# City of Los Angeles

Department of City Planning • Environmental Analysis Section City Hall • 200 N. Spring Street, Room 750 • Los Angeles, CA 90012



# INITIAL STUDY/ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION West Los Angeles Community Plan Area

# **11701 Santa Monica Boulevard Project**

Case Number: ENV-2016-1418-MND

# Project Location: 11701-11715 W. Santa Monica Boulevard; 1511 S. Barrington Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90025

Council District: 11

**Project Description:** Markwood Enterprises, Inc. (the "Applicant") proposes the demolition of the existing commercial and automotive repair buildings on the Project Site and the construction of a 53-unit mixed-use apartment building, which would include six joint Live/Work units and 1,500 square feet of ground floor retail space ("Proposed Project"). A minimum of five units (11% of the base density) would be designated as "Very Low Income" restricted affordable units. The Proposed Project would be five stories high (approximately 56 feet above grade) and would include one subterranean level of fully automated parking with two racks. The Proposed Project's total floor area would consist of 45,429 square feet, with a 3:1 Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The Proposed Project would satisfy the minimum open space requirements of the LAMC by providing 5,600 square feet of open space. The Proposed Project would meet the minimum LAMC code requirements for on-site parking by providing 80 parking stalls in the automated subterranean parking garage. Access to the automated parking garage would be from the adjacent alley. Additionally, the Proposed Project would provide 7 short-term and 55 long-term bicycle parking spaces for a total of 62 bicycle parking spaces.

The Applicant is requesting that the following entitlements be granted by the City of Los Angeles as the designated lead agency: Pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code ("LAMC") Section 12.22.A.25, the Applicant proposes to set aside 11% of the total units as Very Low Income restricted affordable housing and requests a Density Bonus of 35%. Additionally, the Applicant requests the following: (1) Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22.A.25(f)(4)(ii), an "on-menu" incentive to increase the FAR to 3:1 in lieu of the otherwise permitted 1.5:1 FAR and; (2) Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22.A.25(g)(3), an off-menu incentive to permit a building height of five stories and 56 feet in lieu of the otherwise permitted three stories and 45 feet pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22.A.25(d)(1): Parking Option 1 to calculate automobile parking at one space per one-bedroom unit and 2 spaces per two-bedroom and three-bedroom units. Pursuant to various sections of the LAMC, the Applicant will request the following administrative approvals and permits from the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety and other municipal agencies for project construction actions, including but not limited to the following: demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, building, tenant improvements and a haul route environmental review for the hauling of approximately 11,217 cubic yards of soil export.

**APPLICANT:** Markwood Enterprises, Inc. **PREPARED BY:** Parker Environmental Consultants **ON BEHALF OF:** The City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning Environmental Analysis Section

August 18, 2016

## **CITY OF LOS ANGELES** OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK - ROOM 395, CITY HALL LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

LEAD CITY AGENCY: City of Los Angeles		COUNCIL DISTRICT: 11
PROJECT TITLE: 11701 Santa Monica Boulevard	ENVIRONMENTAL CASE:	CASE NO.
Project	ENV-2016-1418-MND	CPC-2016-1417-DB

PROJECT LOCATION: 11701-11715 W. Santa Monica Boulevard; 1511 S. Barrington Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90025

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Markwood Enterprises, Inc. (the "Applicant") proposes the demolition of the existing commercial and automotive repair buildings on the Project Site and the construction of a 53-unit mixed-use apartment building, which would include six joint Live/Work units and 1,500 square feet of ground floor retail space ("Proposed Project"). A minimum of five units (11% of the base density) would be designated as "Very Low Income" restricted affordable units. The Proposed Project would be five stories high (approximately 56 feet above grade) and would include one subterranean level of fully automated parking with two racks. The Proposed Project's total floor area would consist of 45,429 square feet, resulting in a 3:1 Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The Proposed Project would satisfy the minimum open space requirements of the LAMC by providing 5,600 square feet of open space. The Proposed Project would meet the minimum LAMC code requirements for on-site parking by providing 80 parking stalls in the automated subterranean parking garage. Access to the automated parking garage would be from the adjacent alley. Additionally, the Proposed Project would provide 7 short-term and 55 long-term bicycle parking spaces for a total of 62 bicycle parking spaces.

The Applicant is requesting that the following entitlements be granted by the City of Los Angeles as the designated lead agency: Pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code ("LAMC") Section 12.22.A.25, the Applicant proposes to set aside 11% of the total units as Very Low Income restricted affordable housing and requests a Density Bonus of 35%. Additionally, the Applicant requests the following: (1) Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22.A.25(f)(4)(ii), an "on-menu" incentive to increase the FAR to 3:1 in lieu of the otherwise permitted 1.5:1 FAR and; (2) Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22.A.25(g)(3), an off-menu incentive to permit a building height of five stories and 56 feet in lieu of the otherwise permitted three stories and 45 feet pursuant to LAMC Section 12.21.1.A.1. In addition, the Applicant proposes to provide automobile parking spaces in accordance with LAMC Section 12.22 A.25(d)(1): Parking Option 1 to calculate automobile parking at one space per onebedroom unit and 2 spaces per two-bedroom and three-bedroom units. Pursuant to various sections of the LAMC, the Applicant will request the following administrative approvals and permits from the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety and other municipal agencies for project construction actions, including but not limited to the following: demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, building, tenant improvements and a haul route environmental review for the hauling of approximately 11,217 cubic yards of soil export.

NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT IF OTHER THAN CITY AGENCY

Markwood Enterprises, Inc.

8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 336

Beverly Hills, CA 90211

FINDING: The Department of City Planning of the City of Los Angeles has proposed that a mitigated negative declaration be adopted for this project. The mitigation measures outlined on the attached pages will reduce any potentially significant adverse effects to a level of insignificance.

SEE ATTACHED SHEET(S) FOR ANY MITIGATION MEASURES IMPOSED

Any written comment received during the public review period are attached together with the response of the Lead City Agency. The project decision-maker may adopt the mitigated negative declaration, amend it, or require preparation of an EIR. Any changes made should be supported by substantial evidence in the record and appropriate findings made.

### THE EXPANDED INITIAL STUDY PREPARED FOR THIS PROJECT IS ATTACHED.

NAME OF PERSON PREPARING FORM	TITLE Planning Assistant	TELEPHONE NUMBER (213) 978-1840
ADDRESS	SIGNATURE (Official)	DATE
Los Angeles, CA 90012	Jordanna	SEPT. 7, 2016

## **CITY OF LOS ANGELES**

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

ROOM 395, CITY HALL

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

## CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

## **INITIAL STUDY and CHECKLIST (CEQA Guidelines Section 15063)**

LEAD CITY AGENCY:	COUNCIL DISTR	ICT:	, DATE:
City of Los Angeles Department of Cit	y Planning CD 11 - Mike Bor	nin	August 18, 2016
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES:</b> Building a	and Safety, Department of Transp	ortation	
ENVIRONMENTAL CASE:	RELATED CASES	S:	
ENV-2016-1418-MND			
PREVIOUS ACTIONS CASE NO.	DOES have s	ignificant changes fro	m previous actions.
	DOES NOT h	ave significant change	s from previous actions.
<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION:</b> Markwood Enterprises, Inc. (the "Applicant") proposes the demolition of the existing commercial and automotive repair building, which would include six joint Live/Work units and 1,500 square feet of ground floor retail space ("Proposed Project"). A minimum of five units (11% of the base density) would be designated as "Very Low Income" restricted affordable units. The Proposed Project would be five stories high (approximately 56 feet above grade) and would include one subterean level of fully automated parking with two racks. The Proposed Project's total floor area would consist of 45,429 square feet, resulting in a 3:1 Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The Proposed Project would satisfy the minimum open space requirements of the LAMC by providing 5,600 square feet of open space. The Proposed Project would meet the minimum LAMC code requirements for on-site parking by providing 80 parking stalls in the automated subterranean parking garage. Access to the automated parking garage would be from the adjacent alley. Additionally, the Proposed Project would provide 7 short-term and 55 long-term bicycle parking spaces for a total of 62 bicycle parking spaces. The Applicant is requesting that the following entitlements be granted by the City of Los Angeles as the designated lead agency: Pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code ("LAMC") Section 12.22.A.25, the Applicant proposes to set aside 11% of the total units as Very Low Income restricted affordable housing and requests a Density Bonus of 35%. Additionally, the Applicant requests the following: (1) Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22.A.25(f)(4)(ii), an "on-menu" incentive to increase the FAR to 3:1 in lieu of the otherwise permitted three stories and 45 feet pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.25(g)(3), an off-menu incentive to permit a building height of five stories and 56 feet in lieu of the otherwise pace per one-bedroom unit and 2 spaces per two-bedroom and three-bedroom units. Pursuant to various sections of the LAMC, the Applicant will request the follow			
Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND	), attached.	na tubles in the attach	
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:</b> The Project Site is located in the West Los Angeles Community Plan Area of Los Angeles. The Project Site's address is 11701-11715 W. Santa Monica Boulevard and 1511 S. Barrington Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90025. The Project Site is a rectangular-shaped corner lot comprised of six lots that encompass approximately 15,143 square feet of lot area (i.e., 0.35 acres). Further details and photographs of the existing Project Site and surrounding area are provided in the expanded Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND), attached.			
<b>PROJECT LOCATION:</b> 11701-11715 W	/. Santa Monica Boulevard and 151	1 S. Barrington Avenue, L	os Angeles, CA 90025
COMMUNITY PLAN AREA: West	t Los Angeles	AREA PLANNING	CERTIFIED
	☑ Does Conform to Plan	COMIMISSION:	
Preniminary	Does NOT Conform to Plan	West Los Angeles	West Los Angeles
		WEST LUS AIIgeles	MAGIT FOR MIREIES
		LA River Adjacent	No
	MAY DENSITY DI AN-		
General Commercial	1.5:1	3:1	

## Determination (To be completed by Lead Agency)

#### On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

ASSISTAL Signature Title Phone

## **Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:**

- 1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less that significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of a mitigation measure has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analysis," as described in (5) below, may be cross referenced).
- 5. Earlier analysis must be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR, or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

- c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated
- 7. Supporting Information Sources: A sources list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whichever format is selected.
- 9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

### **Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:**

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

<ul> <li>AESTHETICS</li> <li>AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES</li> <li>AIR QUALITY</li> <li>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</li> <li>CULTURAL RESOURCES</li> <li>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</li> <li>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</li> <li>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</li> <li>LAND USE AND PLANNING</li> <li>MINERAL RESOURCES</li> <li>NOISE</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>POPULATION AND HOUSING</li> <li>PUBLIC SERVICES</li> <li>RECREATION</li> <li>TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION</li> <li>UTILITIES</li> <li>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</li> </ul>		
Background PROPONENT NAME: Markwood Ente	rprises. Inc.	PHONE NUMBER: (310) 553-3800		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
APPLICANT ADDRESS: 8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 336 Beverly Hills, CA 90211				
AGENCY REQUIRING CHECKLIST: City Dep	SUBMITTED: August 18, 2016			
PROPOSAL NAME (If Applicable): 11	701 Santa Monica Boulevard Projec	ct		

		Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation	Less Than Significant	
		Impact	Incorporated	Impact	No Impact
PLEAS FROM DETEI DETEI	SE NOTE THAT EACH AND EVERY RESPONSE IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGE 1 AND BASED UPON THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS CONTAINED IN A RMINATIONS. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE RESPONSE IN ATTAC RMINATIONS.	LES INITIAL ST ATTACHEMEN CHMENT B FOI	UDY AND CHECK T B, EXPLANATIC R A DETAILED DI	LIST IS SUMM ON OF CHECKL SCUSSION OF (	ARIZED IST CHECKLIST
١.	AESTHETICS				
a.	HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT ON A SCENIC VISTA?				X
b.	SUBSTANTIALLY DAMAGE SCENIC RESOURCES, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, TREES, ROCK OUTCROPPINGS, AND HISTORIC BUILDINGS, OR OTHER LOCALLY RECOGNIZED DESIRABLE AESTHETIC NATURAL FEATURE WITHIN A CITY-DESIGNATED SCENIC HIGHWAY?				X
c.	SUBSTANTIALLY DEGRADE THE EXISTING VISUAL CHARACTER OR QUALITY OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS?			X	
d.	CREATE A NEW SOURCE OF SUBSTANTIAL LIGHT OR GLARE WHICH WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT DAY OR NIGHTTIME VIEWS IN THE AREA?			X	
П.	AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES		·		
а.	CONVERT PRIME FARMLAND, UNIQUE FARMLAND, OR FARMLAND OF STATEWIDE IMPORTANCE, AS SHOWN ON THE MAPS PREPARED PURSUANT TO THE FARMLAND MAPPING AND MONITORING PROGRAM OF THE CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY, TO NON- AGRICULTURAL USE?				X
b.	CONFLICT WITH EXISTING ZONING FOR AGRICULTURAL USE, OR A WILLIAMSON ACT CONTRACT?				X
C.	CONFLICT WITH EXISTING ZONING FOR, OR CAUSE REZONING OF, FOREST LAND (AS DEFINED IN PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 1220(G)), TIMBERLAND (AS DEFINED BY PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 4526), OR TIMBERLAND ZONED TIMBERLAND PRODUCTION (AS DEFINED BY GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 51104(G))?				X
d.	RESULT IN THE LOSS OF FOREST LAND OR CONVERSION OF FOREST LAND TO NON-FOREST USE?				X
e.	INVOLVE OTHER CHANGES IN THE EXISTING ENVIRONMENT WHICH, DUE TO THEIR LOCATION OR NATURE, COULD RESULT IN CONVERSION OF FARMLAND, TO NON-AGRICULTURAL USE OR CONVERSION OF FOREST LAND TO NON-FOREST USE?				X
Ш.	AIR QUALITY				
a.	CONFLICT WITH OR OBSTRUCT IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SCAQMD OR CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PLAN?			X	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b.	VIOLATE ANY AIR QUALITY STANDARD OR CONTRIBUTE SUBSTANTIALLY TO AN EXISTING OR PROJECTED AIR QUALITY VIOLATION?			X	
C.	WOULD THE PROJECT 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 (INCLUDING RELEASING EMISSIONS, WHICH EXCEED QUANTITATIVE THRESHOLD FOR OZONE PRECURSORS)?			X	
d.	EXPOSE SENSITIVE RECEPTORS TO SUBSTANTIAL POLLUTANT CONCENTRATIONS?			X	
e.	CREATE OBJECTIONABLE ODORS AFFECTING A SUBSTANTIAL NUMBER OF PEOPLE?			$\boxtimes$	
IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
а.	HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT, EITHER DIRECTLY OR THROUGH HABITAT MODIFICATION, ON ANY SPECIES IDENTIFIED AS A CANDIDATE, SENSITIVE, OR SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES IN LOCAL OR REGIONAL PLANS, POLICIES, OR REGULATIONS BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME OR U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE ?		X		
b.	HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT ON ANY RIPARIAN HABITAT OR OTHER SENSITIVE NATURAL COMMUNITY IDENTIFIED IN THE CITY OR REGIONAL PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME OR U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE?				X
с.	HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT ON FEDERALLY PROTECTED WETLANDS AS DEFINED BY SECTION 404 OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT (INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, MARSH VERNAL POOL, COASTAL, ETC.) THROUGH DIRECT REMOVAL, FILLING, HYDROLOGICAL INTERRUPTION, OR OTHER MEANS?				X
d.	INTERFERE SUBSTANTIALLY WITH THE MOVEMENT OF ANY NATIVE RESIDENT OR MIGRATORY FISH OR WILDLIFE SPECIES OR WITH ESTABLISHED NATIVE RESIDENT OR MIGRATORY WILDLIFE CORRIDORS, OR IMPEDE THE USE OF NATIVE WILDLIFE NURSERY SITES?				X
e.	CONFLICT WITH ANY LOCAL POLICIES OR ORDINANCES PROTECTING BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES, SUCH AS TREE PRESERVATION POLICY OR ORDINANCE (E.G., OAK TREES OR CALIFORNIA WALNUT WOODLANDS)?		X		
f.	CONFLICT WITH THE PROVISIONS OF AN ADOPTED HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN, NATURAL COMMUNITY CONSERVATION PLAN, OR OTHER APPROVED LOCAL, REGIONAL, OR STATE HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN?				X
٧.	CULTURAL RESOURCES				
a.	CAUSE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE CHANGE IN SIGNIFICANCE OF A HISTORICAL RESOURCE AS DEFINED IN STATE CEQA SECTION 15064.5?				$\boxtimes$
b.	CAUSE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE CHANGE IN SIGNIFICANCE OF AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE PURSUANT TO STATE CEQA SECTION 15064.5?			X	
с.	DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY DESTROY A UNIQUE PALEONTOLOGICAL			X	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	RESOURCE OR SITE OR UNIQUE GEOLOGIC FEATURE?				
d.	DISTURB ANY HUMAN REMAINS, INCLUDING THOSE INTERRED OUTSIDE OF FORMAL CEMETERIES?			X	
e.	CAUSE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE CHANGE IN THE SIGNIFICANCE OF A SITE, FEATURE, PLACE, CULTURAL LANDSCAPE, SACRED PLACE, OR OBJECT WITH CULTURAL VALUE TO A CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBE THAT IS LISTED OR DETERMINED ELIGIBLE FOR LISTING ON THE CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES, LISTED ON A LOCAL HISTORICAL REGISTER, OR OTHERWISE DETERMINED BY THE LEAD AGENCY TO BE A TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCE?			X	
VI.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
	EXPOSURE OF PEOPLE OR STRUCTURES TO POTENTIAL SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS, INCLUDING THE RISK OF LOSS, INJURY OR DEATH INVOLVING:				
a.	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.			X	
b.	STRONG SEISMIC GROUND SHAKING?			X	
с.	SEISMIC-RELATED GROUND FAILURE, INCLUDING LIQUEFACTION?			X	
d.	LANDSLIDES?				X
e.	RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL SOIL EROSION OR THE LOSS OF TOPSOIL?		$\boxtimes$		
f.	BE LOCATED ON A GEOLOGIC UNIT OR SOIL THAT IS UNSTABLE, OR THAT WOULD BECOME UNSTABLE AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT, AND POTENTIAL RESULT IN ON- OR OFF-SITE LANDSLIDE, LATERAL SPREADING, SUBSIDENCE, LIQUEFACTION, OR COLLAPSE?			X	
g.	BE LOCATED ON EXPANSIVE SOIL, AS DEFINED IN TABLE 18-1-B OF THE UNIFORM BUILDING CODE (1994), CREATING SUBSTANTIAL RISKS TO LIFE OR PROPERTY?			X	
h.	HAVE SOILS INCAPABLE OF ADEQUATELY SUPPORTING THE USE OF SEPTIC TANKS OR ALTERNATIVE WASTE WATER DISPOSAL SYSTEMS WHERE SEWERS ARE NOT AVAILABLE FOR THE DISPOSAL OF WASTE WATER?				X
VII.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				
a.	GENERATE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, THAT MAY HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT?			X	
b.	CONFLICT WITH AN APPLICABLE PLAN, POLICY OR REGULATION ADOPTED FOR THE PURPOSE OF REDUCING THE EMISSIONS OF GREENHOUSE GASES?			X	
VIII.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS		•		
a.	CREATE A SIGNIFICANT HAZARD TO THE PUBLIC OR THE ENVIRONMENT THROUGH THE ROUTINE TRANSPORT, USE, OR DISPOSAL OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			X	
b.	CREATE A SIGNIFICANT HAZARD TO THE PUBLIC OR THE ENVIRONMENT THROUGH REASONABLY FORESEEABLE UPSET AND ACCIDENT CONDITIONS INVOLVING THE RELEASE OF HAZARDOUS			X	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	MATERIALS INTO THE ENVIRONMENT?				
с.	EMIT HAZARDOUS EMISSIONS OR HANDLE HAZARDOUS OR ACUTELY HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, SUBSTANCES, OR WASTE WITHIN ONE-QUARTER MILE OF AN EXISTING OR PROPOSED SCHOOL?		X		
d.	BE LOCATED ON A SITE WHICH IS INCLUDED ON A LIST OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SITES COMPILED PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65962.5 AND, AS A RESULT, WOULD IT CREATE A SIGNIFICANT HAZARD TO THE PUBLIC OR THE ENVIRONMENT?			X	
e.	FOR A PROJECT LOCATED WITHIN AN AIRPORT LAND USE PLAN OR, WHERE SUCH A PLAN HAS NOT BEEN ADOPTED, WITHIN TWO MILES OF A PUBLIC AIRPORT OR PUBLIC USE AIRPORT, WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN A SAFETY HAZARD FOR PEOPLE RESIDING OR WORKING IN THE PROJECT AREA?				X
f.	FOR A PROJECT WITHIN THE VICINITY OF A PRIVATE AIRSTRIP, WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN A SAFETY HAZARD FOR THE PEOPLE RESIDING OR WORKING IN THE AREA?				X
g.	IMPAIR IMPLEMENTATION OF OR PHYSICALLY INTERFERE WITH AN ADOPTED EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN OR EMERGENCY EVACUATION PLAN?			X	
h.	EXPOSE PEOPLE OR STRUCTURES TO A SIGNIFICANT RISK OF LOSS, INJURY OR DEATH INVOLVING WILDLAND FIRES, INCLUDING WHERE WILDLANDS ARE ADJACENT TO URBANIZED AREAS OR WHERE RESIDENCES ARE INTERMIXED WITH WILDLANDS?				X
IX.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY				
a.	VIOLATE ANY WATER QUALITY STANDARDS OR WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS?			X	
b.	SUBSTANTIALLY DEPLETE GROUNDWATER SUPPLIES OR INTERFERE WITH GROUNDWATER RECHARGE SUCH THAT THERE WOULD BE A NET DEFICIT IN AQUIFER VOLUME OR A LOWERING OF THE LOCAL GROUNDWATER TABLE LEVEL (E.G., THE PRODUCTION RATE OF PRE- EXISTING NEARBY WELLS WOULD DROP TO A LEVEL WHICH WOULD NOT SUPPORT EXISTING LAND USES OR PLANNED LAND USES FOR WHICH PERMITS HAVE BEEN GRANTED)?				X
c.	SUBSTANTIALLY ALTER THE EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERN OF THE SITE OR AREA, INCLUDING THROUGH THE ALTERATION OF THE COURSE OF A STREAM OR RIVER, IN A MANNER WHICH WOULD RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL EROSION OR SILTATION ON- OR OFF-SITE?				X
d.	SUBSTANTIALLY ALTER THE EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERN OF THE SITE OR AREA, INCLUDING THROUGH THE ALTERATION OF THE COURSE OF A STREAM OR RIVER, OR SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE THE RATE OR AMOUNT OF SURFACE RUNOFF IN AN MANNER WHICH WOULD RESULT IN FLOODING ON- OR OFF SITE?				X
e.	CREATE OR CONTRIBUTE RUNOFF WATER WHICH WOULD EXCEED THE CAPACITY OF EXISTING OR PLANNED STORMWATER DRAINAGE SYSTEMS OR PROVIDE SUBSTANTIAL ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF POLLUTED RUNOFF?			X	
f.	OTHERWISE SUBSTANTIALLY DEGRADE WATER QUALITY?				$\boxtimes$
g.	PLACE HOUSING WITHIN A 100-YEAR FLOOD PLAIN AS MAPPED ON FEDERAL FLOOD HAZARD BOUNDARY OR FLOOD INSURANCE RATE				X

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

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	DIRECTLY (FOR EXAMPLE, BY PROPOSING NEW HOMES AND BUSINESSES) OR INDIRECTLY (FOR EXAMPLE, THROUGH EXTENSION OF ROADS OR OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE)?				
b.	DISPLACE SUBSTANTIAL NUMBERS OF EXISTING HOUSING NECESSITATING THE CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT HOUSING ELSEWHERE?				X
C.	DISPLACE SUBSTANTIAL NUMBERS OF PEOPLE NECESSITATING THE CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT HOUSING ELSEWHERE?				X
XIV.	PUBLIC SERVICES				
a.	WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE PHYSICAL IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROVISION OF NEW OR PHYSICALLY ALTERED GOVERNMENT 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 OBJECTIVE FOR FIRE PROTECTION?				
b.	POLICE PROTECTION?		X		
с.	SCHOOLS?			$\boxtimes$	
d.	PARKS?			X	
e.	OTHER PUBLIC FACILITIES?			X	
xv.	RECREATION				
a.	WOULD THE PROJECT INCREASE THE USE OF EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD AND REGIONAL PARKS OR OTHER RECREATIONAL FACILITIES SUCH THAT SUBSTANTIAL PHYSICAL DETERIORATION OF THE FACILITY WOULD OCCUR OR BE ACCELERATED?			X	
b.	DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES OR REQUIRE THE CONSTRUCTION OR EXPANSION OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES WHICH MIGHT HAVE AN ADVERSE PHYSICAL EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT?			X	
XVI.	TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION		1		
a.	CONFLICT WITH AN APPLICABLE PLAN, ORDINANCE OR POLICY ESTABLISHING MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF THE CIRCULATION SYSTEM, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT ALL MODES OF TRANSPORTATION INCLUDING MASS TRANSIT AND NON-MOTORIZED TRAVEL AND RELEVANT COMPONENTS OF THE CIRCULATION SYSTEM, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO INTERSECTIONS, STREETS, HIGHWAYS AND FREEWAYS, PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE PATHS AND MASS TRANSIT?				
b.	CONFLICT WITH AN APPLICABLE CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS AND TRAVEL DEMAND MEASURES, OR OTHER STANDARDS ESTABLISHED BY THE COUNTY CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AGENCY FOR DESIGNATED ROADS OR HIGHWAYS?				X
C.	RESULT IN A CHANGE IN AIR TRAFFIC PATTERNS, INCLUDING EITHER AN INCREASE IN TRAFFIC LEVELS OR A CHANGE IN LOCATION THAT RESULTS IN SUBSTANTIAL SAFETY RISKS?				X

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d.	SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE HAZARDS TO A DESIGN FEATURE (E.G., SHARP CURVES OR DANGEROUS INTERSECTIONS) OR INCOMPATIBLE USES (E.G., FARM EQUIPMENT)?		X		
e.	RESULT IN INADEQUATE EMERGENCY ACCESS?			X	
f.	CONFLICT WITH ADOPTED POLICIES, PLANS OR PROGRAMS REGARDING PUBLIC TRANSIT, BICYCLE, OR PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES, OR OTHERWISE DECREASE THE PERFORMANCE OR SAFETY OF SUCH FACILITIES?				X
XVII.	UTILITIES				
a.	EXCEED WASTEWATER TREATMENT REQUIREMENTS OF THE APPLICABLE REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD?			$\boxtimes$	
b.	REQUIRE OR RESULT IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW WATER OR WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES OR EXPANSION OF EXISTING FACILITIES, THE CONSTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS?			X	
c.	REQUIRE OR RESULT IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW STORMWATER DRAINAGE FACILITIES OR EXPANSION OF EXISTING FACILITIES, THE CONSTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS?				X
d.	HAVE SUFFICIENT WATER SUPPLIES AVAILABLE TO SERVE THE PROJECT FROM EXISTING ENTITLEMENTS AND RESOURCE, OR ARE NEW OR EXPANDED ENTITLEMENTS NEEDED?			X	
e.	RESULT IN A DETERMINATION BY THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PROVIDER WHICH SERVES OR MAY SERVE THE PROJECT THAT IT HAS ADEQUATE CAPACITY TO SERVE THE PROJECT'S PROJECTED DEMAND IN ADDITION TO THE PROVIDER'S EXISTING COMMITMENTS?			X	
f.	BE SERVED BY A LANDFILL WITH SUFFICIENT PERMITTED CAPACITY TO ACCOMMODATE THE PROJECT'S SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL NEEDS?			X	
g.	COMPLY WITH FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL STATUTES AND REGULATIONS RELATED TO SOLID WASTE?			X	
XVIII	. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a.	DOES THE PROJECT HAVE THE POTENTIAL TO DEGRADE THE QUALITY OF THE ENVIRONMENT, SUBSTANTIALLY REDUCE THE HABITAT OF FISH OR WILDLIFE SPECIES, CAUSE A FISH OR WILDLIFE POPULATION TO DROP BELOW SELF-SUSTAINING LEVELS, THREATEN TO ELIMINATE A PLANT OR ANIMAL COMMUNITY, REDUCE THE NUMBER OR RESTRICT THE RANGE OF A RARE OR ENDANGERED PLANT OR ANIMAL OR ELIMINATE IMPORTANT EXAMPLES OF THE MAJOR PERIODS OF CALIFORNIA HISTORY OR PREHISTORY?				
b.	DOES THE PROJECT HAVE IMPACTS WHICH ARE INDIVIDUALLY LIMITED, BUT CUMULATIVELY CONSIDERABLE? ("CUMULATIVELY CONSIDERABLE" MEANS THAT THE INCREMENTAL EFFECTS OF AN INDIVIDUAL PROJECT ARE CONSIDERABLE WHEN VIEWED IN CONNECTION WITH THE EFFECTS OF PAST PROJECTS, THE EFFECTS OF OTHER CURRENT PROJECTS, AND THE EFFECTS OF PROBABLE FUTURE PROJECTS).			X	
c.	DOES THE PROJECT HAVE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH CAUSE SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS ON HUMAN BEINGS, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY?		X		

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

The Environmental Impact Assessment includes the use of official City of Los Angeles and other government source reference materials related to various environmental impact categories (e.g., Hydrology, Air Quality, Biology, Cultural Resources, etc.). The State of California, Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology – Seismic Hazard Maps and reports, are used to identify potential future significant seismic events; including probable magnitudes, liquefaction, and landslide hazards. Based on Applicant information provided in the Master Land Use Application and Environmental Assessment Form, impact evaluations were based on stated facts contained therein, including but not limited to, reference materials indicated above, field investigation of the project site, and other reliable reference materials known at the time.

