	3164 E Future St	3126 E Future St	3138 E Future St	3164 E Future St	3164 E Future St	3164 E Future St

Condition Rating: 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2=Fair, 1=Poor, 0=Dead

Significant Tree: Any tree which measures 12 inches or more in DBH and or is more than 35 feet in height. Native Plant: Any species listed in Philip A. Munz' "A Flora of Southern California and identified as indigenous to Los Angeles area. Native Tree: Any of the six plant species (Native oak, Western Sycamore, SoCal black walnut, California bay, Toyon and Mexican elderberry) with a DBH of four inches or more.

Protected Tree Report 3110-3164 E. Future St., Los Angeles, CA

## Appendix II TREE SURVEY ACCORDING TO TREE NUMBER

Impact	N/A	N/A	Grading	Grading	Grading	Grading	N/A	N/A	N/A
Status	Not Impacted/ Retain	Not Impacted/ Retain	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/ Remove	Not Impacted/ Retain	Not Impacted/ Retain	Not Impacted/ Retain
Condition Rating	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3
Spread (Feet)	27	18	18	25	35	20	27	25	6
Height (Feet)	15	15	15	15	22	10	10	25	7
DBH (Inches)	25 (2x2, 2x3, 2x4 & 7)	11 (2x3 & 3x2.5)	17.5 (2x2, 3x3 & 4.5)	42.5 (2x2, 3x3, 4x4 & 3x4.5)	24.5 (4.5, 5, 7 & 8)	24.5 (2x2, 3x2.5, 3x3 & 4)	22 (2x2.5, 3x3 & 2x4)	48 (10, 2x12 & 14)	6.5 (2x0.75, 2x1 & 2x1.5)
Designation	Significant Tree	Significant Tree	Native Tree/ Protected	Significant Tree	Native Tree/ Protected				
Species	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvitolia</i> )	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvitolia</i> )	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Chinese Elm (Ulmus parvifolia)	Southern California Black Walnut ( <i>Juglans californica</i> )	California Pepper (Schinus molle)	Southern California Black Walnut (Juglans californica)
Tree #	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Address	3126 E Future St	3126 E Future St	3126 E Future St	3126 E Future St	3122 E Future St	3122 E Future St	3164 E Future St	3164 E Future St	3164 E Future St

Condition Rating: 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2=Fair, 1=Poor, 0=Dead

Significant Tree: Any tree which measures 12 inches or more in DBH and or is more than 35 feet in height. Native Plant: Any species listed in Philip A. Munz' "A Flora of Southern California and identified as indigenous to Los Angeles area. Native Tree: Any of the six plant species (Native oak, Western Sycamore, SoCal black walnut, California bay, Toyon and Mexican elderberry) with a DBH of four inches or more.

Arsen Margossian, Consulting Arborist

Page 25

Protected Tree Report 3110-3164 E. Future St., Los Angeles, CA

### Appendix III

## SURVEY OF TREES TO BE REMOVED

	Address	Tree #	Species	Designation	DBH (Inches)	Height (Feet)	Spread (Feet)	Condition Rating	Status	Impact
*	3144 E Future St	+	Southern California Black Walnut (Juglans californica)	Native Tree/ Protected	37 (4, 5, 7, 7 & 14)	15	27	e	Impacted/ Remove	House
	3152 E Future St	2	Arizona Ash (Fraxinus velutina)	Significant Tree	32 (9, 11 & 12)	35	30	4	Impacted/ Remove	House Pad
	3164 E Future St	ю	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Significant Tree	46 (5x4, 5, 6, 7 & 8)	25	30	ç	Impacted/ Remove	House Pad
	3164 E Future St	4	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Significant Tree	28.5 (2x2, 2x3, 3x4.5 & 5)	15	25	3	Impacted/ Remove	House Pad
	3164 E Future St	2	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Significant Tree	19 (2x2, 2x4.5 & 6)	20	30	3	Impacted/ Remove	House Pad
	3138 E Future St	g	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Significant Tree	22 (2x2.5, 3x3 & 2x4)	15	30	3	Impacted/ Remove	Grading
¥	3134 E Future St	2	Southern California Black Walnut (Juglans californica)	Native Tree/ Protected	47.5 (4x2, 2x4, 5, 7, 8 & 11.5)	15	30	3	Impacted/ Remove	Grading
1	3122 E Future St	æ	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Significant Tree	17.5 (2.5, 7 & 8)	15	27	ю	Impacted/ Remove	House Pad
									کهی وج کجو ووی وج مغنا شخ شخخ سد د	

Condition Rating: 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2=Fair, 1=Poor, 0=Dead

Significant Tree: Any tree which measures 12 inches or more in DBH and or is more than 35 feet in height. Native Plant: Any species listed in Philip A. Munz' \*A Flora of Southern California and identified as indigenous to Los Angeles area. Native Tree: Any of the six plant species (Native oak, Western Sycamore, SoCal black walnut, California bay, Toyon and Mexican elderberry) with a DBH of four inches or more.

Arsen Margossian, Consulting Arborist

Page 28

Appendix II

# **TREE SURVEY ACCORDING TO TREE NUMBER**

Impact	N/A	House Pad	N/A	Grading		N/A	N/A	N/A
Status	Not Impacted/ Retain	Impacted/ Remove	Not Impacted/ Retain	Impacted/ Remove		Not Impacted/ Retain	Not Impacted/ Retain	Not Impacted/ Retain
Condition Rating	2	3	3	£		3	4	ε
Spread (Feet)	20	30	28	30	on this lot.	30	33	35
Height (Feet)	15	15	18	30	lbs or plants	15	35	10
DBH (Inches)	58 (5x3, 4x4, 2x5, 8 & 9)	69 (3x3, 4x4, 3x5, 3x7 & 8)	22.5 (2x4, 4.5 & 6)	15.5 (5.5 & 10)	no protected trees or shru	38 (2x5, 6, 2x7 & 8)	13	45 (15x3)
Designation	Native Plant/ Significant	Native Plant/ Significant	Significant Tree	Significant Tree	There are	Native Tree/ Protected	Significant Tree	Native Plant/ Significant
Species	Sugar Sumac (Rhus ovata)	Sugar Sumac (Rhus ovata)	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Chinese Elm ` (Ulmus parvifolia)		Southern California Black Walnut (Juglans californica)	Arizona Ash (Fraxinus velutina)	Sugar Sumac (Rhus ovata)
Tree #	27	28	29	30		31	32	33
Address	3144 E Future St	3122 E Future St	3118 E Future St	3118 E Future St	3114 E Future St	3110 E Future St	3110 E Future St	3110 E Future St

Condition Rating: 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2=Fair, 1=Poor, 0=Dead

Significant Tree: Any tree which measures 12 inches or more in DBH and or is more than 35 feet in height. Native Plant: Any species listed in Philip A. Munz' "A Flora of Southern California and identified as indigenous to Los Angeles area. Native Tree: Any of the six plant species (Native oak, Western Sycamore, SoCal black walnut, California bay, Toyon and Mexican elderberry) with a DBH of four inches or more.

Protected Tree Report 3110-3164 E. Future St., Los Angeles, CA

## Appendix III

## SURVEY OF TREES TO BE REMOVED

	Impact	Grading	Grading	Grading	Grading	Grading	Grading	House Pad	Grading
	Status	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/ Remove	Impacted/ Remove
Condition	Rating	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Spread	(Feet)	30	18	25	35	20	20	30	30
Height	(Feet)	15	15	15	22	10	10	15	30
DBH	(Inches)	39.5 (2x2, 5x3, 4x4 & 4.5)	17.5 (2x2, 3x3 & 4.5)	42.5 (2x2, 3x3, 4x4 & 3x4.5)	24.5 (4.5, 5, 7 & 8)	24.5 (2x2, 3x2.5, 3x3 & 4)	18.5 (4x1.5, 2x2, 2x2.5 & 3.5)	69 (3x3, 4x4, 3x5, 3x7 & 8)	15.5 (5.5 & 10)
	Designation	Significant Tree	Significant Tree	Significant Tree	Significant Tree	Significant Tree	Significant Tree	Native Plant/ Significant	Significant Tree
	Species	Chinese ⊟m ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvitolia</i> )	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvitolia</i> )	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )	Sugar Sumac ( <i>Rhus ovata</i> )	Chinese Elm ( <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> )
Tree	#	6	12	13	14	15	23	28	30
	Address	3126 E Future St	3126 E Future St	3126 E Future St	3122 E Future St	3122 E Future St	3138 E Future St	3122 E Future St	3118 E Future St

Condition Rating: 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Average, 2=Fair, 1=Poor, 0=Dead Significant Tree: Any tree which measures 12 inches or more in DBH and or is more than 35 feet in height. Native Plant: Any species listed in Philip A. Munz' "A Flora of Southern California and identified as indigenous to Los Angeles area. Native Tree: Any of the six plant species (Native oak, Western Sycamore, Socal black walnut, California bay, Toyon and Mexican elderberry) with a DBH of four inches or more.

October 30, 2021

### Appendix IV

### **PHOTOGRAPHS**



Aerial view of the property from Los Angeles County Assessor's website.

(Date 03/03/2020)



Tree #1. (This and the following photographs were taken on 07/29/21, 08/03/21 and 08/10/21.)

October 30, 2021



Tree #2.



Tree #3 in the front.

October 30, 2021



Tree #4 (left side) and #5 (right side.)

Protected Tree Report 3110-3164 E. Future St., Los Angeles, CA



Shrub #24.

October 30, 2021



Shrub #25.



Tree #18.

October 30, 2021



Tree #19.



Tree #20.

October 30, 2021



Lower section of Tree #21.