Project specific impacts were evaluated based on all relevant facts indicated in the Environmental Assessment Form and expressed through the Applicant's project description and supportive materials. Both the Initial Study Checklist and Checklist Explanations, in conjunction with the City of Los Angeles's Adopted Thresholds Guide and CEQA Guidelines, were used to reach reasonable conclusions on environmental impacts as mandated under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The project as identified in the project description may cause potentially significant impacts on the environment without mitigation. Therefore, this environmental analysis concludes that a Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be issued to avoid and mitigate all potential adverse impacts on the environment by the imposition of mitigation measures and/or conditions contained and expressed in this document; the environmental case file known as **ENV-2016-1418-MND** and the associated case(s), **CPC-2016-1417-DB**. Finally, based on the fact that these impacts can be feasibly mitigated to less than significant, and based on the findings and thresholds for Mandatory Findings of Significance as described in the California Environmental Quality Act, section 15065, the overall project impacts(s) on the environment (after mitigation) <u>will not</u>:

- Substantially degrade environmental quality.
- Substantially reduce fish or wildlife habitat.
- Cause a fish or wildlife habitat to drop below self sustaining levels.
- Threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community.
- Reduce number, or restrict range of a rare, threatened, or endangered species.
- Eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory.
- Achieve short-term goals to the disadvantage of long-term goals.
- Result in environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable.
- Result in environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

#### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

All supporting documents and references are contained in the Environmental Case File referenced above and may be viewed in the EIR Unit, Room 763, City Hall.

For City information, addresses, and phone numbers: visit the City's website at http://www.lacity.org; City Planning- and Zoning Information Mapping Automated System (ZIMAS) cityplanning.lacity.org/ or EIR Unit, City Hall, 200 N Spring Street, Room 763. Seismic Hazard Maps – http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/ Engineering/Infrastructure/Topographic Maps/Parcel Information – http://boemaps.eng.ci.la.ca.us/index0.1htm or City's main website under the heading "Navigate LA."

PREPARED BY:	TITLE:	TELEPHONE NO.:	DATE:
Parker Environmental Consultants		(661) 257-2282	August 18, 2016

## APPENDIX A: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS EXPLANATION TABLE

	Impact	Explanation	Mitigation Measures		
I. A	I. AESTHETICS				
a.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
b.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
с.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
d.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
II. A	AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES	·			
a.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
b.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
с.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
d.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
e.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
III. /	AIR QUALITY				
a.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
b.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
с.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
d.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
e.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
a.	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	MM-BIO-1		
b.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
с.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
d.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
e.	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	MM-BIO-2		
f.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
V. 0	CULTURAL RESOURCES				
a.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
b.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
с.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
d.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
e.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
VI.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
a.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
b.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
с.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
d.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
e.	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	MM-GEO-1		
f.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
g.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
h.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
VII.	VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				

	Impact	Explanation	Mitigation Measures		
a.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
b.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
VIII	. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				
a.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
b.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
c.	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	MM-HAZ-1, MM-HAZ-2		
d.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
e.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
f.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
g.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
h.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
IX.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY				
a.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
b.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
с.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
d.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
e.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
f.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
g.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
h.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
i.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
j.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
<b>X</b> .	LAND USE AND PLANNING				
a.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
b.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
с.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
XI.	MINERAL RESOURCES				
a.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
b.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
XII.	NOISE				
a.	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	MM-NOISE-1, MM-NOISE-2		
b.	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	MM-NOISE-1		
c.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required		
d.	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	MMNOISE-1, MM-NOISE-2		
e.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
f.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
XIII	. POPULATION AND HOUSING				
a.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
b.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
с.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.		
XIV	XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES				

	Impact	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
а	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	MM-PS-1
b	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	MM-PS-2, MM-PS-3
с.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.
d.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.
e.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.
XV.	RECREATION		
a.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.
b.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.
XVI.	TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION		
a.	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	MM-TR-1
b.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.
с.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.
d.	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	MM-TR-2
e.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.
f.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.
XVI	I. UTILITIES		
a.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.
b.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.
с.	No Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.
d.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.
e.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.
f.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.
g.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE			
a.	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	MM-BIO-1
b.	Less Than Significant Impact.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	No mitigation measures are required.
c.	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.	See attached expanded IS/MND analysis.	See Mitigation Measures listed below.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

#### I. AESTHETICS

No mitigation measures are required.

#### II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

No mitigation measures are required.

#### III. AIR QUALITY

No mitigation measures are required.

#### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

#### MM-BIO-1 Habitat Modification (Nesting Native Birds, Non-Hillside or Urban Areas)

- Proposed project activities (including disturbances to native and non-native vegetation, structures and substrates) should take place outside of the breeding bird season which generally runs from March 1- August 31 (as early as February 1 for raptors) to avoid take (including disturbances which would cause abandonment of active nests containing eggs and/or young). Take means to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture of kill (Fish and Game Code Section 86).
- If project activities cannot feasibly avoid the breeding bird season, beginning thirty days prior to the disturbance of suitable nesting habitat, the applicant shall:
  - a) Arrange for weekly bird surveys to detect any protected native birds in the habitat to be removed and any other such habitat within properties adjacent to the project site, as access to adjacent areas allows. The surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist with experience in conducting breeding bird surveys. The surveys shall continue on a weekly basis with the last survey being conducted no more than 3 days prior to the initiation of clearance/construction work.
  - b) If a protected native bird nest is found, the applicant shall delay all clearance/construction disturbance activities within 300 feet of suitable nesting habitat for the observed protected bird species until August 31.
  - c) Alternatively, the Qualified Biologist could continue the surveys in order to locate any nests. If an active nest is located, clearing and construction within 300 feet of the nest or as determined by a qualified biological monitor, shall be postponed until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged and when there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. The buffer zone from the nest shall be established in the field with flagging and stakes. Construction personnel shall be instructed on the sensitivity of the area.
  - d) The applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures described above to document compliance with applicable State and Federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds. Such record shall be submitted and received into the case file for the associated discretionary action permitting the Project.

## MM-BIO-2 Tree Removal (Non-Protected Trees)

- Prior to the issuance of any permit, a plot plan shall be prepared indicating the location, size, type, and general condition of all existing trees on the site and within the adjacent public right(s)-of-way.
- All significant (8-inch or greater trunk diameter, or cumulative trunk diameter if multi-trunked, as measured 54 inches above the ground) non-protected trees on the site proposed for removal shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio with a minimum 24-inch box tree. Net, new trees, located within the parkway of the adjacent public right(s)of-way, may be counted toward replacement tree requirements.
- Removal or planting of any tree in the public right-of-way requires approval of the Board of Public Works. Contact Urban Forestry Division at: 213-847-3077. All trees in the public right-of-way shall be provided per the current standards of the Urban Forestry Division the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Street Services.

## V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

No mitigation measures are required.

### VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

No mitigation measures are required.

#### VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

No mitigation measures are required.

#### VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

#### MM-HAZ-1 Construction Activity Near Schools

- The Applicant and contractors shall maintain ongoing contact with administrator of University High School. The administrative offices shall be contacted when demolition, grading and construction activity begin on the project site so that students and their parents will know when such activities are to occur. The developer shall obtain school walk and bus routes to the schools from either the administrators or from the LAUSD's Transportation Branch (323)342-1400 and guarantee that safe and convenient pedestrian and bus routes to the school be maintained.
- The Applicant shall install appropriate traffic signs around the site to ensure pedestrian and vehicle safety.
- There shall be no staging or parking of construction vehicles, including vehicles to transport workers on any of the streets adjacent to the school.

#### MM-HAZ-2 Schools affected by Haul Route

• Haul route scheduling shall be sequenced to minimize conflicts with pedestrians, school buses and cars at the arrival and dismissal times of the school day. Haul route trucks shall not be routed past the school during periods when school is in session especially when students are arriving or departing from the campus.

#### IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

No mitigation measures are required.

#### X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

No mitigation measures are required.

#### XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

No mitigation measures are required.

#### XII. NOISE

#### MM-NOISE-1 Increased Noise Levels (Demolition, Grading, and Construction Activities)

- Construction and demolition shall be restricted to the hours of 7:00 am to 6:00 pm Monday through Friday, and 8:00 am to 6:00 pm on Saturday.
- To the maximum extent practical, demolition and construction activities shall be scheduled so as to avoid operating several pieces of equipment simultaneously, which causes high noise levels.
- The project contractor shall use power construction equipment with technically feasible noise shielding and muffling devices.
- The project contractor shall install a temporary noise barrier around the perimeter of the Project Site throughout the duration of the construction period.
- No construction vehicles shall be allowed to utilize any traffic routes to or from the Project Site on Barrington Avenue, north of Ohio Avenue.

#### MM-NOISE-2 Increased Noise Levels (Mixed-Use Development)

• Wall and floor-ceiling assemblies separating commercial tenant spaces, residential units, and public places, shall have a Sound Transmission Coefficient (STC) value of at least 50, as determined in accordance with ASTM E90 and ASTM E413.

#### XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

No mitigation measures are required.

#### XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

#### MM-PS-1 (Fire)

The recommendations of the Fire Department relative to fire safety shall be incorporated into the building plans, which includes the submittal of a plot plan for approval by the Fire Department either prior to the recordation of a final map or the approval of a building permit. The plot plan shall include the following minimum design features: fire lanes, where required, shall be a minimum of 20 feet in width; all structures must be within 300 feet of an approved fire hydrant, and entrances to any dwelling units or guest room shall not be more

than 150 feet in distance in horizontal travel from the edge of the roadway of an improved street or approved fire lane.

#### MM-PS-2 (Police)

The plans shall incorporate the Design Guidelines (defined in the following sentence) relative to security, semi-public and private spaces, which may include but not be limited to access control to building, secured parking facilities, walls/fences with key systems, wellilluminated public and semi-public space designed with a minimum of dead space to eliminate areas of concealment, location of toilet facilities or building entrances in high-foot traffic areas, and provision of security guard patrol throughout the project site if needed. Please refer to "Design Out Crime Guidelines: Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design", published by the Los Angeles Police Department. Contact the Community Relations Division, located at 100 W. 1st Street, #250, Los Angeles, CA 90012; (213) 486-6000. These measures shall be approved by the Police Department prior to the issuance of building permits.

#### MM-PS-3 Public Services (Police – Demolition/Construction Sites)

Temporary construction fencing shall be placed along the periphery of the active construction areas to screen as much of the construction activity from view at the local street level and to keep unpermitted persons from entering the construction area.

#### XV. RECREATION

No mitigation measures are required.

#### XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

#### MM-TR-1 Construction Management Plan

A Construction work site traffic control plan shall be submitted to DOT for review and approval in accordance with the LAMC prior to the start of any construction work. The plans shall show the location of any roadway or sidewalk closures, traffic detours, haul routes, hours of operation, protective devices, warning signs and access to abutting properties, and if applicable, the location of off-site staging areas for haul trucks and construction vehicles. All construction related traffic shall be restricted to off-peak hours.

#### MM-TR-2 Transportation (Safety Hazards)

- The developer shall install appropriate traffic signs around the site to ensure pedestrian and vehicle safety.
- The applicant shall submit a parking and driveway plan that incorporates design features that reduce accidents, to the Bureau of Engineering and the Department of Transportation for approval.

#### XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

No mitigation measures are required.

### **CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

As discussed in the expanded Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND), attached, there may be environmental impacts which are individually limited, but significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current project, and probably future projects. However, the Proposed Project's contribution to those cumulative impacts will be reduced to a less than cumulatively considerable level through compliance with the above mitigation measures. Thus, the Proposed Project's cumulative impacts will be less than significant.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Mitigated Negative Declaration Form/CEQA Initial Study Checklist (front insert).	IS-1
I.	INTRODUCTION	I-1
II.	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	II-1
	A. PROJECT LOCATION	II-1
	B. PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS	II-9
	C. ENTITLEMENT REQUESTS	II-37
III.	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS	III-1
	I. AESTHETICS	III-1
	II. AGRICULTURE	III-8
	III. AIR QUALITY	III-9
	IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	III-19
	V. CULTURAL RESOURCES	III-23
	VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	III-28
	VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	III-34
	VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	III-47
	IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	III-59
	X. LAND USE AND PLANNING	III-65
	XI. MINERAL RESOURCES	III-71
	XII. NOISE	III-72
	XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING	III-88
	XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES	III-90
	XV. RECREATION	III-101
	XVI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION	III-103
	XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	III-108
	XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	III-119
IV.	PREPARERS OF THE INITIAL STUDY AND PERSONS CONSULTED	IV-1
V.	REFERENCES, ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	V-1

# List of Figures

Figure II-1: Project Location Map	II-2
Figure II-2: Zoning and General Plan Land Use Designation Map	II-4
Figure II-3: Aerial Photograph of the Project Site	II-5
Figure II-4: Photographs of the Project Site	II-6
Figure II-5: Photographs of Surrounding Land Uses	II-8
Figure II-6: Site Plan	II-10
Figure II-7: Underground Automatic Parking - Rack 1	II-11
Figure II-8: Underground Automatic Parking – Rack 2	II-12
Figure II-9: Ground Level Floor Plan	II-13
Figure II-10: Mezzanine Level Floor Plan	II-14
Figure II-11: Second Level Floor Plan	II-15
Figure II-12: Third Level Floor Plan	II-16
Figure II-13: Fourth Level Floor Plan	II-17
Figure II-14: Fifth Level Floor Plan	II-18
Figure II-15: Roof Plan	II-19
Figure II-16: South Elevation	II-20
Figure II-17: North Elevation	II-21
Figure II-18: East Elevation	II-22
Figure II-19: West Elevation	II-23
Figure II-20: North/South Section A	II-24
Figure II-21: East/West Section B	II-25
Figure II-22: North/South Section C	II-26
Figure II-23: Landscape Concept Plan – Ground Level	II-29
Figure II-24: Landscape Concept Plan – Levels 2 through 4	II-30
Figure II-25: Landscape Concept Plan – Level 5 and Roof Terrace	II-31