Protected Tree Report 3110-3164 E. Future St., Los Angeles, CA



Tree #17.

October 30, 2021



Tree #22.

Protected Tree Report 3110-3164 E. Future St., Los Angeles, CA



Native Plant #26.

October 30, 2021



Tree #16.

Protected Tree Report 3110-3164 E. Future St., Los Angeles, CA



Tree #23.

October 30, 2021



Tree #6.

October 30, 2021



Tree #7.

October 30, 2021



Native Plant #27.

Protected Tree Report 3110-3164 E. Future St., Los Angeles, CA



Tree #9.

October 30, 2021



Tree #10.

Protected Tree Report 3110-3164 E. Future St., Los Angeles, CA



Tree #11.

October 30, 2021



Tree #12.

October 30, 2021



Tree #13.

October 30, 2021



Tree #14.

Protected Tree Report 3110-3164 E. Future St., Los Angeles, CA



Tree #15.

October 30, 2021

1



Tree #8.

Protected Tree Report 3110-3164 E. Future St., Los Angeles, CA



Native Plant #28.

October 30, 2021



Tree #29 (right side) and Tree #30 (in the center.)

Protected Tree Report 3110-3164 E. Future St., Los Angeles, CA



Tree #31.
October 30, 2021



**Tree #32.** 

Arsen Margossian, Consulting Arborist

October 30, 2021



Native Plant #33.

Arsen Margossian, Consulting Arborist

# Appendix V

# SITE PLAN

(See in back pocket.)

# Glossary

Buttress Root	Roots at the base of the trunk; trunk flare.
Canopy	Parts of the tree above the trunk that includes the leaves and branches.
Cavity	An open wound or hollow within a tree, associated usually with decay.
Condition Rating	The condition of a tree expressed as percentage of ideal for that species.
Crown	The above ground portion of the tree that includes the branches and the leaves.
Deadwood	Dead branches remaining attached within the canopy of the tree.
Decay	The gradual decomposition of organic matter.
Diameter at Breast Height (DBH)	Basic measure of tree girth usually at 4.5 feet above ground level.
Dieback	Condition in which the ends of the branches are dying.
Foliage	The leaves in the canopy of the tree.
Included Bark	Bark that becomes embedded in a crotch between branch and trunk or between co-dominant stems and causes a weak structure
Scaffold Branch	The permanent or structural branches of a tree.
Stump	That part of a felled or broken tree left in the ground.
Vigor	Overall health of a tree; the capacity to grow and resist physiological stress.

## Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

This arborist report and any values expressed herein represent my personal opinion and my fee is in no way contingent upon the reporting of a specified value, a stipulated result, the occurrence of a subsequent event, nor upon any finding to be reported.

The information contained in this report covers only those items that were examined and reflects the condition of those items at the time of inspection.

I certify that I have no personal interest in or bias with respect to the subject matter of this report. I have inspected the subject trees and shrubs, and native plants, and to my knowledge and belief, all statements and information in this report are true and correct.

This arborist report was performed entirely at ground level. The inspection and evaluation were limited to visual examination of accessible items without dissection, probing or coring. There is no warranty or guarantee, expressed or implied, that problems or deficiencies of the trees and shrubs or property in question may not arise in the future.

## **Certification of Performance**

I, Arsen Margossian, certify:

- That I have personally inspected the trees/shrubs and/or property referred to in the report, and have stated my findings accurately. The extent of the evaluation is stated in the attached report and the Limits of Assignment;
- That I have no current or prospective interest in the vegetation on the property that is the subject of this report and have no personal interest or bias with respect to the parties involved;
- That the analysis, opinions and conclusions stated herein are my own and are based on current scientific procedures and facts;
- That my analysis, opinions and conclusions were developed and this report has been prepared according to commonly accepted arboricultural practices;
- That no one provided significant professional assistance to me, except as indicated within the report;
- That my compensation is not contingent upon the reporting of a predetermined conclusion that favors the cause of the client or any other party nor upon the results of the assignment, the attainment of stipulated results, or the occurrence of any subsequent events.

I am an ISA Certified Arborist (#WE-7233A), I hold ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualification (TRAQ), am California Licensed Pest Control Advisor (#71429) and California Licensed Forestry Pesticide Applicator (#121525). I also am a graduate of ASCA Academy (2007).

I further certify that I am a member in good standing of the American Society of Consulting Arborists (ASCA) and International Society of Arboriculture (ISA).

Signed: Stargarson

Date: October 30, 2021

Arsen Margossian, Consulting Arborist

Page 65

### October 30, 2021

### **Copies of Licenses**



Arsen Margossian, Consulting Arborist





# APPENDIX D - CHRIS LETTER

### South Central Coastal Information Center

California State University, Fullerton Department of Anthropology MH-426 800 North State College Boulevard Fullerton, CA 92834-6846 657.278.5395

California Historical Resources Information System

Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura and San Bernardino Counties sccic@fullerton.edu

7/28/2021

SCCIC File #: 22509.8693

Bryan Hamilton Ceqaology 122A East Foothill Boulevard #178 Arcadia, CA 91006

Re: Record Search Results for Future Street Single Family Development

The South Central Coastal Information Center received your records search request for the project area referenced above, located on the Los Angeles, CA USGS 7.5' quadrangle. The following summary reflects the results of the records search for the project area and a ½-mile radius. The search includes a review of all recorded archaeological and built-environment resources as well as a review of cultural resource reports on file. In addition, the California Points of Historical Interest (SPHI), the California Historical Landmarks (SHL), the California Register of Historical Resources (CAL REG), the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California State Built Environment Resources Directory (BERD), and the City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments (LAHCM) listings were reviewed for the above referenced project site and a ¼-mile radius. Due to the sensitive nature of cultural resources, archaeological site locations are not released.

### **RECORDS SEARCH RESULTS SUMMARY**

Archaeological Resources*	Within project area: 0
(*see Recommendations section)	Within project radius: 0
Built-Environment Resources	Within project area: 0
	Within project radius: 2
Reports and Studies	Within project area: 0
	Within project radius: 12
OHP Built Environment Resources	Within project area: 0
Directory (BERD) 2019	Within ¼-mile radius: 4
California Points of Historical	Within project area: 0
Interest (SPHI) 2019	Within ¼-mile radius: 0
California Historical Landmarks	Within project area: 0
(SHL) 2019	Within ¼-mile radius: 0
California Register of Historical	Within project area: 0
Resources (CAL REG) 2019	Within ¼-mile radius: 0
National Register of Historic Places	Within project area: 0
(NRHP) 2019	Within ¼-mile radius: 0

City of Los Angeles Historic-	Within project area: 0
Cultural Monuments (LAHCM)	Within ¼-mile radius: 0

**HISTORIC MAP REVIEW** - Pasadena, CA (1900) 15' USGS historic map indicates that in 1900 there was no visible development within the project area. There were three roads and several buildings within the project search radius which was located within the historic place name of San Rafael. The Glendale Branch of the Los Angeles Terminal rail road ran through the southwestern edge of the project search radius. The historic place names of Threemile House and Bennington were located nearby.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

\*When we report that no archaeological resources are recorded in your project area or within a specified radius around the project area; that does not necessarily mean that nothing is there. It may simply mean that the area has not been studied and/or that no information regarding the archaeological sensitivity of the property has been filed at this office. The reported records search result does not preclude the possibility that surface or buried artifacts might be found during a survey of the property or ground-disturbing activities.

The archaeological sensitivity of the project location is unknown because there are no previous studies for the subject property. While there are currently no recorded archaeological sites within the project area, resources could potentially be discovered during project activities. Therefore, customary caution and a halt-work condition should be in place for all ground-disturbing activities. In the event that any evidence of cultural resources is discovered, all work within the vicinity of the find should stop until a qualified archaeological consultant can assess the find and make recommendations. Excavation of potential cultural resources should not be attempted by project personnel. It is also recommended that the Native American Heritage Commission be consulted to identify if any additional traditional cultural properties or other sacred sites are known to be in the area. The NAHC may also refer you to local tribes with particular knowledge of potential sensitivity. The NAHC and local tribes may offer additional recommendations to what is provided here and may request an archaeological monitor.

For your convenience, you may find a professional consultant\*\*at <u>www.chrisinfo.org</u>. Any resulting reports by the qualified consultant should be submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center as soon as possible.

\*\*The SCCIC does not endorse any particular consultant and makes no claims about the qualifications of any person listed. Each consultant on this list self-reports that they meet current professional standards.

If you have any questions regarding the results presented herein, please contact the office at 657.278.5395 Monday through Thursday 9:00 am to 3:30 pm. Should you require any additional information for the above referenced project, reference the SCCIC number listed above when making inquiries. Requests made after initial invoicing will result in the preparation of a separate invoice.

Thank you for using the California Historical Resources Information System,

Isabela Kott Assistant Coordinator, GIS Program Specialist Due to processing delays and other factors, not all of the historical resource reports and resource records that have been submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation are available via this records search. Additional information may be available through the federal, state, and local agencies that produced or paid for historical resource management work in the search area. Additionally, Native American tribes have historical resource information not in the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Inventory, and you should contact the California Native American Heritage Commission for information on local/regional tribal contacts.