Figure III-1.	Noise Monitoring a	nd Sensitive Recer	ntor Location Ma	n III-76
I iguic ill-1.	i voise ivionitoring a	nu bensni ve Recep		μ

# List of Tables

Table II-1: Description of Project Site	II-1
Table II-2: Proposed Development Program	II-9
Table II-3: Open Space / Landscape Summary	II-28
Table II-4: Proposed Parking Summary	II-32
Table III-1: Estimated Peak Daily Construction Emissions	III-12
Table III-2    Existing Daily Operational Emissions	III-14
Table III-3 Estimated Daily Operational Emissions	III-15
Table III-4 Localized On-Site Peak Daily Construction Emissions	III-17
Table III-5: Climate Change Scoping Plan 2020 Emissions Target	III-36
Table III-6: Proposed Project Construction-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions	III-41
Table III-7: Existing Ambient Daytime Noise Levels in Project Site Vicinity	III-41
Table III-8: Proposed Project Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions	III-43
Table III-9: Consistency with Applicable AB 32 Scoping Plan Measures	III-44
Table III-10: Existing Ambient Daytime Noise Levels in Project Site Vicinity	III-75
Table III-11: Typical Outdoor Construction Noise Levels	III-78
Table III-12: Vibration Damage Potential Threshold Criteria	III-82
Table III-13: Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment	III-83
Table III-14: Project Vibration Impacts on Adjacent Structures	III-83
Table III-15: Community Noise Exposure (CNEL)	III-86
Table III-16: SCAG Population and Housing Projections	III-88
Table III-17: West Los Angeles Area Crime Statistics	III-94
Table III-18: Resident Schools Serving the Project Site	III-96
Table III-19: Proposed Project Estimated Student Generation	III-96
Table III-20: Recreation and Park Facilities Within the Project Area	III-98
Table III-21: Traffic Generation Rates	III-104
Table III-22: Project Trip Generation	III-104

Table III-23: Proposed Project Estimated Water Demand	III-110
Table III-24: Proposed Project Estimated Wastewater Generation	III-111
Table III-25: Estimated Construction and Demolition Debris	III-116
Table III-26: Expected Operational Solid Waste Generation	III-117

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A: AIR QUALITY MODELING WORKSHEETS

## APPENDIX B: TREE SURVEY

## APPENDIX C: HISTORIC ASSESSMENT

- C.1: PCR Services Corporation, <u>Preliminary Historic Resources Assessment For</u> <u>11701-11715 Santa Monica Boulevard and 1511 Barrington Avenue, Los</u> <u>Angeles, California 90025</u>, Dated March 17, 2016.
- C.2: South Central Coastal Information Center, Records Search, dated January 27, 2016.

## APPENDIX D: GEOTECHNICAL REPORT

- D.1: SASSAN Geosciences, Inc., <u>Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering</u> <u>Investigation</u>, for 11701, 11711, 11715 Santa Monica Boulevard 1511 <u>Barrington Avenue Los Angeles</u>, dated October 21, 2015.
- **D.2:** City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety, Soil Report Approval Letter, dated December 8, 2015.

## APPENDIX E: GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS WORKSHEETS

## APPENDIX F: ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT

- **F.1:** iRealty Inspection Services, LLC, <u>Phase I Environmental Site Assessment</u> <u>Report for the Single-Story Retail Building, 11701 Santa Monica Boulevard,</u> <u>Los Angeles, California 90025</u>, dated April 29, 2011.
- F.2: Quinn Environmental Strategies, Inc., <u>Report of Findings of Screening-Level</u> <u>Phase II Subsurface Investigation, Single-Story Retail Building, 11701 Santa</u> <u>Monica Boulevard, Los Angeles, California, dated May 24, 2011.</u>

- F.3: Quinn Environmental Strategies, Inc., <u>Report of Findings of Screening-Level</u> <u>Phase II Subsurface Investigation, Single-Story Retail Building, 11715 Santa</u> <u>Monica Boulevard, Los Angeles, California, dated May 25, 2011.</u>
- F.4: Quinn Environmental Strategies, Inc., <u>Phase I Environmental Site Assessment</u> <u>Report, 1511 S. Barrington Ave. and 11711 Santa Monica Blvd., Los Angeles,</u> <u>California 90025</u>, dated May 30, 2014.
- F.5: Quinn Environmental Strategies, Inc., <u>Report of Findings, Phase II</u> <u>Environmental Investigation, 11711 Santa Monica Boulevard and 1511</u> <u>Barrington Avenue, Los Angeles, California, dated May 30, 2014.</u>

## APPENDIX G: NOISE MONITORING DATA

## APPENDIX H: TRAFFIC MEMORANDUM

- H.1 Crain and Associates, <u>Markwood Enterprises Mixed-Use Project Trip Generation</u> <u>Assessment NW Corner of Santa Monica Boulevard and Barrington Avenue,</u> <u>City of Los Angeles</u>, dated February 23, 2016.
- H.2 LADOT written correspondence, dated March 21, 2016.
- H.3 LADOT Referral Form, Traffic Assessment Study, dated July 8, 2016.

This page intentionally left blank

# **PROJECT INFORMATION**

Project Title:	11071 Santa Monica Boulevard Project
Project Location:	11701-11715 W. Santa Monica Boulevard; 1511 S. Barrington Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90025
Project Applicant:	Markwood Enterprises, Inc. 8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 336 Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Lead Agency:	City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning 200 N. Spring Street, Room 721 Los Angeles, CA 90012
<b>PROJECT SUMM</b>	IARY

Markwood Enterprises, Inc. (the "Applicant") proposes the demolition of the existing commercial and automotive repair buildings on the Project Site and the construction of a 53-unit mixed-use apartment building, which would include six joint Live/Work units and 1,500 square feet of ground floor retail space ("Proposed Project"). A minimum of five units (11% of the base density) would be designated as "Very Low Income" restricted affordable units. The Proposed Project would be five stories high (approximately 56 feet above grade) and would include one subterranean level of fully automated parking with two racks. The Proposed Project's total floor area would consist of 45,429 square feet for a 3 to 1 Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The Proposed Project would satisfy the minimum open space requirements of the LAMC by providing 5,600 square feet of open space. The Proposed Project would meet the minimum LAMC code requirements for on-site parking by providing 80 parking stalls in the automated subterranean parking garage. Access to the automated parking garage would be from the adjacent alley. Additionally, the Proposed Project would provide 7 short-term and 55 long-term bicycle parking spaces for a total of 62 bicycle parking spaces.

The Applicant is requesting that the following entitlements be granted by the City of Los Angeles as the designated lead agency: Pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code ("LAMC") Section 12.22.A.25, the Applicant proposes to set aside 11% of the total units as Very Low Income restricted affordable housing and requests a Density Bonus of 35%. Additionally, the Applicant requests the following: (1) Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22.A.25(f)(4)(ii), an "on-menu" incentive to increase the Floor Area Ratio to 3:1 in lieu of the otherwise permitted 1.5:1 Floor Area Ratio and; (2) Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22.A.25(g)(3), an off-menu incentive to permit a building height of five stories and 56 feet in lieu of the otherwise permitted three stories and 45 feet pursuant to LAMC Section 12.21.1.A.1. In addition, the Applicant proposes to provide automobile parking spaces in accordance with LAMC Section 12.22

A.25(d)(1): Parking Option 1 to calculate automobile parking at one space per one-bedroom unit and 2 spaces per two-bedroom and three-bedroom units. Pursuant to various sections of the LAMC, the Applicant will request the following administrative approvals and permits from the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety and other municipal agencies for project construction actions, including but not limited to the following: demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, building, tenant improvements and a haul route environmental review for the hauling of approximately 11,217 cubic yards of soil export.

## ORGANIZATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY

This Draft IS/MND is organized into seven sections as follows:

**Mitigated Negative Declaration Form:** The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is provided at the beginning of this document. The MND contains the City's environmental findings that all of the Project's potential environmental impacts will be reduced to a level of less than significance with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

**Initial Study Checklist:** This Section contains the completed IS Checklist showing the significance level under each environmental impact category.

**Introduction:** This Section provides introductory information such as the Proposed Project title, the Project Applicant, and the lead agency for the Proposed Project.

**Project Description:** This Section provides a detailed description of the Proposed Project including the environmental setting, project characteristics, related project information, and environmental clearance requirements.

**Environmental Impact Analysis:** This Section contains an assessment and discussion of impacts for each environmental issue identified in the Initial Study Checklist. Where the evaluation identifies potentially significant effects, mitigation measures are provided to reduce such impacts to less-than-significant levels.

**Preparers of the Initial Study and Persons Consulted:** This Section provides a list of consultant team members and governmental agencies that participated in the preparation of the IS/MND.

**References, Acronyms and Abbreviations:** This Section includes various documents and information used and referenced during the preparation of the IS, along with a list of commonly used acronyms.

This expanded IS/MND is a preliminary analysis prepared by and for the City of Los Angeles as Lead Agency to determine whether an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or a Negative Declaration (ND) or MND must be prepared for a proposed project. An MND is prepared for a project when the initial study has identified potentially significant effects on the environment, but (1) revisions in the project plans or proposals made by, or agreed to by, the applicant before the proposed negative declaration and initial study are released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where

clearly no significant effect on the environment would occur, and (2) there is no substantial evidence in light of the whole record before the public agency that the project, as revised, may have a significant effect on the environment.

Implementation of the Proposed Project could cause some potentially significant impacts on the environment, but as shown in the environmental analysis contained in this IS/MND, all of the Project's potentially significant impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels through the implementation of mitigation measures. Consequently, the analysis contained herein concludes that an MND shall be prepared for the Proposed Project.

# II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION A. PROJECT LOCATION

## **PROJECT LOCATION**

The Project Site is bounded by W. Santa Monica Boulevard to the south, S. Barrington Avenue to the east, an alleyway to the west and residential uses to the north. The Project Site's address is 11701-11715 W. Santa Monica Boulevard and 1511 S. Barrington Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90025. As shown in Figure II-1, Regional and Project Vicinity Map, the Project Site is located in the West Los Angeles Community Planning area of the City of Los Angeles. The Project Site is a rectangular-shaped corner lot comprised of six lots that encompass approximately 15,143 square feet of lot area (i.e., 0.35 acres). As shown in Table II-1, below, the Project Site is identified by County of Los Angeles Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) 4262-003-007 through 462-003-011.

APN	Address	Lot Size	Current Use
4262-003-007	1511 S. Barrington Avenue	5,833.9	Single-story auto repair shop
4262-003-008	11715 W. Santa Monica Boulevard	1,166.3	Single-story commercial building
4262-003-009	11715 ½ W. Santa Monica Boulevard	1,772	Single-story commercial building
4262-003-010	11711 W. Santa Monica Boulevard	1,424.5	Single-story auto repair shop
4262-003-011	No Address 11701 W. Santa Monica Boulevard	514.6 4,379.6	Single-story commercial building
ource: City of Los Angeles ZIMAS website: http://zimas.lacity.org/, accessed December 2015, and R&A Design, Inc., July 12, 016			

Table II-1Description of Project Site

## **Regional and Local Access**

Regional access to the Project Site is provided by the San Diego Freeway (I-405), located approximately 0.5 mile to the east and the Santa Monica Freeway (I-10), located approximately 1.1 miles to the south. The Santa Monica freeway runs in an east-west direction in relation to the Project Site, the San Diego freeway runs in a north-south direction in relation to the Project Site. Local access to the Project Site is provided by W. Santa Monica Boulevard, S. Barrington Avenue and Ohio Avenue. The City's Mobility Element of the General Plan classifies street designations in the project vicinity. W. Santa Monica Boulevard runs in relation to the Project Site and is designated as a Boulevard II. W. Santa Monica Boulevard provides three lanes of travel in each direction and on-street parking. S. Barrington Avenue run in a north-south direction in relation to the Project Site and is designated as an Avenue II. S. Barrington Avenue provides one lane of travel in each direction and allows for on street parking. Ohio Street runs in an east-west direction of the Project Site and is designated as a local street.



Ohio Street provides one lane of travel in each direction and allows for on street parking. Metro Local Bus Line 4 and Metro Rapid Bus Line 704 have stops directly in front of the Project Site and across the street to the south (at Santa Monica Boulevard and Barrington Avenue). Metro Local Bus Line 4 provides service from Downtown Los Angeles to Santa Monica, with stops through West Hollywood, Beverly Hills, Century City and West Los Angeles. Metro Rapid Service Line 704 stops at this location every 15 minutes or less, providing eastbound service to Downtown Los Angeles and westbound service to Santa Monica. Big Blue Bus (BBB) Route 1 also stops at this location (across the street) and 2 blocks to the east (at the corner of Santa Monica Boulevard and Federal Avenue) about once every 15 minutes or less, providing service from UCLA (through Downtown Santa Monica) to Venice Beach, with select trips to Marina Del Rey.

# ZONING AND LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

The Project Site is located within the West Los Angeles Community Plan Area and the West Los Angeles Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Specific Plan. As shown in Figure II-2, Zoning and General Plan Designations, the Project Site is zoned C2-1VL, which permits commercial and multi-family residential uses. Pursuant to the General Plan, the existing land use designation is General Commercial, which corresponds to the C2 zone. The Project Site is located within the C2 zone and Height District 1VL, which allows a maximum permitted floor area ratio ("FAR") to be 1.5 times the buildable area of the lot. In the C2 zone, the Height District 1VL limits projects with commercial uses to a maximum height of 45-feet and 3 stories. In addition, residential density in the C2 zone corresponds to the R4 zone (400 square feet per unit). The maximum permitted density for the Project Site according to C2 Zone regulations is 39 residential apartment units. As such, the applicant is requesting a 35% density bonus to achieve a total of 53 residential apartment units. The Project Site is also designated as a transit priority area per the Department of City Planning's Zoning Information File ZI No. 2452, Transit Priority Areas (TPAs) / Exemptions to Aesthetics and Parking within TPAs Pursuant to CEQA.<sup>1</sup>

## **EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The Project Site is currently occupied by three existing one-story commercial buildings and two one-story auto repair shops. The existing structures on site include approximately 2,404 square feet of retail space and approximately 2,522 square feet of auto repair uses.<sup>2</sup> As shown in the photographs depicting the current conditions of the Project Site (See Figure II-3 Aerial Photograph of the Project Site and II-4, Photographs of the Project Site), the Project Site is an infill development that is bordered by two improved roadways to the immediate south and east of the Project Site and residential buildings to the immediate north of the Project Site. Vegetation on the Project Site consists of shrubs and one tree (*Podocarpus gracilior*). There are no protected native tree species located on the Project Site.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, Zoning Information File, ZI No. 2452, Transit Priority Areas (TPAs) / Exemptions to Aesthetics and Parking within TPAs Pursuant to CEQA, website: http://zimas.lacity.org/documents/zoneinfo/ZI2452.pdf, accessed June 2016.