The California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) contracts with the California Historical Resources Information System's (CHRIS) regional Information Centers (ICs) to maintain information in the CHRIS inventory and make it available to local, state, and federal agencies, cultural resource professionals, Native American tribes, researchers, and the public. Recommendations made by IC coordinators or their staff regarding the interpretation and application of this information are advisory only. Such recommendations do not necessarily represent the evaluation or opinion of the State Historic Preservation Officer in carrying out the OHP's regulatory authority under federal and state law. **APPENDIX E – CONSTRUCTION NOISE WORKSHEETS** 

Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM), Version 1.1

Report date: Case Description: 04/19/2021 Future Street SFR

\*\*\*\* Receptor #1 \*\*\*\*

			Baselines	(dBA)
Description	Land Use	Daytime	Evening	Night
Residential 1	Residential	45.9	40.0	40.0

# Equipment

Description	Impact Device	Usage (%)	Spec Lmax (dBA)	Actual Lmax (dBA)	Receptor Distance (feet)	Estimated Shielding (dBA)
Grader	No	40	85.0		55.0	0.0
Dump Truck	No	40		76.5	20.0	0.0
Backhoe	No	40		69.4	40.0	0.0
Excavator 2020	No	40		72.9	31.7	0.0

### Results

-----

Noise Limits (dBA)

Noise Limit Exceedance (dBA)

			Calculat	ed (dBA)	D	ау	Eveni	ng	
Night		Day		Evening		Night 			
Equipmer	 nt		Lmax	Leq	Lmax	Leq	Lmax	Leq	Lmax
Leq	Lmax	Leq	Lmax	Leq	Lmax	Leq 			
							NI / A	NI / A	NI / A
Grader	NI / A	NI / A	84.2 N/A	80.2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			NI / A	NI / A	NI / A
N/A	N/A	N/A	84.4 N/A	80.4 N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Backhoe	,	,	71.3	67.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	,		,
Excavato	or 2020	-	76.9	72.9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-		-
-	Тс	otal	84.4	83.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

Report date: Case Description: 04/19/2021 Future Street SFR

\*\*\*\* Receptor #1 \*\*\*\*

			Baselines	(dBA)
Description	Land Use	Daytime	Evening	Night
Residential 1	Residential	45.9	40.0	40.0

			Equipme	nt		
Description	Impact Device	Usage (%)	Spec Lmax (dBA)	Actual Lmax (dBA)	Receptor Distance (feet)	Estimated Shielding (dBA)
Backhoe 2020	No	40		69.4	40.0	0.0
Excavator 2020	No	40		72.9	31.7	0.0
Concrete Saw	No	20		89.6	55.0	0.0
Skid Steer Loader	No	50		74.4	35.0	0.0
Skid Steer Loader	No	50		74.4	20.0	0.0
Dump Truck	No	40		76.5	20.0	0.0
Dump Truck	No	40		76.5	20.0	0.0
Dump Truck	No	40		76.5	20.0	0.0
Dump Truck	No	40		76.5	20.0	0.0

### Results

\_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_

Noise Limits (dBA)

Noise Limit Exceedance (dBA)

-----

Night	ight		Calculated (dBA) Day Ev Evening Night		Calculate Day 		Calculated (dBA) Day Day Evening Night		ed (dBA) Day Evening Night		lated (dBA) Day Evening Evening Night			.ng 	
Equipment	: Lmax	Leq	Lmax Lmax	Leq Leq	Lmax	Leq Leq	Lmax	Leq	Lmax						
Backhoe 2	2020		71.3	67.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A						
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A									
Excavator	2020		76.9	72.9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A						
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A									
Concrete	Saw		88.8	81.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A						
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A									

Skid	Steer	Loader		77.5	74.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Skid	Steer	Loader		82.4	79.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Dump	Truck			84.4	80.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Dump	Truck			84.4	80.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Dump	Truck			84.4	80.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Dump	Truck			84.4	80.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
		Tota	al	88.8	88.6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

Report date: Case Description: 04/19/2021 Future Street SFR

\*\*\*\* Receptor #1 \*\*\*\*

			Baselines	(dBA)
Description	Land Use	Daytime	Evening	Night
Residential 1	Residential	45.9	40.0	40.0

Equipment										
Description	Impact Device	Usage (%)	Spec Lmax (dBA)	Actual Lmax (dBA)	Receptor Distance (feet)	Estimated Shielding (dBA)				
Excavator 2020	No	40		72.9	31.7	0.0				
Concrete Saw	No	20		89.6	55.0	0.0				
Skid Steer Loader	No	50		74.4	35.0	0.0				
Concrete Mixer Truck	No	40		78.8	20.0	0.0				
Concrete Pump Truck	No	20		81.4	20.0	0.0				
Crane (Link Belt) 2020	No	16		68.7	20.0	0.0				
Front End Loader	No	40		79.1	55.0	0.0				
Drill Rig Truck	No	20		79.1	40.0	0.0				
Front End Loader	No	40		79.1	40.0	0.0				

### Results

\_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_

Noise Limits (dBA)

Noise Limit Exceedance (dBA)

-----

Night		Day	Calculated (dBA) Evening		D	Day Night		Evening	
Equipment Leq	Lmax	Leq	Lmax Lmax	Leq Leq	Lmax Lmax	Leq Leq	Lmax	Leq	Lmax
Excavator	2020		76.9	72.9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Concrete S	Saw		88.8	81.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Skid Steer	r Loader		77.5	74.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

Concre	ete M	lixer Tru	uck	86.8	82.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Concre	ete F	ump Tru	ck	89.4	82.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Crane	(Lir	nk Belt)	2020	76.7	68.7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Front	End	Loader		78.3	74.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Drill	Rig	Truck		81.1	74.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Front	End	Loader		81.0	77.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
		To	tal	89.4	88.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

Report date: Case Description: 04/19/2021 Future Street SFR

\*\*\*\* Receptor #1 \*\*\*\*

			Baselines	(dBA)
Description	Land Use	Daytime	Evening	Night
Residential 1	Residential	45.9	40.0	40.0

		Equi	pment			
Description	Impact Device	Usage (%)	Spec Lmax (dBA)	Actual Lmax (dBA)	Receptor Distance (feet)	Estimated Shielding (dBA)
Concrete Saw	No	20		89.6	55.0	0.0
Skid Steer Loader	No	50		74.4	35.0	0.0
Crane (Link Belt) 2020	No	16		68.7	20.0	0.0
Front End Loader	No	40		79.1	55.0	0.0
Front End Loader	No	40		79.1	40.0	0.0
Chain Saw	No	20		83.7	40.0	0.0
Backhoe 2020	No	40		69.4	20.0	0.0
Backhoe 2020	No	40		69.4	20.0	0.0

# Results

Noise Limits (dBA)

Noise Limit Exceedance (dBA)

Night		Day	Calculat	ed (dBA) Evening	D D- 	ay Night 	Even	ing 	
Equipment Leq	Lmax	Leq	Lmax Lmax	Leq Leq	Lmax Lmax	Leq Leq	Lmax	Leq	Lmax
 Concrete S	aw		 88.8	 81.8	 N/A	 N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A Skid Steer	N/A Loader	N/A	N/A 77.5	N/A 74.5	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A Crane (Lin	N/A k Belt)	N/A 2020	N/A 76.7	N/A 68.7	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A Front End	N/A Loader	N/A	N/A 78.3	N/A 74.3	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Front E	nd Loader		81.0	77.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Chain S	aw		85.7	78.7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Backhoe	2020		77.4	73.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Backhoe	2020		77.4	73.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
	То	otal	88.8	85.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM), Version 1.1

Report date: Case Description: 04/19/2021 Future Street SFR

\*\*\*\* Receptor #1 \*\*\*\*

			Baselines	(dBA)
Description	Land Use	Daytime	Evening	Night
Residential	Residential	45.9	40.0	40.0

		Eq 	uipment 			
Description	Impact Device	Usage (%)	Spec Lmax (dBA)	Actual Lmax (dBA)	Receptor Distance (feet)	Estimated Shielding (dBA)
Concrete Mixer Truck	No	40		78.8	40.0	0.0
Concrete Pump Truck	No	20		81.4	40.0	0.0
Concrete Mixer Truck	No	40		78.8	20.0	0.0
Concrete Pump Truck	No	20		81.4	20.0	0.0
Backhoe 2020	No	40		69.4	30.0	0.0
Cylinder Roller 2020	No	20		77.8	40.0	0.0

### Results

#### \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_

Noise Limits (dBA)

Noise Limit Exceedance (dBA)

-----

_	-	-	-	-	<b>`</b>	/	

Night Day		Calculated (dBA) Evening		Day Night		Eveni			
Equipment	t .		Lmax	Leq	Lmax	Leq	Lmax	Leq	Lmax
Leq	Lmax	Leq	Lmax	Leq	Lmax	Leq			
Concrete	Mixer T	ruck	80.7	76.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Concrete	Pump Tr	uck	83.3	76.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Concrete	Mixer T	ruck	86.8	82.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Concrete	Pump Tr	uck	89.4	82.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Backhoe 2	2020		73.8	69.9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Cylinder	Roller	2020	79.7	72.7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
	٦	otal	89.4	86.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM), Version 1.1

Report date:04/19/2021Case Description:Future Street SFR

\*\*\*\* Receptor #1 \*\*\*\*

			Baselines	(dBA)
Description	Land Use	Daytime	Evening	Night
Residential	Residential	45.9	40.0	40.0

### Equipment

		Usage (%)				
Description	Impact Device		Spec Lmax (dBA)	Actual Lmax (dBA)	Receptor Distance (feet)	Estimated Shielding (dBA)
Compressor (air)	No	40		77.7	55.0	0.0

Results

-----

Noise Limits (dBA)

Noise Limit Exceedance (dBA)

----------Calculated (dBA) Day Evening Night Day Evening Night -------------------- ------Equipment Lmax Leq Lmax Leq Lmax Leq Leq Lmax Leq Lmax Leq Equipment Lmax ----- ---------- ----- ----- ---------- ---------Compressor (air)76.872.9N/AN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AN/ATotal76.872.9N/AN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AN/A N/A N/A

APPENDIX F - SACRED LANDS FILE REQUEST RESULTS



CHAIRPERSON Laura Miranda Luiseño

VICE CHAIRPERSON Reginald Pagaling Chumash

SECRETARY Merri Lopez-Keifer Luiseño

Parliamentarian **Russell Attebery** Karuk

COMMISSIONER William Mungary Paiute/White Mountain Apache

COMMISSIONER Julie Tumamait-Stenslie Chumash

COMMISSIONER [Vacant]

COMMISSIONER [**Vacant**]

COMMISSIONER [Vacant]

Executive Secretary Christina Snider Pomo

NAHC HEADQUARTERS

1550 Harbor Boulevard Suite 100 West Sacramento, California 95691 (916) 373-3710 nahc@nahc.ca.gov NAHC.ca.gov STATE OF CALIFORNIA

# NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

June 28, 2021

Bryan Hamilton Ceqaology

Via Email to: BryanHamilton@ceqaology.com

### Re: Future Street Single Family Project, Los Angeles County

Dear Mr. Hamilton:

A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was completed for the information submitted for the above referenced project. The results were <u>positive</u>. Please contact the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation on the attached list for information. Please note that tribes do not always record their sacred sites in the SLF, nor are they required to do so. A SLF search is not a substitute for consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with a project's geographic area. Other sources of cultural resources should also be contacted for information regarding known and recorded sites, such as the appropriate regional California Historical Research Information System (CHRIS) archaeological Information Center for the presence of recorded archaeological sites.

Attached is a list of Native American tribes who may also have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. This list should provide a starting place in locating areas of potential adverse impact within the proposed project area. Please contact all of those listed; if they cannot supply information, they may recommend others with specific knowledge. By contacting all those listed, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult with the appropriate tribe. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Commission requests that you follow-up with a telephone call or email to ensure that the project information has been received.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from tribes, please notify the NAHC. With your assistance, we can assure that our lists contain current information.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at my email address: <u>Andrew.Green@nahc.ca.gov</u>.

Sincerely,

Indrew Green

Andrew Green Cultural Resources Analyst

Attachment

#### Native American Heritage Commission Native American Contact List Los Angeles County 6/28/2021

### Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation

Andrew Salas, Chairperson P.O. Box 393 Gabrieleno Covina, CA, 91723 Phone: (626) 926 - 4131 admin@gabrielenoindians.org

## Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel

Band of Mission IndiansAnthony Morales, ChairpersonP.O. Box 693GabrielenoSan Gabriel, CA, 91778Phone: (626) 483 - 3564Fax: (626) 286-1262GTTribalcouncil@aol.com

### Gabrielino /Tongva Nation

Sandonne Goad, Chairperson 106 1/2 Judge John Aiso St., Gabrielino #231 Los Angeles, CA, 90012 Phone: (951) 807 - 0479 sgoad@gabrielino-tongva.com

### Gabrielino Tongva Indians of

California Tribal CouncilRobert Dorame, ChairpersonP.O. Box 490GabrielinoBellflower, CA, 90707Phone: (562) 761 - 6417Fax: (562) 761-6417gtongva@gmail.com

## Gabrielino Tongva Indians of

California Tribal Council Christina Conley, Tribal Consultant and Administrator P.O. Box 941078 Gabrielino Simi Valley, CA, 93094 Phone: (626) 407 - 8761 christina.marsden@alumni.usc.ed u

### Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe

Charles Alvarez, 23454 Vanowen Street West Hills, CA, 91307 Phone: (310) 403 - 6048 roadkingcharles@aol.com

Gabrielino

## Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla

Indians Lovina Redner, Tribal Chair P.O. Box 391820 Anza, CA, 92539 Phone: (951) 659 - 2700 Fax: (951) 659-2228 Isaul@santarosa-nsn.gov

Cahuilla

#### Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians

Joseph Ontiveros, Cultural Resource Department P.O. BOX 487 San Jacinto, CA, 92581 Phone: (951) 663 - 5279 Fax: (951) 654-4198 jontiveros@soboba-nsn.gov

Cahuilla Luiseno

### Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians

Isaiah Vivanco, Chairperson P. O. Box 487 San Jacinto, CA, 92581 Phone: (951) 654 - 5544 Fax: (951) 654-4198 ivivanco@soboba-nsn.gov

Cahuilla Luiseno

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed Future Street Single Family Project, Los Angeles County.

# 3152-3164 East Future Street Hillside Development Construction Traffic Management Plan

July 14, 2021

Prepared by:

Jano Baghdanian, P.E., T.E., PTOE

Fax: 818.888.4541



# 3152-3164 East Future Street Hillside Development Construction Traffic Management Plan

Per the LADOT Transportation Assessment Guidelines Addendum – Hillside Developments, new land use development projects requiring discretionary entitlements proposed in hillside communities on streets less than 24-feet wide (on any roadway segment used by the project for hauling materials and equipment) should develop a Traffic Management Plan ("Plan") that identifies measures to offset access, circulation, and parking issues for LADOT review and approval.

This document represents said Plan to be followed by Andre Ohanian & Highrise, Incorporated and its successors and assigns (collectively, the "Owner"), the General Contractors, and Subcontractors, in connection with the construction of ten single family dwellings at 3152-3164 East Future Street, Los Angeles, CA 90065.

### **Project Description**

The Owner proposes the construction of ten single- family dwellings with a two car garages, and associated grading (herein referred to as the "Project").

### **Purpose of the Plan**

The purpose of this Plan is to facilitate timely completion of the Project, coordinate schedules and parking with other developers within the affected area and to minimize any potential impacts that may be experienced by the surrounding community in connection with the construction of the Project. The Plan shall apply during all aspects of construction related to the Project and the Owner and his/her/their agents will coordinate with LADOT to ensure the construction of each project should be scheduled so as not to create adverse construction traffic in the area.

## **Construction Activities**

### **Construction Hours**

Construction shall take place in compliance with the provisions of Section 41.40 and62.61 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC). In order to ensure timely completion of the Project while minimizing impacts on the surrounding community, exterior noise- generating construction shall be limited to Monday through Friday from 7:00 AM to 9:00 PM and Saturday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM. No construction activities shall occur on Sundays or any national holidays without a separate permit. Management, supervisory, administrative and inspection activities shall take place with the designated construction hours to the extent feasible; however, such activities may take place outside of the designed construction hours if approved by the appropriate agencies.

### **Construction Contact**

The Owner shall appoint a Construction Contact ("CC") to respond to inquiries or concerns of surrounding residents as well as the general public. The CC may be an employee or representative of either the General Contractor or Owner. A project hotline will be provided for local neighbor complaints or any inquiries and the construction process. A response to comments or inquiries will be provided within 72 hours of receipt. The project hotline number is (818) 636-1594 and shall be conspicuously posted at each construction site. The CC shall notify the Owner if the CC is notified of any construction activities that potentially violate this Plan or any of the construction-related conditions of approval.

### **Construction Phasing**

It is anticipated that construction of the Project would be continuous and in two phases. Once mobilized, the construction barricades (Fencing) would remain in place for the duration of the construction (or returned once that area is complete).

The on-site construction process will be conducted in two phases to further ensure material staging and employee parking can be accommodated.

**Phase 1** consists of grading the property and foundation work in order to create the pads to build upon the single-family dwellings. Traffic control measures will be implemented during excavations or other work within the existing roadway per the latest standards of *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]) or the latest edition of *Work Area Traffic Control Handbook* (American Public Works Association) WATCH Manual. East Future Street is a roadway of approximately 25 single family homes, so traffic impacts are expected to be minimal.

Phase 2 is the construction of the main houses, and the garages.

### **Barricades**

All construction barriers will be maintained in accordance with City regulations and their appearance will be maintained in a visually attractive manner throughout the construction period.

Signs will be posted along the fencing stating that no unauthorized materials are permitted to be posted. The General Contractor will ensure with daily morning walks by designated personnel that no unauthorized materials are posted on any temporary barricades or any temporary fencing. Graffiti on barricades will be removed or covered at the earliest possible time after the General Contractor is aware of its existence.

## **Construction Site Security**

The Owner will utilize all appropriate security measures, including but not limited to security guards, lighting, fencing and locks at all entrances as appropriate to maintain safety in and around the

construction site.

### **Emergency Access**

Emergency access to the projects and adjacent areas shall be kept clear and unobstructed during all phases of construction.

The nearest hospital is LAC+USC Medical Center, located at 2051 Marengo Street, Los Angeles, CA 90033 and the nearest fire station is Fire Station 44, located at 1410 Cypress Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90065.

### Very High Fire Severity Zone

In accordance with Section 57.322.1.1, the project shall adhere to LAFD brush clearance regulations to ensure that certain vegetation does not provide a ready fuel supply to augment the spread or intensity of a fire.

Additionally, grading and hauling activities shall be discontinued during periods of high winds and Red Flag days as determined by the Los Angeles Fire Department. The Owner and General Contractor will cooperate with Fire Station 44 to ensure that the Project ensures fire safety and minimizes fire hazards during construction.

# **Construction Circulation**

### **Traffic Control Plans**

The Owner will generate all worksite traffic control plans ("TCP") and obtain prior Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) approval for any lane closures, detours, on-street staging areas and/or temporary changes in street traffic control that may be required during construction. Temporary traffic control procedures will be employed as appropriate to address circulation requirements. These procedures could include, but are not limited to; traffic cones, temporary signs, changeable message signs, and flagmen.

All traffic control procedures shall be undertaken in accordance with the standards in the latest edition of *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]) or the latest edition of *Work Area Traffic Control Handbook* (American Public Works Association). The General Contractors will be responsible for replacing any signs missing or damaged due to construction activities according to LADOT specifications. In addition, the General Contractor will be responsible for striping (proposed and exiting) to be in good condition and visible. Any faded existing striping would be repainted as directed by LADOT.