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Crain and Associates, Markwood Enterprises Mixed-Use Project Trip Generation Assessment NW Corner of Santa Monica Boulevard and Barrington Avenue, City of Los Angels, dated February 23, 2016. See Appendix H of this IS/MND.







Source: Google Earth, Aerial View, 2016



Figure II-3 Aerial Photograph of the Project Site



View 1: From the northeast corner of S. Barrington Avenue and Santa Monica Boulevard looking northwest at the Project Site.



View 3: From the south side of Santa Monica Boulevard looking northwest at the Project Site.



View 2: From the southeast corner of S. Barrington Avenue and Santa Monica Boulevard looking northwest.



View 4: From the south side of Santa Monica Boulevard looking northwest at the Project Site.



View 5: From the south side of Santa Monica Boulevard looking north at the Project Site.



View 6: From the alley way west of the Project Site looking south.

Source: Parker Environmental Consultants, 2015



Figure II-4 Photographs of the Project Site
## SURROUNDING LAND USES

Photographs of the land uses immediately surrounding the Project Site are provided in Figure II-5. As shown in Figure II-5, the Project Site is surrounded by multi-family residential uses, single-family residential uses and commercial uses.

Immediately north of the Project Site is a single-family residence fronting Barrington Avenue (See Figure II-5, View 8). Other properties to the north include a two-story multifamily residential building and three single-family residences fronting Ohio Avenue (See Figure II-5, View 8). Properties to the north are zoned R3-1 with a Medium Residential land use designation. To the east and northeast of the Project Site, across Barrington Avenue, is a one-story commercial building and two- and three-story multi family buildings (See Figure II-5, View 7). Properties to the east are zoned C2-1VL and R3-1 with Neighborhood Commercial and Medium Residential land use designations, respectively.

To the south of the Project Site, across Santa Monica Boulevard, are one-story commercial land uses (See Figure II-5, View 11 and 12). Properties to the south are zoned C2-1VL with a General Commercial land use designation. To the west of the Project Site are one-story commercial uses and a three-story multi-family building (See Figure II-5, View 9 and 10). Properties to the east are zoned C2-1VL and R3-1 with General Commercial and Medium Residential land use designations, respectively.



View 7: From the west side of S. Barrington Avenue looking southeast.



View 9: From the south side of Santa Monica Boulevard looking northwest.



View 8: From the northeast corner of S. Barrington Avenue and Ohio Avenue looking southwest.



View 10: From the alley way west of the Project Site looking north.



View 11: From the north side of Santa Monica Boulevard looking southeast.



View 12: From the north side of Santa Monica Boulevard looking southwest.

Source: Parker Environmental Consultants, 2016



# II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION B. PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

## 1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The Proposed Project includes the demolition of the existing buildings on the Project Site and the construction of a 53-unit mixed-use apartment building, including six joint Live/Work units, with a minimum of five units (11% of the base density) designated as "Very Low Income" restricted affordable units. The proposed structure would be five stories high (approximately 56 feet above grade). The proposed total floor area consists of 45,429 square feet for a 3 to 1 Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The Proposed Project includes up to 1,500 square feet of neighborhood serving commercial space and the remaining 43,920 square feet of floor area will contain residential units and amenities. The Proposed Project would include on level of fully automated parking with two racks.

A summary of the proposed development program is provided in Table II-2, below. The proposed site plan is depicted in Figure II-6, Site Plan. Figures II-7 through II-15 depict the subterranean parking levels, first, second, third, fourth and fifth levels and roof plan, respectively.

Proposed Development Program					
Land Uses	Units	Square Feet			
Residential					
Joint Live/Work Units	6	43,929 <sup>[a]</sup>			
Studio Units	9				
1-Bedroom Units	32				
2-Bedroom Units	6				
Commercial Retail		1,500			
	TOTAL FLOOR AREA	45,429 (3:1 FAR)			
Notes: <sup>[a]</sup> Includes all residential unit, residen Source: R&A Design, Inc., July 12, 20	ntial amenities and circulation are	eas.			

Table II-2Proposed Development Program

### **Architectural Features**

The Proposed Project would consist of a five-story mixed-use residential building with a height of 56 feet above grade. Parking would be concealed in one subterranean level of fully automated parking with two racks. Architectural features and materials include, but are not limited to, smooth finish architectural plaster, horizontal and vertical rain screens, glass guardrails, awnings, metal canopies and fixed architectural shade screens. Building elevations of the Proposed Project are depicted in Figures II-16 through II-19. Building sections are depicted in Figures II-20 through II-22.





Figure II-6 Site Plan





Figure II-7 Underground Automatic Parking - Rack 1





Figure II-8 Underground Automatic Parking - Rack 2





Figure II-9 Ground Level Floor Plan





Figure II-10 Mezzanine Level Floor Plan





Figure II-11 Second Level Floor Plan





Figure II-12 Third Level Floor Plan





Figure II-13 Fourth Level Floor Plan





Figure II-14 Fifth Level Floor Plan





Figure II-15 Roof Plan





Figure II-16 South Elevation





Figure II-17 North Elevation





Figure II-18 East Elevation





Figure II-19 West Elevation



 Figure II-20 North/South Section A



Figure II-21 East/West Section B





Figure II-22 North/South Section C

## Floor Area And Height

The Project Site is located within the C2 zone and Height District 1VL, which allows a maximum permitted floor area ratio ("FAR") to be 1.5 times the buildable area of the lot. The total lot area is approximately 15,143 square feet. As defined in LAMC Section 12.03, the buildable area in the C2 zone is equal to the lot area regardless of required setbacks.

Based on the maximum permitted floor area ratio of 1.5 to 1 in Height District 1VL in the C2 zone, the total permitted floor area is approximately 22,715 square feet. The Applicant is proposing to provide 11% of the Project's units as "Very Low Income" restricted affordable units, which grants a 35% density bonus. In accordance with LAMC 12.22.A.25(f)(4)(ii), the Applicant requests an incentive to increase maximum permitted floor area ratio to 3 to 1. The total maximum floor area with a 3 to 1 FAR is approximately 45,429 square feet.

In the C2 zone, the Height District 1VL limits projects with commercial uses to a maximum height of 45feet and 3 stories. In accordance with the Density Bonus Ordinance in LAMC 12.22 A.25(g)(3), the Applicant requests an "off-menu" incentive to increase the maximum height to 56 feet (an 11 foot increase) and 5 stories.

## Density

The Proposed Project is located on six contiguous lots that are located within the C2 zone with a lot area of 15,143 square feet. According to LAMC 12.22.C.16, the lot area for the purposes of calculating density includes one-half the alley. Including one-half of the adjacent alley area, the total lot area is 15,886 square feet. The C2 zone permits the minimum lot area per dwelling unit to be 400 square feet consistent with R4 Zone regulations. The base density of the Project Site is 39 residential apartment units (15,886/400 = 39.715). The Applicant is proposing to provide 11% of the Project's units as "Very Low Income" restricted affordable units, which permits a density bonus increase of 35% in accordance with the Density Bonus Ordinance in LAMC Sec. 12.22 A.25(c)(1). A Density Bonus of 35% yields 14 additional units for a total of 53 units.

## Affordable Housing

The Proposed Project will set aside a minimum of 11% of its units as Very Low Income restricted affordable housing units, which will, at a minimum, meet the LAMC's definition of Very Low Income, as noted in Sec. 12.22 A.25. The LAMC stipulates that the annual income of a household may not exceed the amounts designated for the Very Low Income category as determined by the California Department of Housing and Community Investment Department ("HCID") or any successor agency. As a result of providing 11% of its units as Very Low Income units, the Proposed Project is entitled to a 35% Density Bonus increase. The Affordable Housing Incentives permitted under LAMC Sec. 12.22 A.25 offers applicants incentives based on the percent of designated affordable units and their affordability level

## Setbacks

The Project Site has a front yard along Barrington Avenue and a rear yard along the adjacent alley to the west. The side yards are located along Santa Monica Boulevard and the northern property line abutting the R3 Zone. There are no front yard setbacks required in the C2 Zone. For portions of buildings with ground floor commercial uses in the C2 Zone, there are no required yards. For the northern property line where the ground floor building use is residential, the side yard requirements of the R4 zone applies and requires a minimum of 8 feet. The Project will maintain an 8-foot side yard setback along the northerly property line yard.

## **Open Space and Landscaping**

The Proposed Project will provide open space areas consisting of private open space on balconies and common open space areas, which includes a 3,520 rooftop deck and 920 square foot common outdoor terrace. Additionally, the Proposed Project includes an approximate 910 square foot residential amenity room on the ground floor. According to LAMC Section 12.21.G.2(a)(3), a minimum of 25% of the common open space shall be landscaped. Of the common open space, a minimum of 1,338 square feet is required to be landscaped and 1,350 square feet will be landscaped. Refer to Figures II-23 to II-25 for the Landscape Concept Plan of the proposed building. Additionally, one tree is required for every four dwelling units. Based on the Project's total unit count, the Project is required to provide a minimum of 14 trees. As summarized in Table II-3, below, the Proposed Project will provide 5,600 square feet of open space.

Open Space Code Requirements							
	Number of Units	Square Feet Required	Total Square Feet Required				
Less than 3 Habitable Rooms	41	100	4,100				
3 Habitable Rooms	12	125	1,500				
TOTAL	53		5,600				
Source: Los Angeles Municipal Code, Section 12.21.G							
<b>Open Space / Landscaping Features</b>		Area Proposed (Square Feet)					
Rooftop Deck	3,520						
Common Outdoor Terrace (5 <sup>th</sup> Floor)	920						
Amenity Room (Ground Floor)		910					
Private Open Space		25	50				
	TOTAL	5,600					
Source: P& 1 Design Inc. July 12 2016							

Table II-3Open Space / Landscape Summary









Figure II-24 Landscape Concept Plan - Levels 2 through 4





## **Parking and Access**

The Proposed Project would meet the minimum LAMC code requirements for on-site parking. Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.25 (d)(1), the minimum number of residential parking spaces shall be provided at the following ratio: 1-bedroom units shall provide 1 stall for each unit and for 2 to 3 bedroom units, shall provide 2 stalls per unit. Therefore, the forty-seven proposed 1-bedroom units (including Live/Work units, studio units, and 1-bedroom units) would require 47 stalls and the six proposed 2-bedroom units would require 12 stalls for a total of 64 required off-street residential parking stalls. The commercial component of the Proposed Project would require parking at a maximum of four spaces for every 1,000 square feet, and as such six parking spaces would be required for such uses. At maximum, the total required parking for the proposed project is 65 parking stalls. The Applicant proposes 80 parking stalls in a fully automated subterranean parking garage. The parking garage will have two parking bays and one automated lift. Each parking level will have two automated shuttles. Access to the automated parking bay is from the adjacent alley.

Bicycle parking is required in accordance with LAMC Section 12.21 A.16, including 5 short-term residential spaces (at 1 per 10 units) and 53 long-term residential spaces (at 1 per unit), for a total of 58 residential bicycle spaces. An additional 2 short-term (at 1 per 2,000 sf, minimum 2) and 2 long-term (at 1 per 2,000 sf minimum 2) commercial bicycle parking spaces are required for the 1,500 square feet of ground floor retail space for a total of 62 bicycle spaces. The Proposed Project will meet this requirement by providing 7 short-term bicycle parking spaces (located within 50 feet of the main entrance to the building, as required) and 55 long-term for a total of 62 bicycle spaces. A summary of the proposed parking plan is provided in Table II-4.

Description	Quantity	Units Maximum Parking Requirements		Parking	Parking					
-			Per LAMC	Required	Proposed					
Apartments <sup>a</sup>										
1 Bedroom	47	du	1 space per du	47						
2 and 3 Bedroom	6	du	2 spaces per du	12						
Retail <sup>b</sup>	1,500		4 space per 1,000 sf	6						
	-		TOTAL	65	80					
Bicycle Parking <sup>c</sup>										
Short-Term Bicycle Space		1 space per 10 du		5	7					
		1 per 2,000 sf of commercial (min 2 spaces)		2	/					
Long-Term Bicycle Space		1 space per du 1 per 2,000 sf of commercial (min 2 spaces)		53	55					
				2						
			TOTAL	62	62					
<u>Notes</u> :										
<sup>a.</sup> LAMC 12.21 A.25(d)(1)										
<sup>b.</sup> LAMC 12.21 A.16										
<sup>c</sup> LAMC 12.21.A.4(c)(3)										
Source: R&A Design, Inc., July 12, 2016.										

Table II-4 Proposed Parking Summary

# Construction

Construction of the Proposed Project is anticipated to occur over an approximate 13-month period. Buildout and occupancy is anticipated in 2018. The construction process would be divided into the following phases: (1) Demolition of the existing buildings, (2) Excavation/Grading/Structural Foundation, (3) Structural Framing/Building, and (4) Finishing.

Construction of the Proposed Project would require the demolition of the existing buildings and associated parking garages on the Project Site. Approximately 4,926 square feet of existing development would be demolished and exported from the site. Site clearing is anticipated to take approximately one month.

The excavation, grading, and foundation site preparation phase is anticipated to occur over a four month period immediately following the demolition phase. The Proposed Project includes two levels of subterranean parking and would require the excavation and export of approximately 11,217 cubic yards of soil. Appropriate shoring and/or lagging techniques would be used to ensure the structural stability of the surrounding structures and roadways. Trucks for soil export and construction material delivery would enter and exit the Project Site from Santa Monica Boulevard.

The building construction and finishing phases are estimated to occur over an approximate 12-month period immediately following the completion of the building foundation and subterranean parking level. The finishing phases of construction usually involve painting the interior of the buildings and installation of windows, millwork and flooring materials. The finishing phase of the Proposed Project is expected to occur during the final three months of the construction process.

Construction activities could necessitate temporary lane closures on streets adjacent to the Project Site on an intermittent basis for utility relocations/hook-ups, delivery of materials, and other construction activities as may be required. However, site deliveries and the staging of all equipment and materials would be organized in the most efficient manner possible on-site to mitigate any temporary impacts to the neighborhood and surrounding traffic. To the extent feasible construction equipment would be staged onsite for the duration of construction activities. Traffic lane and right-of-way closures, if required, will be properly permitted by the City agencies.

Unless stated otherwise, all construction activities would be performed in accordance with all applicable state and federal laws and City Codes and policies with respect to building construction and activities. As provided in Section 41.40 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC), the permissible hours of construction within the City of Los Angeles are 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on any Saturday or national holiday. No construction activities are permitted on Sundays. Mitigation Measure MM-NOISE-1: Increased Noise Levels (Demolition, Grading, and Construction Activities) in Section III. (XII Noise) of the Environmental Analysis of this IS/MND, would further restrict construction and demolition activities associated with the Proposed Project to the hours of 7:00 am to 6:00 pm Monday through Friday, and 8:00 am to 6:00 pm on Saturday. The Proposed Project will comply with these restrictions.

# Haul Route

All construction debris would be recycled to the maximum extent feasible. Construction debris and soil materials from the site that cannot be recycled or diverted would likely be hauled to the Sunshine or Chiquita Canyon landfills, which accept construction and demolition debris and inert waste from areas within the City of Los Angeles. The Sunshine Canyon Landfill is approximately 22 miles north of the Project Site (approx. 44-miles round trip). The Chiquita Canyon landfill is approximately 40 miles to the north of the Project Site (approx.80-miles round trip). For recycling efforts, the Central L.A. Recycling Center and Transfer Station (Browning Ferris Industries) accepts construction waste for recycling and is located approximately 15 miles east from the Project Site.

Approval of a Haul Route would be requested from the City prior to construction. For purposes of analyzing the construction-related impacts, it is anticipated that the excavation and soil export would involve 18-wheel bottom-dump trucks with an average of 16 cubic yard hauling capacity. All truck staging would either occur on-site or at designated off-site locations and radioed into the site to be filled. The anticipated haul route would include entering/exiting the Project Site from Santa Monica Boulevard. The haul route would then extend northeast to the 405 Freeway or southbound to the 10 Freeway. The haul route may be modified provided DOT and/or Street Services approves any such modification.

## **RELATED PROJECTS**

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h), this IS/MND includes an evaluation of the Project's cumulative impacts. The guidance provided under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064 (h) is as follows:

"(1) When assessing whether a cumulative effect requires an EIR, the lead agency shall consider whether the cumulative impact is significant and whether the effects of the project are cumulatively considerable. An EIR must be prepared if the cumulative impact may be significant and the project's incremental effect, though individually limited, is cumulatively considerable. "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.

(2) A lead agency may determine in an initial study that a project's contribution to a significant cumulative impact will be rendered less than cumulatively considerable and thus is not significant. When a project might contribute to a significant cumulative impact, but the contribution will be rendered less than cumulatively considerable through mitigation measures set forth in a mitigated negative declaration, the initial study shall briefly indicate and explain how the contribution has been rendered less than cumulatively considerable.

(3) A lead agency may determine that a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable if the project will comply with the requirements in a previously approved plan or mitigation program (including, but not limited to, water quality control plan, air quality attainment or maintenance plan, integrated waste management plan, habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, plans or regulations for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions) that provides specific requirements that will avoid or substantially lessen the cumulative problem within the geographic area in which the project is located. Such plans or programs must be specified in law or adopted by the public agency with jurisdiction over the affected resources through a public review process to implement, interpret, or make specific the law enforced or administered by the public agency. When relying on a plan, regulation or program, the lead agency should explain how implementing the particular requirements in the plan, regulation or program ensure that the project's incremental contribution to the cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable. If there is substantial evidence that the possible effects of a particular project are still cumulatively considerable notwithstanding that the project complies with the specified plan or mitigation program addressing the cumulative problem, an EIR must be prepared for the project.

(4) The mere existence of significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects alone shall not constitute substantial evidence that the proposed project's incremental effects are cumulatively considerable."

In light of the guidance summarized above, an adequate discussion of a project's significant cumulative impact, in combination with other closely related projects, can be based on either: (1) a list of past, present, and probable future producing related impacts; or (2) a summary of projections contained in an adopted local, regional, statewide plan, or related planning document that describes conditions contributing to the cumulative effect. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b)(1)(A)-(B). The lead agency may also blend the "list" and "plan" approaches to analyze the severity of impacts and their likelihood of occurrence. Two related projects have recently been approved for mixed-use multi-family housing within a half-mile radius along Santa Monica Boulevard, including a project located at 11401 Santa Monica Boulevard for a 51-unit, 56-foot 5-story development (CPC-2014-4780-DB) as well as a project located at 11842 Santa Monica Boulevard for a 157-unit, 56-foot, 4-story development (DIR-2014-2297-DB-SPR). Additionally, plans have been filed for a mixed use project, including approximately 55,430 square feet of grocery store space, 166 residential apartments, and three-levels of subterranean parking, located to the southeast of the Project Site at 11674 Santa Monica Boulevard (CPC-2015-2956-VZC-DB-CUB-SPR; ENV-2015-2957-EIR). With respect to each environmental issue identified in the IS/MND, cumulative impacts are discussed further in Section III. Environmental Analysis.

# **II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION C. ENTITLEMENT REQUESTS**

Markwood Enterprises, Inc. ("the Applicant") is requesting that the following entitlements be granted by the City of Los Angeles as the designated lead agency for the construction of a new five-story mixed-use project consisting of 53 multi-family residential apartment units 1,500 square feet of ground floor retail space, and subterranean automated parking:

Pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code ("LAMC") Section 12.22.A.25, the Applicant proposes to set aside 11% of the total units as Very Low Income restricted affordable housing and requests a Density Bonus of 35%. Additionally, the Applicant requests the following:

- 1. Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22.A.25(f)(4)(ii), an "on-menu" incentive to increase the Floor Area Ratio to 3:1 in lieu of the otherwise permitted 1.5:1 Floor Area Ratio.
- 2. Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22.A.25(g)(3), an off-menu incentive to permit a building height of five stories and 56 feet in lieu of the otherwise permitted three stories and 45 feet pursuant to LAMC Section 12.21.1.A.1.

In addition, the Applicant proposes to provide automobile parking spaces in accordance with LAMC Section 12.22 A.25(d)(1):

Parking Option 1 to calculate automobile parking at one space per one-bedroom unit and 2 spaces per two-bedroom and three-bedroom units in accordance with LAMC Section 12.22 A.25(d)(1).

Pursuant to various sections of the LAMC, the Applicant will request the following administrative approvals and permits from the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety and other municipal agencies for project construction actions, including but not limited to the following: demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, building, tenant improvements and a haul route environmental review for the hauling of approximately 11,217 cubic yards of soil export.

This page intentionally left blank

## INTRODUCTION

This section of the Initial Study contains an assessment and discussion of impacts associated with the environmental issues and subject areas identified in the Initial Study Checklist (Appendix G to the State CEQA Guidelines, (C.C.R. Title 14, Chapter 3, 15000-15387). Unless otherwise noted, the thresholds of significance are based on the City of Los Angeles' *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*.

## I. AESTHETICS

Senate Bill 743 - Environmental Quality: Transit Oriented Infill Projects

In 2013, the State of California enacted Senate Bill 743 (SB 743),<sup>1</sup> which provides that "aesthetic and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project on an infill site within a transit priority area shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment." Public Resources Code Section 21099 defines a "transit priority area" as an area within one-half mile of a major transit stop that is "existing or planned, if the planned stop is scheduled to be completed within the planning horizon included in a Transportation Improvement Program adopted pursuant to Section 450.216 or 450.322 of Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations." Public Resources Code Section 21064.3 defines "Major Transit Stop" as "a site containing an existing rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods." Public Resources Code Section 21061.3 defines an "Infill Site" as a lot located within an urban area that has been previously developed, or on a vacant site where at least 75 percent of the perimeter of the site adjoins, or is separated only by an improved public right-of-way from, parcels that are developed with qualified urban uses. This state law supersedes the aesthetic impact thresholds of significance that were previously adopted in the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* (2006).

The Project Site is an infill site within a Transit Priority Area as defined by CEQA. The Project Site is located approximately ½ mile east of the intersection of S. Bundy Drive and Santa Monica Boulevard, which provides access to major bus routes (Metro Bus Routes 1, 4, 14, 704 and R10) with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods. Accordingly, the Project's aesthetic impacts shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21099. While Section 21099 prohibits aesthetic

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> SB 743 is codified as Public Resources Code Section 21099.

impacts from being considered significant environmental impacts pursuant to CEQA, it does not affect the ability of the City of Los Angeles to implement design review through its ordinances or other discretionary powers.

## a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No Impact. A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project introduces incompatible visual elements within a field of view containing a scenic vista or substantially blocks views of a scenic vista. Scenic vistas are generally described in two ways: panoramic views (visual access to a large geographic area, for which the field of view can be wide and extend into the distance); and focal views (visual access to a particular object, scene, or feature of interest). As shown in the site photographs depicted in Figure II-4 of the Project Description, the Project Site is currently occupied by retail and auto repair uses and is immediately surrounded by residential and commercial uses ranging from one to three stories in height. The surrounding neighborhood is characterized by a mix of retail, automotive repair, and vacant lots in the C2 zone along Santa Monica Boulevard and one- to five-story residential dwellings in the R3 zone along Barrington Avenue to the east and Ohio Avenue to the north. Views in the vicinity of the Project Site are largely constrained by adjacent structures and the area's relatively flat topography. No scenic views are provided from or through the Project Site. The Project Site is an infill lot within a developed area of the West Los Angeles Community Planning area of the City of Los Angeles and does not possess any unique aesthetic characteristics. The Proposed Project would improve the Project Site with a new five-story mixed-use residential development approximately 56 feet high above grade. As shown in the elevations of the Proposed Project included in Section II, Project Description (See Figure II-16 through II-19), the Proposed Project would alter the existing views and character of the Project Site and immediately surrounding area in a manner that is compatible with the urban form of the surrounding neighborhood. The Project will maintain an 8-foot side yard setback along the northerly property line yard. Additionally, the northerly portion of the fifth level, of the Proposed Project, fronting the R3 Zone, includes a rooftop amenity deck. Due to the relatively level topography and extent of development within the immediate area, there are no scenic views or vantage points that afford scenic views. Therefore, no impact to any recognized or valued scenic view would occur.

# b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a city-designated scenic highway?

**No Impact**. A significant impact would occur only if scenic resources would be damaged and/or removed by development of the Proposed Project. The Project Site is not located within or along a designated scenic corridor, and is not considered a scenic resource. The Project Site is bounded by Santa Monica Boulevard to the south, S. Barrington Avenue to the east, and an alleyway to the west, none of

which are designated as a scenic highway.<sup>2</sup> The Project Site is currently occupied by three existing onestory commercial buildings and two one-story auto repair buildings and does not contain any natural scenic resources, such as native habitat, locally protected tree species, or unique geologic features. There is one tree located on the Project Site, which is not a protected native species. Furthermore, as concluded in the Historic Assessment and Records Search (See Appendix C of this IS/MND), no historic structures would be impacted by the redevelopment of the Project Site. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not damage and/or remove any scenic resources within a State or City designated scenic highway, and no impact would occur.

# c) Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project were to introduce incompatible visual elements on the Project Site or visual elements that would be incompatible with the character of the area surrounding the Project Site.

## Building Height and Massing

With respect to building mass and height, the surrounding neighborhood is characterized by a mix retail, automotive repair, and vacant lots in the C2 zone along Santa Monica Boulevard and one- to five-story residential dwellings in the R3 zone along Barrington Avenue to the east and Ohio Avenue to the north. However, several projects have recently been approved for mixed-use multi-family housing within a half-mile radius along Santa Monica Boulevard, including a project at Purdue Avenue and Santa Monica Boulevard for a 51-unit, 56-foot 5-story development (CPC-2014-4780-DB) as well as a project at Granville Avenue and Santa Monica Boulevard for a 157-unit, 56-foot, 4-story development (DIR-2014-2297-DB-SPR). Additionally, there are two previously constructed 5-story buildings (approximately 54 feet in height) on Santa Monica Boulevard at Federal Avenue and at Colby Avenue.

As shown in Figure II-5 Photographs of Surrounding Land Uses, the Project Site is surrounded by multifamily residential uses, single-family residential uses and commercial uses. Immediately north of the Project Site is a single-family residence fronting Barrington Avenue. Other properties to the north include a two-story multifamily residential building and three single-family residences fronting Ohio Avenue. Properties to the north are zoned R3-1 with a Medium Residential land use designation. To the east and northeast of the Project Site, across Barrington Avenue, is a one-story commercial building and two- and three-story multi family buildings. Properties to the east are zoned C2-1VL and R3-1 with Neighborhood Commercial and Medium Residential land use designations, respectively.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, 2035 Mobility Plan, Citywide General Plan Circulation System Map A3 – West Subarea, Adopted August 11, 2015.

To the south of the Project Site, across Santa Monica Boulevard, are one-story commercial land uses. Properties to the south are zoned C2-1VL with a General Commercial land use designation. To the west of the Project Site are one-story commercial uses and a three-story multi-family building. Properties to the east are zoned C2-1VL and R3-1 with General Commercial and Medium Residential land use designations, respectively.

The Project Site is located within the C2 zone and Height District 1VL, which allows a maximum permitted floor area ratio ("FAR") to be 1.5 times the buildable area of the lot. The total lot area is approximately 15,143 square feet. As defined in LAMC Section 12.03, the buildable area in the C2 zone is equal to the lot area regardless of required setbacks. Based on the maximum permitted floor area ratio of 1.5 to 1 in Height District 1VL in the C2 zone, the total permitted floor area is approximately 22,714.5 square feet. The Applicant is proposing to provide 11% of the Project's units as "Very Low Income" restricted affordable units, which grants a 35% density bonus. In accordance with LAMC 12.22.A.25(f)(4)(ii), the applicant requests an incentive to increase maximum permitted floor area ratio to 3 to 1. The total maximum floor area with a 3 to 1 FAR is approximately 45,429 square feet. In the C2 zone, the Height District 1VL limits projects with commercial uses to a maximum height of 45-feet and 3 stories. In accordance with the Density Bonus Ordinance in LAMC 12.22 A.25(g)(3), the Applicant requests an "off-menu" modification to increase the maximum height to 56 feet (an 11 foot increase) and 5 stories. Thus, the Proposed Project's scale and massing is consistent with the surrounding urban form characterized by the C2 zone along Santa Monica Boulevard and the R3 zone along Barrington Avenue to the east and Ohio Avenue to the north and, as such, the Proposed Project's impacts with respect to building height and massing would therefore be less than significant.