Per LAMC Section 62.61, construction activities that are within or obstruct the public right of way on East Future Street are restricted during peak traffic hours, defined as the hours of 6:00 AM - 9:00 AM and

3:30 PM – 7:00 PM, unless an exemption is approved by the Department of Public Works.

### **Truck Access**

All vehicle access to the Project site is via East Future Street. Ingress and Egress to the Project would occur along East Future Street entering from Future Street and Cypress Avenue to the South. The following are the anticipated truck routes for hauling and other large construction vehicles.

Inbound trucks, Southbound Glendale Freeway (2): Exit 14 San Fernando Road Left onto San Fernando Road, Left on Cazador Street Right onto Cypress Avenue Left onto Future Street Right onto Kemper Street Left onto Future Street Continue to Project site

Inbound trucks, Northbound Glendale Freeway (2): Exit 14 San Fernando Road Right onto San Fernando Road, Left on Cazador Street Right onto Cypress Avenue Left onto Future Street Right onto Kemper Street Left onto Future Street Continue to Project site

Outbound trucks: Exit Project site turn left and head southbound Right onto Kemper Street Left on Future Street Right on Cypress Avenue Left on Cazador Street Right on San Fernando Road Turn left onto the 2 Freeway (southbound) Turn right onto 2 Freeway (northbound)

Where necessary, flagmen with communication devices shall be used to coordinate hauling activities. The Owner and General Contractor will be responsible to submit the necessary documents to the Board of Building & Safety in order to get an approved haul route to be used during construction.

Permits for oversized or overweight loads, if needed, will be obtained from the Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Street Services (and Caltrans, if the oversized or overweight load will be traveling on a state highway). Such permit loads will be subject to the conditions of the permit and the time of issuance.

## **Construction Truck Hours**

To the extent feasible, the arrival and departure of construction trucks shall occur outside of peak commute hours and shall be minimized when not feasible. On weekdays, haul truck trips shall be scheduled between the hours of (9:00 AM to 3:00 PM) of the permitted construction work period to avoid generating trips during the weekday peak periods. Hauling is prohibited on weekends and federal holidays.

Equipment and material deliveries and pick-ups shall be coordinated to reduce the potential for trucks to wait to load or unload on public or private streets for protracted periods for time to ensure that trucks are not impeding traffic flow on the surrounding streets while waiting to enter the Project site.

## **Construction Employee Parking and Material Staging**

It shall be the responsibility of the General Contractor to minimize on-street employee parking during the construction periods. However there does not seem to be any viable off-street parking areas that can be used. Therefore it is anticipated that 2 to 3 vehicles will be parked on-street during the grading and foundation work phase of construction. Once the concrete work and retaining walls are completed and fully cured, these areas can be used for parking and material staging. During the building construction phase, some parking can be on-site and employees will be encouraged to carpool to minimize on-street parking. All material staging will take place on site. If required, the General Contractor can provide the desired parking and staging information to the satisfaction of The City prior to the issuance of any permits.

The on-site construction process will be conducted in 2 phases to further ensure material staging can be accommodated on-site.

The General Contractor shall provide all construction contractors with written information on where their workers and subcontractors are permitted to park, including identification of clear consequences to violators for failure to following these regulations.

The General Contractor shall be responsible for informing subcontractors and construction workers of these requirements and will monitor the compliance of the subcontractors.

# **Traffic Related Environmental Controls**

## Vehicle Air Ouality Measures

Loads shall be secured by trimming or watering or may be covered to prevent the spilling or blowing of the earth material. If the load, where it contacts the sides, front, and back of the truck cargo container area, remains six inches from the upper edge of the container area, and if the load does not extend, at its peak, above any part of the upper edge of the cargo container area, the load is not required to be covered, pursuant to California Vehicle Code Section 23114(e)(4).

Trucks and loads are to be watered at the Project site to prevent blowing dirt and are to be cleaned of loose earth at the Project site to prevent spilling.

Adjacent streets will be swept as needed to remove dirt dropped by the construction vehicles or mud

that would otherwise be carried off by trucks departing the site.

### Vehicle Water Ouality Measure

Where truck traffic is frequent, gravel approaches shall be used to reduce soil compaction and limit the racking of sediment into streets.

All vehicle/equipment maintenance, repair, and washing shall be conducted away from storm remains. All major repairs shall be conducted off-site. Drip Pans or drop cloths shall be used to catch drips and spills.

## <u>Idling</u>

All construction vehicles shall be prohibited from idling in excess of five minutes, both on-site and off-site.

# **Nearby Construction/Permit Activity**

This area is mainly built out with single family dwellings, however there are twelve vacant parcels on this segment of East Future Street, including the subject project. The vacant parcel at 3233 Future Street has submitted plans to the Department of Building & Safety to build a new single family home with garage and retaining walls on the parcel. The vacant parcel at 1420 Killarney Avenue has also submitted plans to the Department of Building & Safety to build a new single family home with attached garage and retaining walls on the parcel. The vacant parcel at 1538 Randall Court has submitted plans to the Department of Building & Safety to build a new single family home with attached garage and retaining walls on the parcel. The vacant parcel at 1538 Randall Court has submitted plans to the Department of Building & Safety to build a new single family home with garage and retaining walls on the parcel. It does not seem that any other parcel has submitted any requests to the City to be developed at this time. If any other projects do appear during the construction of 3152-3164 East Future Street, The Owner and General Contractor will attempt to work with the other projects in good faith to coordinate activity as best as feasibly possible.



#### DEPARTMENT OF **CITY PLANNING**

COMMISSION OFFICE (213) 978-1300

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

VACANT PRESIDENT

MONIQUE LAWSHE VICE-PRESIDENT

MARIA CABILDO CAROLINE CHOE ILISSA GOLD HELEN LEUNG KAREN MACK JACOB NOONAN ELIZABETH ZAMORA

February 5, 2024

Applicant/Owner Andre Ohanian Highrise, Inc. 10955 Penrose Street Sun Valley, CA 91352

# CITY OF LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA



KAREN BASS MAYOR

# EXHIBIT I

FICES

Errata ROOM 525 LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801 (213) 978-1271

> VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP DIRECTOR

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN DEPUTY DIRECTOR

HAYDEE URITA-LOPEZ DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ARTHLI VARMA AICP DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP DEPUTY DIRECTOR

#### RE: ENV-2016-4999-MND Errata for 3110-3164 East Future Street, Northeast Los Angeles

On December 14, 2023, the Department of City Planning published Mitigated Negative Declaration ENV-2016-4999-MND (MND) with the following project description:

The project site totals approximately 63,462 square feet (or 1.45 acres) in size and is comprised of 10 contiguously-owned, vacant lots in a Hillside Area. The proposed project involves the development of two (2) of the 10 lots located at 3152 and 3164 Future Street, and the future development of the remaining eight (8) lots. The lot located at 3152 Future Street consists of 6,470.2 square feet and is proposed to be developed with a new single-family dwelling with two (2) covered parking spaces consisting of a total floor area of 2,502.09 square feet, and 37 feet, 7 inches in height. The lot located at 3164 Future Street consists of 6,626.1 square feet and is proposed to be developed with a new single-family dwelling with two (2) covered parking spaces consisting of a total floor area of 2,508.34 square feet and 41 feet, 8 inches in height. The project proposes to cut 1,655 cubic yards and to fill 240 cubic yards of soil, and a haul route to export a total of 1,415 cubic yards of soil. No import of soil is proposed. The project will require the removal of a total of two Protected Tree species and a total of 14 Significant Tree species. These trees are located at 3134 and 3144 Future Street. The Applicant will replace each Protected Tree according to a 4:1 ratio pursuant to the latest version of the Los Angeles City Ordinance 186873. Therefore, a total of eight new trees will be planted throughout the two aforementioned parcels. The project would also require the removal of 14 Significant Trees from 3122, 3126, 3138, 3152, and 3164 Future Street. These Significant Trees are required to be replaced at a 1:1 ratio; therefore, a total of 14 new trees will be planted to compensate for the removal of the aforementioned Significant Trees.

Subsequent to the publication of ENV-2016-4999-MND and conclusion of the public comment period, but prior to the MND's adoption, the Department of City Planning is issuing this Errata to further clarify and bolster the existing environmental analysis in three different sections of the

ENV-2016-4999-MND Errata Page 2

MND. These clarifications do not change the impact conclusions listed in the MND. Below are the sections of the MND that have been updated. This Errata supersedes all previous documents and publications for the sections included. Additions are illustrated with <u>underline</u> and removals are illustrated with <u>strikethrough</u>.

## Section 4.4.1.B

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

Riparian habitat consists of land located along watercourses and bodies of water, such as floodplains and streambanks. Riparian habitat is characterized by unique soil and/or vegetation that is influenced by the presence of water. The project site is currently occupied by sloping grasslands interspersed with California black walnut trees. There are no natural watercourses or bodies of water located within the project site. The field survey that was conducted for this project indicated that there is no riparian habitat present onsite or within the adjacent properties. This conclusion is also supported by a review of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory, Wetlands Mapper. As a result, no impacts on natural or riparian habitats will result from the proposed project's implementation.

The site does not contain riparian habitat or sensitive natural vegetation communities identified by CDFW and USFWS. This statement is confirmed by the habitat assessment that was undertaken for the Project. As a result, there would be no impact to riparian habitats or sensitive natural vegetation communities, and no mitigation is required.

Section 4.8.1.A

A. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? Less than Significant Impact.