## General Maintenance and Graffiti

During construction, the Project Site would have the potential to attract unlawful bill postings, graffiti, and other forms of vandalism if the site is not properly secured and maintained. The Project would therefore be required to comply with the Regulatory Compliance Measures as identified in RC-AES-1 through RC-AES-4, below. To ensure the Project Site is maintained in an acceptable manner the Proposed Project would be required to comply with Municipal Code Section 91.8104, which states that every building, structure, or portion thereof, shall be maintained in a safe and sanitary condition and good repair, and free from, debris, rubbish, garbage, trash, overgrown vegetation or other similar material. Furthermore, pursuant to Municipal Code Section 91.8104.15, the exterior of all buildings and fences shall be free from graffiti when such graffiti is visible from a street or alley. As such, impacts associated with graffiti, poor maintenance and/or overgrown vegetation during the operation of the Proposed Project would less than significant. Environmental impacts may result from the Proposed Project due to on-site signage in excess of that allowed under the Municipal Code Section 91.6205. However, this potential impact will be reduced to a less than significant level as the Applicant would be required to affix or paint a plainly visible sign, on publically accessible portions of the construction barriers, with the following language: "POST NO BILLS." Such language shall appear at intervals of no less than 25 feet along the length of the publically accessible portions of the barrier. The applicant shall be responsible for maintaining the visibility of the required signage and for maintaining the construction barrier free and clear of any unauthorized signs within 48 hours of occurrence. Additionally, environmental impacts to the character and aesthetics of the neighborhood may result from project implementation if the Project Site is not attractively landscaped and maintained in an acceptable manner. The Proposed Project would comply with LAMC Section 12.40 and 12.41, which requires that all landscaped areas be maintained in accordance with a landscape plan, including an automatic irrigation plan, prepared by a licensed landscape architect. Compliance with the Regulatory Measures listed below would ensure aesthetic impacts are less than significant.

## **Regulatory Compliance Measures:**

## RC-AES-1 (Vandalism)

Compliance with provisions of the Los Angeles Building Code. The project shall comply with all applicable building code requirements, including the following:

- Every building, structure, or portion thereof, shall be maintained in a safe and sanitary condition and good repair, and free from, debris, rubbish, garbage, trash, overgrown vegetation or other similar material, pursuant to Municipal Code Section 91.8104.
- The exterior of all buildings and fences shall be free from graffiti when such graffiti is visible from a street or alley, pursuant to Municipal Code Section 91.8104.15.

### RC-AES-2 (Signage)

Compliance with provisions of the Los Angeles Building Code. The project shall comply with the Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 91.6205, including on-site signage maximums and multiple temporary sign restrictions, as applicable.

### **RC-AES-3** (Signage on Construction Barriers)

Compliance with provisions of the Los Angeles Building Code. The project shall comply with the Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 91.6205, including but not limited to the following provisions:

- The applicant shall affix or paint a plainly visible sign, on publically accessible portions of the construction barriers, with the following language: "POST NO BILLS".
- Such language shall appear at intervals of no less than 25 feet along the length of the publically accessible portions of the barrier.
• The applicant shall be responsible for maintaining the visibility of the required signage and for maintaining the construction barrier free and clear of any unauthorized signs within 48 hours of occurrence.

#### **RC-AES-4** (Landscape Plan)

All landscaped areas shall be maintained in accordance with a landscape plan, including an automatic irrigation plan, prepared by a licensed landscape architect in accordance with LAMC Sections 12.40 and 12.41. The final landscape plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning during the building permit process.

### d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project introduces new sources of light or glare on or from the Project Site, which would be incompatible with the areas surrounding the Project Site, or which pose a safety hazard to motorists utilizing adjacent streets or freeways. The determination of whether a project results in a significant nighttime illumination impact shall be made considering the following factors: (a) the change in ambient illumination levels as a result of Proposed Project sources; and (b) the extent to which Proposed Project lighting would spill off the Project Site and affect adjacent light-sensitive areas.

#### Light

Night lighting for the Proposed Project would be provided in order to illuminate the building entrances, common open space areas, and parking areas, largely to provide adequate night visibility for residents and visitors and to provide a measure of security. A moderate to high degree of illumination already exists in the project vicinity by street and pedestrian lighting along Santa Monica Boulevard. The Proposed Project would not generate a substantial increase in ambient lighting. Project lighting fixtures would be directed towards the interior of the Project Site and away from any nearby land uses. The Proposed Project would not introduce any new sources of substantial light that are incompatible with the surrounding areas. Vehicular access to the Project Site would be provided from the alleyway to immediately west of the Project Site. As such vehicle headlights entering and existing the Project Site would generally be directed towards the adjacent land uses to the west, which consist of a one-story auto repair shop and a three-story multi-family residential building with parking spaces at the ground level fronting the alleyway. As noted in Project Design Feature AES-1, below, the Proposed Project will include directional lighting with shielding to ensure lighting fixtures do not cast excessive light on adjacent properties. Therefore, with implementation of Project Design Feature AES-1 the Proposed Project's impacts would be less than significant.

#### Glare

Potential reflective surfaces in the project vicinity include automobiles traveling and parked on streets, exterior building windows, and surfaces of brightly painted buildings. Excessive glare not only restricts visibility, but increases the ambient heat reflectivity in a given area. Architectural materials would include a mix of masonry/tile, metal, exterior plaster and glass. Landscaping in the form of street trees would be provided along Santa Monica Boulevard and S. Barrington Avenue. The Proposed Project would not introduce any new sources of substantial glare that are incompatible with the surrounding areas. Additionally, as noted in Project Design Feature AES-2 below, the architectural materials to be used would be limited to such materials that do not cause excessive glare. Therefore, the Proposed Project's impacts would be less than significant.

#### **Project Design Features:**

#### PDF-AES-1 (Light)

Outdoor lighting shall be designed and installed with shielding, such that the light source cannot be seen from adjacent residential properties, the public right-of-way, nor from above.

#### PDF-AES-2 (Glare)

The exterior of the proposed structure shall be constructed of materials to minimize glare and reflected heat, such as, but not limited to, high-performance and/or non-reflective tinted glass (no mirror-like tints or films) and pre-cast concrete or fabricated wall surfaces.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the Proposed Project in conjunction with related projects would result in an incremental intensification of existing prevailing land uses in an already heavily urbanized area of Los Angeles. With respect to aesthetics and views, and shade and shadow impacts, no projects are proposed in proximity to the Project Site such that their development would affect the aesthetic character of the site or its immediate surroundings. Furthermore, development of related projects is expected to occur in accordance with adopted plans and regulations. Therefore, cumulative aesthetic impacts would be less than significant.

#### II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

a) Would the project 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.** The Project Site is currently occupied by auto repair and commercial uses. The Project Site is also located in a heavily urbanized area of the City of Los Angeles. No farmland or agricultural activity exists on or in the vicinity of the Project Site. According to the Soil Candidate Listing for Prime Farmland of Statewide Importance, Los Angeles County, which was prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), the soils at the Project Site are not candidates for listing as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. In addition, the Project Site has not been mapped pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, no impact to agricultural lands would occur.

### b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

**No Impact.** The Project Site is zoned C2-1VL, which permits commercial and multi-family residential uses. The Project Site is located within the West Los Angeles Community Plan area and has a land use designation of General Commercial. The Project Site is not zoned for agricultural production, and there is no farmland at the Project Site. In addition, no Williamson Act Contracts are in effect for the Project Site.<sup>3</sup> Therefore no impact would occur.

c) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

**No Impact.** The Project Site is C2-1VL (Commercial Zone) and has a land use designation of General Commercial in the West Los Angeles Community Plan. The Project Site is not zoned as forest land or timberland, and there is no Timberland Production at the Project Site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Williamson Act Program, California Division of Land Resource Protection, website ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/LA\_12\_13\_WA.pdf, accessed February 2016.

#### d) Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

**No Impact.** The Project Site is occupied by auto repair and commercial uses. The Project Site is also located in a heavily urbanized area of the City of Los Angeles. No forested lands or natural vegetation exist on or in the vicinity of the Project Site. Therefore no impact would occur.

## e) Would the project 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.** Neither the Project Site, nor nearby properties, are currently utilized for agricultural or forestry uses. The Project Site is not classified in any "Farmland" category designated by the State of California. According to the City General Plan Conservation Element (Exhibit B), the Project Site is not located near or in any significant farmland area (i.e., a significant commercial crop or animal producing site). Therefore, no impact would occur.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

**No Impact**. The Extent of Important Farmland Map Coverage maintained by the Division of Land Protection indicates that the Project Site and the surrounding area are not included in the Important Farmland category.<sup>4</sup> The Project Site and the surrounding area are highly urbanized area and do not include any State-designated agricultural lands or forest uses. Therefore, development of the Proposed Project in combination with related projects would not result in the conversion of State-designated agricultural use to a non-agricultural use, nor result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use and no cumulative impact would occur.

#### III. AIR QUALITY

### a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Based on the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a significant air quality impact may occur if the project is not consistent with the applicable Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) or would in some way represent a substantial hindrance to employing the policies or obtaining the goals of that plan. In the case of projects proposed within the City of Los Angeles or elsewhere in the South Coast Air Basin (Basin), the applicable plan is the AQMP, which is prepared by the South Coast

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.

Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD is the agency principally responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in the Basin and works directly with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), county transportation commissions, local governments, and cooperates actively with all state and federal government agencies. The SCAQMD develops rules and regulations, establishes permitting requirements, inspects emissions sources, and enforces such measures through educational programs or fines, when necessary.

The SCAQMD is directly responsible for reducing emissions from stationary (area and point), mobile, and indirect sources. It has responded to this requirement by preparing a series of AQMPs. The most recent AQMP was adopted by the Governing Board of the SCAQMD on December 7, 2012. The 2012 AQMP was prepared to comply with the federal and State Clean Air Acts and amendments, to accommodate growth, to reduce the high levels of pollutants in the Basin, to meet federal and state air quality standards, and to minimize the fiscal impact that pollution control measures have on the local economy. Projects that are consistent with the regional growth projections identified in the used by SCAG in the 2012/2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) are inherently consistent with the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP.

The proposed residential and commercial land uses are consistent with the allowable density under the current zoning and General Plan land use designation and will neither conflict with the SCAQMD's 2012 AQMP nor obstruct implementation of the region's plan to attain air quality standards. While the Proposed Project will increase the number of housing units in the City of Los Angeles, the projected population would be consistent with the City of Los Angeles' General Plan, as well as population growth projections used by SCAG in the 2012/2035 RTP/SCS. As discussed in Question XII, Population and Housing, the Proposed Project would also not exceed the population and housing projections of the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS for the Los Angeles subregion.<sup>5</sup> It should be noted that the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS update projects the SCAG region's population to grow slower than that of the previous years, thus the comparison to the 2012-2035 growth projections provides for a more conservative analysis.<sup>6</sup> In addition, as discussed in Question III(b) below, the Project would not have the potential to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Thus, the Proposed Project would not impair implementation of the AQMP, and this impact would be less than significant.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> SCAG, 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy, adopted April 2016.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> The SCAQMD released the Draft 2016 AQMP on June 30, 2016 and is currently soliciting comments from the public. It is anticipated that the 2016 AQMP will be presented to the SCAQMD Governing Board in December 2016 and submitted for CARB's approval into the SIP/EPA submittal by January 2017.

### b) Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less Than Significant Impact. Based on the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project may have a significant impact where project-related emissions would exceed federal, State, or regional standards or thresholds, or where project-related emissions would substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation.

#### **Construction Emissions**

For purposes of analyzing impacts associated with air quality, this analysis assumes a construction schedule of approximately 13 months with buildout anticipated in 2018. This assumption is conservative and yields the maximum daily impacts. Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would be undertaken in four main phases: (1) demolition/site clearing, (2) excavation, grading and foundations and (3) building construction, paving, and (4) architectural coatings. The building construction phase includes the demolition of the existing commercial buildings, construction of the proposed buildings, connection of utilities to the buildings, laying irrigation for landscaping, architectural coatings, paving, and landscaping the Project Site. Construction activities would temporarily create emissions of dusts, fumes, equipment exhaust, and other air contaminants. Construction activities involving site excavation, grading and foundation preparation would primarily generate  $PM_{2.5}$  and  $PM_{10}$  emissions. Mobile sources (such as diesel-fueled equipment onsite and traveling to and from the Project Site) would primarily generate  $NO_x$  emissions. The application of architectural coatings would primarily result in the release of ROG emissions. The amount of emissions generated on a daily basis would vary, depending on the amount and types of construction activities occurring at the same time.

The Proposed Project's construction emissions were quantified utilizing the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2) as recommended by the SCAQMD. Table III-1, Estimated Peak Daily Construction Emissions, identifies the maximum daily emissions that are estimated to occur on peak construction days for each phase of project construction. These calculations assume that appropriate dust control measures would be implemented as part of the Proposed Project during each phase of development, as required and regulated by SCAQMD. For purposes of this analysis, the following regulatory compliance measures have been identified as being applicable to the Proposed Project's construction activities:

- **Regulatory Compliance Measure RC-AQ-1** (Demolition, Grading and Construction Activities): Compliance with provisions of the SCAQMD District Rule 403. The project shall comply with all applicable standards of the Southern California Air Quality Management District, including the following provisions of District Rule 403:
  - a) All unpaved demolition and construction areas shall be wetted at least twice daily during excavation and construction, and temporary dust covers shall be used to reduce dust

emissions and meet SCAQMD District Rule 403. Wetting could reduce fugitive dust by as much as 50 percent.

- The construction area shall be kept sufficiently dampened to control dust caused by grading b) and hauling, and at all times provide reasonable control of dust caused by wind.
- All clearing, earth moving, or excavation activities shall be discontinued during periods of c) high winds (i.e., greater than 15 mph), so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
- All dirt/soil loads shall be secured by trimming, watering or other appropriate means to d) prevent spillage and dust.
- All dirt/soil materials transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely e) covered to prevent excessive amount of dust.
- General contractors shall maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize f) exhaust emissions.
- Trucks having no current hauling activity shall not idle but be turned off. g)

Emission Source	ROG	ŇO	CO	<b>SO2</b>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM
Demolition	Rod	ΠOX	00	501	1 1/110	1 1112.5
On-Site (Fugitive Dust)					0.48	0.07
On-Site Off-Road (Diesel Equipment)	1.20	10.48	8.58	0.01	0.73	0.69
Off Site (Hauling, Vendor, Worker)	0.08	0.64	1.08	<1	0.16	0.05
Total Emissions	1.28	11.12	9.66	0.01	1.27	0.81
Grading						
On-Site Fugitive Dust					0.82	0.42
On-Site Off-Road (Diesel Equipment)	1.20	10.48	8.58	0.01	0.73	0.69
Off Site (Hauling, Vendor, Worker)	1.27	18.74	16.18	0.05	1.60	0.61
Total Emissions	2.47	29.22	24.76	0.06	3.15	1.72
<b>Building Construction Phase</b>						
On-Site Off-Road Diesel Equipment	1.27	12.64	8.04	0.01	0.86	0.79
Off Site (Hauling, Vendor, Worker)	0.21	0.70	2.94	<1	0.47	0.13
Total Emissions	1.48	13.34	10.98	0.01	1.33	0.92
Paving Phase						
On-Site Paving	1.04	9.83	7.24	0.01	0.60	0.56
Off-Site Hauling/Vendor/Worker Trips	0.07	0.10	1.06	<1	0.20	0.05
Total Emissions	1.10	9.93	8.30	0.01	0.80	0.61
Architectural Finishing						
On-Site Architectural Coating	8.41	2.19	1.87	<1	0.17	0.17
Off-Site Hauling/Vendor/Worker Trips	0.03	0.05	0.47	<1	0.90	0.02
Total Emissions	8.44	2.24	2.34	0.00	1.07	0.19
SCAQMD Thresholds	100	100	550	150	150	55
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Note: Calculations assume compliance with SCAOMD Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust						

Table III-1 **Estimated Peak Daily Construction Emissions** 

iance with SCAQMD Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust.