### **Construction and Operational Emissions**

Typical CEQA analyses address local actions that have local or regional impacts, whereas climate change presents the considerable challenge of analyzing the relationship between local activities and the resulting potential, if any, for global environmental impacts. Most environmental analyses examine the "project-specific" impacts that a particular project is likely to generate. With regard to global climate change, however, it is generally accepted that while the magnitude of global warming effects is substantial, the contribution of an individual general development project is so small that direct project-specific significant impacts are highly unlikely.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 requires that, in performing environmental review under CEQA, an agency shall make a good-faith effort, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data, to describe, calculate, or estimate the amount of GHG emissions resulting from a project. The lead agency has discretion to determine whether
# to quantify GHG emissions, and/or rely on a qualitative analysis or performance-based standards.

Section 15064.4 does not establish a threshold of significance and there is not currently an applicable established numeric threshold for GHG emissions. In determining the significance of a project's GHG emissions, the lead agency should focus its analysis on the reasonably foreseeable incremental contribution of the project's emissions to the effects of climate change. CEQA Guidelines provide that the effects of GHG emissions are cumulative, and should be analyzed in the context of CEQA's requirements for cumulative impact analysis (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(f)). CEQA Guidelines specify that compliance with a GHG emissions reduction plan renders a cumulative impact insignificant. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3), a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable if the project would comply with an approved plan or mitigation program that provides specific requirements that would avoid or substantially lessen the cumulative problem within the geographic area of the project. Section 15064(h)(3) allows a lead agency to make a finding of less than significant for GHG emissions if a project complies with adopted programs, plans, policies and/or other regulatory strategies to reduce GHG emissions.

In the absence of any adopted numeric threshold, the significance of the Project's GHG emissions is evaluated consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(b)(2) by considering whether the Project complies with applicable plans, policies, regulations and requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions. For this Project, as a land use development project, the most directly applicable adopted regulatory plan to reduce GHG emissions is the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, which is designed to achieve regional GHG reductions from the land use and transportation sectors as required by SB 375 and the State's long-term climate goals. This analysis also considers consistency with regulations or requirements.

The Project is in compliance with the 2020-2045 Connect SoCal Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy:

- Connect SoCal Plan, which is the 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) for the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region. The plan includes several policies that relate to residential development, such as:
  - <u>Support local jurisdictions in achieving the Regional Housing Needs Assessment</u> (RHNA) goals and increasing housing supply and affordability. *The Project* proposes two units, with eight more planned for a future time.
  - Promote infill development and redevelopment to revitalize urbanized areas and provide greater housing choices. The Project involves the development of new homes on vacant lots surrounded by an existing residential neighborhood. In addition, the Project site is currently zoned for residential uses.
  - Support the preservation of existing affordable housing units and the development of new ones, especially for lower-income households. The Project provides additional housing opportunities in the Project area and does not require the demolition of existing affordable housing units.

 Promote Diverse Housing Choices: Aims to preserve affordable housing, prevent displacement, and identify funding for new workforce and affordable housing development. The Project provides additional housing opportunities in the Project area and does not require the removal of affordable housing or of any individuals residing on-site.

Based on the above analysis, the Project complies with the goals outlined in the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. As a result, GHG impacts would be less than significant.

The following quantitative analysis is for informational purposes only. As stated above, the City has discretion to determine the method it will use to determine significant GHG impacts and relies on a qualitative analysis to determine this impact. The project's construction and operational GHG emissions were calculated using CalEEMod. The GHG emissions estimates reflect what two single-family dwelling units of the same location and description would generate once fully occupied. Construction and operational emissions for the project as a whole (including the two immediately developed units and eight other planned units to be developed at a later date) are shown in Table 4-8. The type of activities that may be undertaken once the initial two units are occupied have been predicted and accounted for in the model for the selected land use type. The results are presented in Table 4-7 and can be found in **Appendix A – CalEEMod Worksheets**.

Source	GHG Emissions (tons/year)				
	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH₄	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO₂E	
Long-Term – Area Emissions	0.03			0.03	
Long-Term - Energy Emissions	7.89			7.92	
Long-Term - Mobile Emissions	20.91			21.22	
Long-Term – Waste Emissions	0.49	0.02		1.23	
Long-Term – Water Emissions	0.74			0.85	
Long-Term - Total Emissions	30.09	0.03		31.28	
Total Construction Emissions	149.74	0.03		150.66	
Construction Emissions Amortized Over 30 Years				5 MTCO <sub>2</sub> E	
Total Operational Emissions with Amortized Construction Emissions				36.28 MTCO₂E	
Significance Threshold				3,000 MTCO₂E	

Table 4-7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory

As shown in Table 4-7, the CO<sub>2</sub>E total for the project is  $31.28 \text{ MTCO}_2E$  per year, which is below the thresholds of 3,000 and 10,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E per year. The project's construction would result in an annual generation of  $150.66 \text{ MTCO}_2E$  per year. When amortized over a 30-year period, these emissions decrease to 5 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E per year. These amortized construction emissions were added to the project's operational emissions to calculate the project's true GHG emissions. As shown in the table, the project's total operational emissions would be 36.28 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E per year, which is still below the thresholds identified for residential land uses.

It is important to note that the project is an "infill" development, which is seen as an important strategy in combating the release of GHG emissions. Infill development provides a regional benefit in terms of a reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) since the project is consistent with the regional and State sustainable growth objectives identified in the State's Strategic Growth Council (SGC). Infill development reduces VMT by recycling existing undeveloped or underutilized properties located in established urban areas. When development is located in a more rural setting, such as further east in the desert areas, employees, patrons, visitors, and residents may have to travel farther since rural development is often located a significant distance from employment, entertainment, and population centers. Consequently, this distance is reduced when development is located in urban areas since employment, entertainment, and population centers tend to be set in more established communities. As a result, the potential impacts will be less than significant.

#### **Cumulative Emissions**

The project's cumulative GHG emissions were estimated by incorporating the development of all 10 parcels, including two immediately proposed parcels and the additional eight parcels, into the model. As indicated previously, the Applicant intends to develop the remaining eight parcels with single-family units at a later, undetermined date. The results of the cumulative emissions analysis are presented in Table 4-8 and can be found in **Appendix A – CalEEMod Worksheets**.

		,			
Source	GHG Emissions (tons/year)				
	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH₄	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO₂E	
Long-Term – Area Emissions	0.16			0.17	
Long-Term - Energy Emissions	39.48			39.64	
Long-Term - Mobile Emissions	98.47			99.91	
Long-Term – Waste Emissions	2.41	0.14		5.97	
Long-Term – Water Emissions	3.72	0.01		4.28	
Long-Term - Total Emissions	144.27	0.16		149.99	
Total Construction Emissions	347.85	0.09		350.40	
Construction Emissions Amortized Over 30 Years				11.68 MTCO₂E	
Total Operational Emissions with Amortized Construction Emissions				161.67 MTCO₂E	
Significance Threshold				3,000 MTCO₂E	

Table 4-8 Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory

As shown in Table 4-8, the project's cumulative  $CO_2E$  total is 149.99 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E per year, which is below the thresholds of 3,000 and 10,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E per year. The project's construction would result in an annual generation of 350.40 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E per year. When

amortized over a 30-year period, these emissions decrease to  $11.68 \text{ MTCO}_2\text{E}$  per year. These amortized construction emissions were added to the project's operational emissions to calculate the project's true GHG emissions. As shown in the table, the project's total cumulative operational emissions would be  $161.67 \text{ MTCO}_2\text{E}$  per year, which is still below the thresholds identified for residential land uses.

The quantitative analysis provided above is presented for informational purposes <u>only</u>. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3) allows a lead agency to make a finding of less than significance for GHG emissions if a project complies with regulatory programs to reduce GHG emissions. Because there is no applicable adopted or accepted numerical threshold of significance for GHG emissions, the methodology for evaluating the project's impacts related to GHG emissions focuses on its consistency with statewide, regional, and local plans adopted for the purpose of reducing and/or mitigating GHG emissions. This evaluation of consistency with such plans is the sole basis for determining the significance of the project's GHG-related impacts on the environment.

For informational purposes, the analysis also calculates the amount of GHG emissions that would be attributable to the project using recommended air quality models, as described below. The primary purpose of quantifying the project's GHG emissions is to satisfy State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(a), which calls for a good-faith effort to describe and calculate emissions. The significance of the project's GHG emissions impacts is not based on the amount of GHG emissions resulting from the project. As a result, the potential impacts would be less than significant.

In summary, the lead agency has the discretion to choose the analysis method that provides a meaningful analysis of the Project's potential GHG impacts. The City relied on a qualitative analysis to determine GHG impacts for the Project. A quantitative analysis was provided for informational purposes only. This analysis made a good-faith effort to describe and calculate the amount of GHG emissions that would be attributable to the Project using recommended air quality models. However, the significance of the project's GHG emissions impacts is not based on the amount of GHG emissions resulting from the Project. As stated previously, the lead agency has the choice when establishing GHG emissions thresholds. Cumulative GHG emissions were analyzed qualitatively, which allows for a broader evaluation of a project's consistency with state or regional climate goals. The Project was analyzed for compliance with SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. As shown above, the Project complies with the goals outlined in the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. As a result, GHG impacts would be less than significant.

# Section 4.10.1.A

A. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? Less than Significant Impact.

Sections 64.70.01 and 64.72 of Article 4.4 of Chapter VI of the Los Angeles Municipal Code were expanded in 2012 by imposing rainwater Low Impact Development (LID) strategies on projects that require building permits. These LID requirements are required in addition to the preparation of the mandatory Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The LID report identifies set *Low Impact Development* standards and practices for stormwater pollution mitigation and provides documentation to demonstrate

compliance with the municipal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit on the plans and permit application submitted to the City.

The project's construction and operation will not significantly impact water quality. The Applicant will be installing temporary drainage and erosion control measures during the project's construction. In the City of Los Angeles, construction projects that disturb less than one acre of soil are generally not required to obtain coverage under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities. However, according to Los Angeles County, they must still implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to prevent erosion and sedimentation problems during the construction phase of the development. The SWPPP will contain construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will restrict the discharge of sediment into the streets and local storm drains. In addition, the project's contractors must adhere to any construction BMPs identified by the City. As a result, the potential construction impacts will be less than significant.

Once occupied, the project will improve water quality over the present conditions. Currently, stormwater runoff, sediment, and waste discharges off-site into Future Street. The project will include various LID Best Management Practices (BMPs) such as planter boxes, permeable pavement, and new drainage pipes. Runoff will be filtered as it percolates through the soil located in the planter boxes. This filtered runoff will then be conveyed off-site through new drainage pipes that will be provided. As a result, any potential operational impacts will be less than significant.

#### **Conclusion**

The Errata is provided to clarify and bolster the previous analysis provided in the MND and does not identify impacts or find new mitigation measures are needed.

Sincerely,

Nashya Sadono-Jensen Nashya Sadono-Jensen

Nashya Sadono-Jensen City Planning Associate Department of City Planning

DEPARTMENT OF

COMMISSION OFFICE (213) 978-1300

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

VACANT

MONIQUE LAWSHE VICE-PRESIDENT

MARIA CABILDO CAROLINE CHOE ILISSA GOLD HELEN LEUNG KAREN MACK JACOB NOONAN ELIZABETH ZAMORA



CALIFORNIA



KAREN BASS

EXHIBIT J

Mitigation Monitoring Program S M 525 Los ANGELES, CA 90012-4801 (213) 978-1271

> VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP DIRECTOR

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN DEPUTY DIRECTOR

HAYDEE URITA-LOPEZ DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP DEPUTY DIRECTOR

# MITIGATION AND MONITORING PROGRAM

#### 1.1 Introduction

This Mitigation Monitoring Program ("MMP") has been prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, which requires a Lead Agency to adopt a "reporting or monitoring program for changes to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment." In addition, Section 15097(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that a public agency adopt a program for monitoring or reporting mitigation measures and project revisions, which it has required to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. This MMP has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA, Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 and Section 15097 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

The City of Los Angeles is the Lead Agency for the Project and therefore is responsible for administering and implementing the MMP. A public agency may delegate reporting or monitoring responsibilities to another public agency or to a private entity that accepts the delegation; however, until mitigation measures have been completed, the Lead Agency remains responsible for ensuring that implementation of the mitigation measures occurs in accordance with the program.

A Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) has been prepared to address the potential environmental impacts of the Project. The evaluation of the Project's impacts in the MND takes into consideration the project design features (PDF) and applies mitigation measures (MM) needed to avoid or reduce potentially significant environmental impacts. This MMP is designed to monitor implementation of the PDFs and MMs identified for the Project.

## 1.2 Organization

As shown on the following pages, each identified project design feature and mitigation measure for the Project is listed and categorized by environmental impact area, with accompanying identification of the following:

• Enforcement Agency: the agency with the power to enforce the PDF or MM.

- Monitoring Agency: the agency to which reports involving feasibility, compliance, implementation, and development are made.
- Monitoring Phase: the phase of the Project during which the PDF or MM shall be monitored.
- Monitoring Frequency: the frequency at which the PDF or MM shall be monitored.
- Action Indicating Compliance: the action by which the Enforcement or Monitoring Agency indicates that compliance with the identified PDF or required MM has been implemented.

# 1.3 Administrative Procedures and Enforcement

This MMP shall be enforced throughout all phases of the Project. The Applicant shall be responsible for implementing each PDF and MM and shall be obligated to provide certification, as identified below, to the appropriate monitoring and enforcement agencies that each PDF and MM has been implemented. The Applicant shall maintain records demonstrating compliance with each PDF and MM. Such records shall be made available to the City upon request.

During the construction phase and prior to the issuance of building permits, the Applicant shall retain an independent Construction Monitor (either via the City or through a third-party consultant), approved by the Department of City Planning, who shall be responsible for monitoring implementation of PDFs and MMs during construction activities consistent with the monitoring phase and frequency set forth in this MMP.

The Construction Monitor shall also prepare documentation of the Applicant's compliance with the PDFs and MMs during construction every 90 days in a form satisfactory to the Department of City Planning. The documentation must be signed by the Applicant and Construction Monitor and be included as part of the Applicant's Compliance Report. The Construction Monitor shall be obligated to immediately report to the Enforcement Agency any non-compliance with the MMs and PDFs within two businesses days if the Applicant does not correct the non-compliance within a reasonable time of notification to the Applicant by the monitor or if the non-compliance is repeated. Such non-compliance shall be appropriately addressed by the Enforcement Agency.

# 1.4 Program Modification

After review and approval of the final MMP by the Lead Agency, minor changes and modifications to the MMP are permitted, but can only be made subject to City approval. The Lead Agency, in conjunction with any appropriate agencies or departments, will determine the adequacy of any proposed change or modification. This flexibility is necessary in light of the nature of the MMP and the need to protect the environment. No changes will be permitted unless the MMP continues to satisfy the requirements of CEQA, as determined by the Lead Agency.

The Project shall be in substantial conformance with the PDFs and MMs contained in this MMP. The enforcing departments or agencies may determine substantial conformance with PDFs and MMs in the MMP in their reasonable discretion. If the department or agency cannot find substantial conformance, a PDF or MM may be modified or deleted as follows: the enforcing department or agency, or the decision maker for a subsequent discretionary project related approval, finds that the modification or deletion complies with CEQA, including CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164, which could include the preparation of an addendum or subsequent environmental clearance, if necessary, to analyze the impacts from the modifications to or deletion of the PDFs

or MMs. Any addendum or subsequent CEQA clearance shall explain why the PDF or MM is no longer needed, not feasible, or the other basis for modifying or deleting the PDF or MM, and that the modification will not result in a new significant impact consistent with the requirements of CEQA. Under this process, the modification or deletion of a PDF or MM shall not in and of itself require a modification to any Project discretionary approval unless the Director of Planning also finds that the change to the PDF or MM results in a substantial change to the Project or the non-environmental conditions of approval.

# 1.5 Mitigation Monitoring Program

# A. Biology

The project will result in the removal of vegetation and disturbances to the ground and therefore may result in take of nesting native bird species. The degree of sensitivity to disturbances varies by species and is influenced by the nesting stage (e.g., nest building, incubation, feeding chicks). The below MM-BIO-1 would reduce impacts to nesting birds and would ensure compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and Section 3503 of the California Fish and Game Code. Prior to the start of tree/shrub removal and grading activities associated with the proposed project, implementation of the following mitigation measure is recommended:

MM-BIO-1: Highrise Incorporated, or its successor, must retain a qualified biologist (with at least two years of avian experience and knowledge of local bird species) to conduct a directed clearance survey to locate any active bird nests prior to any tree/shrub removal or grading/construction activities during the bird or raptor breeding season (general breeding and nesting bird season is February 1 through September 1; raptor nesting season is January 1 through June 30). This survey shall be conducted no more than three (3) days prior to the start of ground disturbing activities. If the qualified biologist determines there are active nests, a construction buffer will be implemented to avoid impacts to the nest. The qualified biologist shall determine the appropriate standard buffer distance for nests based on the sensitivity levels of specific avian species. The determination of the standard buffer widths shall be site- and species-specific, data-driven, and shall not be based on generalized assumptions regarding all nesting birds. If warranted, the qualified biologist will identify feasible measures to avoid any potential adverse effects on nesting birds.

Enforcement Agency: Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety

Monitoring Agency: Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety

Monitoring Phase: Construction

**Monitoring Frequency:** Once, prior to issuance of building permit; or, if vegetation removal, building demolition or grading is initiated during the nesting season, as determined by a qualified biologist.

Action Indicating Compliance: If vegetation removal, building demolition, or grading is initiated during the nesting season, submittal of a survey report by a qualified biologist.

# INITIAL SUBMISSIONS

The following submissions by the public are in compliance with the Commission Rules and Operating Procedures (ROPs), Rule 4.3a. Please note that "compliance" means that the submission complies with deadline, delivery method (hard copy and/or electronic) <u>AND</u> the number of copies. The Commission's ROPs can be accessed at <u>http://planning.lacity.org</u>, by selecting "Commissions & Hearings" and selecting the specific Commission.

The following submissions are not integrated or addressed in the Staff Report but <u>have</u> been distributed to the Commission.

Material which does not comply with the submission rules is not distributed to the Commission.

ENABLE BOOKMARKS ONLINE:

\*\*If you are using Explorer, you will need to enable the Acrobat the bookmarks on the left side of the screen.

If you are using Chrome, the bookmarks are on the upper right-side of the screen. If you do not want to use the bookmarks, simply scroll through the file.

If you have any questions, please contact the Commission Office at (213) 978-1300.



# Re: 3152 & 3164 Future Street

Nashya Sadono-Jensen <nashya.sadono-jensen@lacity.org> Mon, Feb 5, 2024 at 9:31 AM To: Jack Gomez <a fireplaces726@gmail.com>, Planning APC East LA <a column columnation columns and colu

Hi Abel,

Thank you for your email. I am forwarding this to the Commission office.

On Sat, Feb 3, 2024 at 12:14 PM Jack Gomez <a gfireplaces726@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Nashya,

It has come to my attention that the 3152 & 3164 Future Street projects are being considered for approved by the Area Planning Commission. As a member of the community, I want to express my support for the projects because we have a housing crisis and need support more housing for all family types especially when they are consistent with the zoning, such as this project.

I urge the Area Planning Commission to approve this project.

Thank you.

Abel Gomez



# Future street DIR-2016-4998-SSP-HCA and DIR-2016-5000-SSP-HCA

Janie Geiser <janiegeiser2@gmail.com> To: "apceastla@lacity.org" <apceastla@lacity.org> Cc: FutureStDevelopment@gmail.com Mon, Jan 22, 2024 at 1:13 PM

To the commission:

We are writing about the planned construction of two large homes on the top of the hill on Future Street (DIR-2016-4998-SSP-HCA and DIR-2016-5000-SSP-HCA).

The construction of these large homes on this raw hillside where rocks and mud already tumble regularly to the road seems unconsidered and unsafe.

Additionally, Future Street is the main artery up and down the hill for countless residents. We have recently seem two similar projects that have caused regular road closures (still ongoing after several years) during the construction of two large homes on the hilltop on Kemper Street, on a less travelled artery. We are greatly concerned about the prevalence of construction vehicles, water hookup work, etc on Future Street, a winding and narrow one lane road that we all depend on.

There are many elderly residents on this hill, and we are also concerned about emergency vehicle access, as well as fire department access.

Parking on Future street already barely accommodates current residents.

The planning for this project seems inadequate. Until a viable, community approved plan exists to deal with both maintaining constant Future Street road access for all residents, and hillside erosion safety, and consideration of possible damage to neighboring properties, we strongly request a hold be placed on these projects.

Thank you for your consideration.

Janie Geiser and Lew Klahr 1728 Kilbourn St, LA 90065



# 3152/3164 Future St

**Dawn Loryne GSROC** <ohhdawn@yahoo.com> To: apceastla@lacity.org Thu, Jan 18, 2024 at 12:05 PM

Dir-2016-4998-spp-hca Dir-2016-5000-spp-hca

To whom it may concern,

Please don't let the old timers that don't want to see progress keep these house from being built. There are other avenues for traffic and they both have garages so it won't impact parking other than the people that park vehicles that don't even run there. I look forward to new construction and neighbors. Thank you

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone



# Hearing on Future Street: PLEASE READ

#### Nina Treadwell <gausib@gmail.com>

Sat. Nov 18, 2023 at 7:05 PM To: apceastla@lacity.org, nashya.sadono-jensen@lacity.org, Jeanne Jackson <jeannejcksn@gmail.com>, Nina Treadwell <gausib@gmail.com>

They can submit an email to apceastla@lacity.org, attend in person, or call in on the day of the hearing. More information on how to call in will be available as the meeting date gets closer. TO BE READ AT THE MEETING.

Department of City Planning City of Los Angeles 200 N. Spring Street, Room 525 Los Angeles, CA 90012

Jeanne Jackson, Ph.D. Nina Treadwell, Ph.D. 3168 Future Street Los Angeles, CA 90065

Nov. 12, 2023

## **APPEAL AGAINST DEVELOPMENT OF 3152 and 3164 FUTURE ST, LOS ANGELES**

Dear Nashya Sandono-Jensen and LA City Planning Department:

We are writing to you at the suggestion of your colleague, Vanessa Soto, with whom we have been in contact regarding the recent decision to grant permission for the development of 3164 and 3152 Future Street. We are the owners of 3168 Future Street which abuts 3164 Future Street so will be *directly* impacted by any attempt to build on the unstable, degraded ground on the lot of 3164 Future Street.

Unfortunately, we were out of the country when the appeal process took place, and our mail was not forwarded by the tenants, so we had no notice of this action. We have now returned to live at 3168 Future Street as our primary residence, and have grave concerns regarding the consequences of developing 3164 and 3152. We will address in detail below the repercussions of such action in relation to own property below (3168 Future Street), but first would like to reiterate the concerns already formally voiced by several of your neighbors:

RE: APPEAL AGAINST DEVELOPMENT OF 3152 and 3164 FUTURE ST, LOS ANGELES CASE Numbers: DIR-2016-4998-SPP-HCA and DIR-2016-5000-SP-HCA

REF: Case # DIR-2016-4998-SPP-HCA / 3152 East Future Street Case # DIR-2016-5000-SPP-HCA / 3164 East Future Street

# UNADDRESSED SAFETY AND ACCESS ISSUES

Our neighbors have already officially appealed against the proposed development pinpointing *lack of attention by the developers to safety and access*, among other issues that will threaten our community. As we hope you are aware, Future Street is a narrow, winding, up-hill/down-hill street which is especially narrow at the points of the proposed development; further, on one side, access to Future Street is difficult to navigate *even by car*, and for this reason is rarely used to access/leave our hillside community. For large vehicles (needed for excavation and construction equipment, building materials, etc.) the route is impossible. The other side of Future Street is approached by a one-way lane, and a work around via Kemper Street and Isabel Street is similarly limited, with only one car at a time able to move through those streets. Our community is also in a high-risk fire zone; should the one main artery out of the neighborhood be blocked, residents will be unable to quickly evacuate the area, and fire and emergency services will be unable to access our community.

From firsthand experience, we can attest that when we moved into 3168 Future Street it was not possible to bring *any* (one) large a truck up the hill; the truck remained on Division Street, and a small van was used to shuttle furniture up and down the hill. If the City has not done due diligence by ensuring that the proposed plan does not compromise loss of life and property, they could be sued for negligence. We are currently working with a lawyer who will address these issues with you in detail. We hope that this measure will prompt the Department of City and Planning to re-consider the planned proposal, in light of these serious, unaddressed issues, overlooked by both the City and the developers.

# **SPECIFIC RISK TO 3168 FUTURE STREET**

With regard to *damage and dislodgement of our property (3168 Future St)* which would occur should development occur at 3164 Future Street, we emphasize the following. First, we will provide background to the construction of 3168 and 3172 Future Street. The dwellings were built *together* in 1965 as twin houses that are *bolted into the pre-existing bedrock on those two lots*. At the rear, the land is less stable, and for this reason, both houses share a long retaining wall of considerable height on both ends (Photo 1) and a large concrete "gutter" which have functioned efficiently for nearly 60 years to prevent mudslides during and after excessive rainfall; both features extend the entire length of both properties.

The reason the lot at 3164 Future Street has not been developed in almost 60 years is because *such bedrock does not exist on that lot*. The hillside is almost completely degraded due to fine soil that continuously pours down the hill to the road (Photo 2) and gopher infestations that cross-cross the entirety of the lot has led to intensified degradation (see photo 3). Gopher tunnels run between 4 - 16 inches below the ground, with many connected lateral tunnels; some parts of the main tunnel can be up to 5 or 6 feet deep. *We see no evidence that these issues regarding the instability of the land have been addressed in granting permission for development*.

Of great concern is that the retaining wall of our property (3168 Future Street) abuts the proposed construction area at 3164 Future Street (Photo 4). The only reason the land at 3164 Future has not completely collapsed is due to a number of large trees whose extended root systems have helped to keep the hillside somewhat intact. *The proposed elimination of those trees will have dire effects on the land's already weak stability and undoubtedly effect the stability of our abutting property*; some of that instability will likely remain unseen if work is done. Destabilizing the land by the upheaval of construction also risks greater repercussions due to earthquakes.

As the plan is to bulldoze the hillside in order to construct a large two-car garage, in light of the above, there is high probability that our retaining wall will collapse, as it will no longer be supported. As mentioned above, the retaining wall is crucial for stabilizing and avoiding mudslides both for our property and that of 3172 Future Street. Any construction at 3164 Future Street will also destroy our *wooden deck* (Photo 5) which abuts the said lot; as you can see in Photo 5 loose dirt already continues to pour in from 3164 Future

Street, piling up on our deck This is plain common sense. *We see no evidence presented to circumvent these likely outcomes.* 

The Los Angeles Department of City Planning has not attended to the major risks inherent in the specific matter of construction on the lot of 3164 Future Street by assessing its impending impact on our property at 3168 Future Street and beyond. This is a major dereliction of duty, and we therefore ask that you immediately halt any further development until all of the above can be fully assessed.

To our knowledge, there has been no specific geological report that assesses the numerous issues outlined here. The larger implications for such construction are loss of habitable dwellings and to life.

While we understand that this letter falls outside the time to submit a formal grievance, rather than use that as an excuse to disregard the issues outlined, we hope that the City will take these issues very seriously. Many of the issues specifically relate to the development on 3164 Future Street, which directly abuts our property at 3168 Future Street, so have not been addressed elsewhere.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Jackson and Nina Treadwell jeannejcksn@gmail.com gausib@gmail.com (831) 331-1378

#### 6 attachments



Photo 1.jpg 108K



Photo 2.jpg 114K



Photo 4.jpg 102K



**Photo 3.jpg** 185K



Photo 5.jpg 111K

Jackson-Treadwell Appeal LA City Dept of Planning.pdf



# Re: New Project 3152 & 3164 Future Street (DIR-2016-5000-SPP-HCA; DIR-2016-4998-SPP-HCA)

 Nashya Sadono-Jensen <nashya.sadono-jensen@lacity.org>
 Mon, Feb 5, 2024 at 9:31 AM

 To: Roy Schwartz <royschwartz819@gmail.com>, Planning APC East LA <apceastla@lacity.org>

Hi Roy,

Thank you for your email. I am forwarding this to the Commission office.

On Sun, Feb 4, 2024 at 11:50 AM Roy Schwartz <royschwartz819@gmail.com> wrote:

Re: 3152 & 3164 Future Street (DIR-2016-5000-SPP-HCA; DIR-2016-4998-SPP-HCA)

Hi,

Love these project's renderings and design!! There is absolutely no reason for the city to not approve this project.

Best,

**Roy Schwartz**