*Emissions are in pounds per day (lbs/day).* 

Calculation sheets are provided in Appendix A to this MND.

11701 Santa Monica Boulevard Project ENV-2016-1418-MND

III. Environmental Impact Analysis Page III-12

- **Regulatory Compliance Measure RC-AQ-2:** 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.
- **Regulatory Compliance Measure RC-AQ-3:** In accordance with Section 93115 in Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations, operation of any stationary, diesel-fueled, compression-ignition engines shall meet specified fuel and fuel additive requirements and emission standards.
- **Regulatory Compliance Measure RC-AQ-4:** The Project shall comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113 limiting the volatile organic compound content of architectural coatings.

As shown in Table III-1, construction-related daily emissions associated with the Proposed Project would not exceed any regional SCAQMD significance thresholds for criteria pollutants during the construction phases. Therefore, construction impacts are considered to be less than significant.

#### **Operational Emissions**

Air pollutant emissions are currently generated at the Project Site by existing commercial retail uses. The Project Site is currently improved with an approximate 2,404 square foot retail building and an approximately 2,522 square foot automobile repair use. These uses generate air pollutant emissions from stationary sources, such as space and water heating, architectural coatings (paint), and mobile vehicle traffic traveling to and from the Project Site. The average daily emissions generated by the existing uses at the Project Site have been estimated utilizing the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod 2013.2.2) recommended by the SCAQMD. As shown in Table III-2, motor vehicles are the primary source of air pollutant emissions associated with existing uses at the Project Site.

Operational emissions generated by both stationary and mobile sources would result from normal day-today activities of the Proposed Project. Area source emissions would be generated by the consumption of natural gas and landscape maintenance. The following regulatory compliance measures have been identified as being applicable to the operational aspects of the Proposed Project:

• **Regulatory Compliance Measure RC-AQ-5:** New on-site facility nitrogen oxide emissions shall be minimized through the use of emission control measures (e.g., use of best available control technology for new combustion sources such as boilers and water heaters) as required by South Coast Air Quality Management District Regulation XIII, New Source Review.

	Emissions in Pounds per Day					
<b>Emissions Source</b>	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SOx	<b>PM</b> <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Summertime (Smog Season) Emissions						
Area Source	0.13	0.00	<1	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy (Natural Gas)	<1	0.01	0.01	<1	<1	<1
Mobile (Vehicles)	0.82	1.60	7.02	0.01	0.90	0.25
Total Emissions	0.95	1.61	7.03	0.01	0.90	0.25
Wintertime (Non-Smog Season) Emissions						
Area Source	0.12	0.00	<1	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy (Natural Gas)	<1	0.01	0.01	<1	<1	<1
Mobile (Vehicles)	0.88	1.67	7.40	0.01	0.90	0.25
Total Emissions	1.00	1.68	7.41	0.01	0.90	0.25
Calculation data are provided in Appendix A to this MND. Source: Parker Environmental Consultants, 2015.						

Table III-2 Existing Daily Operational Emissions

Similar to existing conditions, operational emissions generated by both stationary and mobile sources would result from normal day-to-day activities of the Proposed Project. Area source emissions would be generated by the consumption of natural gas and landscape maintenance. Mobile emissions would be generated by the motor vehicles traveling to and from the Project Site. The Proposed Project's regional operational emissions are presented in Table III-3, Proposed Project Estimated Daily Operational Emissions. As shown in Table III-3, the Proposed Project's net operational emissions would not exceed the regional thresholds of significance set by the SCAQMD and regional operational emissions from the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

# c) Would the project 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 (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative threshold for ozone precursors)?

Less Than Significant Impact. Based on the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a significant impact may occur if a project adds a considerable cumulative contribution to federal or State non-attainment pollutants. As the Basin is currently in State non-attainment for ozone,  $NO_2$ ,  $PM_{10}$  and  $PM_{2.5}$ , related projects could exceed an air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality exceedance. In regards to determining the significance of the Project contribution, the SCAQMD neither recommends quantified analyses of construction and/or operational emissions from multiple development projects nor provides methodologies or thresholds of significance to be used to assess the cumulative emissions generated by multiple cumulative projects. Instead, the SCAQMD recommends that a project's potential contribution to cumulative impacts should be assessed utilizing the same significance criteria as

	Emissions in Pounds per Day					
Emissions Source	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	СО	SO <sub>x</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Summertime (Smog Season) Emission	ons					
Area Source	1.16	0.05	4.40	<1	0.02	0.02
Energy (Natural Gas)	0.01	0.09	0.04	<1	<1	<1
Mobile (Vehicles)	1.27	3.78	15.12	0.04	2.81	0.79
Total Project Emissions	2.44	3.92	19.56	0.04	2.83	0.81
Less Existing Project Site Emissions	-0.95	-1.61	-7.03	-0.01	-0.90	-0.25
NET Project Emissions	1.49	2.31	12.53	0.03	1.93	0.56
SCAQMD Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
Potentially Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Wintertime (Non-Smog Season) Em	issions	•			•	•
Area Source	1.16	0.05	4.40	<1	0.02	0.02
Energy (Natural Gas)	0.01	0.09	0.04	<1	<1	<1
Mobile (Vehicles)	1.33	3.98	15.14	0.04	2.81	0.79
Total Project Emissions	2.50	4.12	19.58	0.04	2.83	0.81
Less Existing Project Site Emissions	-1.00	-1.68	-7.41	-0.01	-0.90	-0.25
NET Project Emissions	1.50	2.44	12.17	0.03	1.93	0.56
SCAQMD Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
Potentially Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Note: Calculation worksheets are provided in Appendix A to this MND. Source: Parker Environmental Consultants 2015						

 Table III-3

 Proposed Project Estimated Daily Operational Emissions

those for project specific impacts. Furthermore, SCAQMD states that if an individual development project generates less than significant construction or operational emissions, then the development project would not generate a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment. As discussed under Question III(b) above, the Project would not generate construction or operational emissions that exceed the SCAQMD's recommended regional thresholds of significance. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not generate a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions of the pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment for which the Basin is in nonattainment, and impacts would be less than significant.

#### d) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Based on the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a significant impact may occur if a project were to generate pollutant concentrations to a degree that would significantly affect sensitive receptors. Sensitive receptors are populations that are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than are the population at large. The SCAQMD identifies the following as sensitive receptors:

long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities.<sup>7</sup>

The SCAQMD has developed localized significance thresholds (LSTs) that are based on the amount of pounds of emissions per day that can be generated by a project that would cause or contribute to adverse localized air quality impacts. These localized thresholds, which are found in the mass rate look-up tables in the "Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology" document prepared by the SCAQMD,<sup>8</sup> apply to projects that are less than or equal to five acres in size and are only applicable to the following criteria pollutants: NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. LSTs represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards, and are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each source receptor area (SRA). For PM<sub>10</sub>, the LSTs were derived based on requirements in SCAQMD Rule 403 — Fugitive Dust. For PM<sub>2.5</sub>, the LSTs were derived based on a general ratio of PM<sub>2.5</sub> to PM<sub>10</sub> for both fugitive dust and combustion emissions.

LSTs are provided for each of SCAQMD's 38 SRAs at various distances from the source of emissions. The Project Site is located within SRA 2, which covers the northwest coastal areas of Los Angeles. The nearest sensitive receptors that could potentially be subject to localized air quality impacts associated with construction of the Proposed Project include single- and multi-family residences adjacent to the Project Site and University High School, which is approximately 300 feet to the north-northwest. Given the proximity of these sensitive receptors to the Project Site, the LSTs with receptors located within 25 meters (approximately 82 feet) are used to address the potential localized air quality impacts associated with the construction-related NO<sub>X</sub>, CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions for each construction phase. Sensitive receptors located further than 25 meters would be less impacted by localized emissions.

As shown in Table III-4, Localized On-Site Peak Daily Construction Emissions, peak daily emissions generated within the Project Site during construction activities for each phase would not exceed the applicable localized construction emissions thresholds. These calculations assume that appropriate dust control measures would be implemented as part of the Proposed Project during each phase of development, as required by SCAQMD Rule 403 - Fugitive Dust. Specific Rule 403 control requirements include, but are not limited to, applying water in sufficient quantities to prevent the generation of visible dust plumes, applying soil binders to uncovered areas, reestablishing ground cover as quickly as possible, utilizing a wheel washing system to remove bulk material from tires and vehicle undercarriages before vehicles exit the Project Site, and maintaining effective cover over exposed areas.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> South Coast Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 1993, page 5-1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> South Coast Air Quality Management District, Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology, June 2003, Revised July 2008.

Construction Phase <sup>4</sup>	Total On-site Emissions (Pounds per Day)				
Construction r nase	NO <sub>x</sub> <sup>b</sup>	CO	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	
Demolition	10.48	8.58	1.21	0.77	
Grading	10.48	8.58	1.54	1.11	
Building Construction	12.67	8.04	0.86	0.79	
Paving	9.83	7.24	0.60	0.56	
Architectural Coatings	2.19	1.87	0.17	0.17	
SCAQMD Localized Thresholds	103	562	4	3	
Potentially Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	
		1			

Table III-4	
Localized On-Site Peak Daily Construction E	Emissions

The localized thresholds for all phases are based on a receptor within a distance of 82 feet (25 meters) in SCAQMD's SRA 2 for a 1-acre site. The on-site emissions reported in this table reflect the Mitigated Emissions output in the CalEEMod worksheets, however the mitigation scenario is based on compliance with Rule 403 (dust suppression) which is a regulatory compliance measure.

<sup>b</sup> The localized thresholds listed for  $NO_x$  takes into consideration the gradual conversion of  $NO_x$  to  $NO_2$ , and are provided in the mass rate look-up tables in the SCAQMD's "Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology" guidance document. The analysis of localized air quality impacts associated with  $NO_x$  emissions is focused on  $NO_2$ levels as they are associated with adverse health effects.

Source: CalEEMod 2013.2.2, Calculation sheets are provided in Appendix A to this MND.

With regard to localized emissions from motor vehicle travel, traffic congested roadways and intersections have the potential to generate localized high levels of carbon monoxide (CO). The SCAQMD suggests conducting a CO hotspots analysis for any intersection where a project would worsen the Level of Service (LOS) to any level below C, and for any intersection rated D or worse where the project would increase the V/C ratio by two percent or more. Based on a review of the Project's Traffic Impact Study, the Project's increase in traffic levels would not have the potential to meet this criteria. Therefore, no further analysis for CO hotspots is warranted and localized operational emissions would be less than significant.

#### Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC)

The Proposed Project consists of a mixed-use development containing a mix of retail and residential land uses and would not support any land uses or activities that would involve the use, storage, or processing of carcinogenic or non-carcinogenic toxic air contaminants. As such no significant toxic airborne emissions would result from Proposed Project implementation. In addition, construction activities would be subject to the regulations and laws relating to toxic air pollutants at the regional, State, and federal level that would protect sensitive receptors from substantial concentrations of these emissions. Therefore, impacts associated with the release of toxic air contaminants would be less than significant.

#### e) Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if objectionable odors occur which would adversely impact sensitive receptors. Odors are typically associated with industrial projects involving the use of chemicals, solvents, petroleum products, and other strong-smelling elements used in manufacturing processes, as well as sewage treatment facilities and landfills. As the Project involves no elements related to these types of activities, no odors from these types of uses are anticipated. Garbage collection areas for the Project would have the potential to generate foul odors if the areas are located in close proximity to habitable areas. Good maintenance practices would be sufficient to prevent nuisance odors. In addition, SCAQMD Rule 402 (Nuisance), and SCAQMD Best Available Control Technology Guidelines would limit potential objectionable odor impacts during the Proposed Project's long-term operations phase. With implementation of applicable regulatory compliance measures, potential operational odor impacts would be less than significant.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Development of the Proposed Project in conjunction with the related projects in the Project Site vicinity would result in an increase in construction and operational emissions in the already urbanized area of the City of Los Angeles.

Cumulative development can affect implementation of the 2012 AQMP. The 2012 AQMP was prepared to accommodate growth, reduce pollutants within the areas under SCAQMD jurisdiction, improve the overall air quality of the region, and minimize the impact on the economy. Growth considered to be consistent with the 2012 AQMP would not interfere with attainment because this growth is included in the projections utilized in the formulation of the AQMP. Consequently, as long as growth in the Basin is within the projections for growth identified by SCAG, implementation of the 2012 AQMP will not be obstructed by such growth and cumulative impacts would be less than significant. Since the Proposed Project is consistent with SCAG's growth projections, it would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to an impact regarding a potential conflict with or obstruction of the implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Thus, cumulative impacts related to conformance with the 2012 AQMP would be less than significant.

Cumulative air quality impacts from construction and operation of the Proposed Project, based on SCAQMD guidelines, are analyzed in a manner similar to Project-specific air quality impacts. The SCAQMD recommends that a project's potential contribution to cumulative impacts should be assessed utilizing the same significance criteria as those for project specific impacts. Therefore, according to the SCAQMD, individual development projects that generate construction or operational emissions that exceed the SCAQMD recommended daily thresholds for project-specific impacts would also cause a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the Basin is in non-attainment. Thus, as discussed in Question 3(c) above, because the SCAQMD's recommended daily emissions associated with Proposed Project would not exceed the SCAQMD's recommended

thresholds, these emissions associated with the Proposed Project would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative air quality impacts would be less than significant.

With respect to cumulative odor impacts, potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities at each related project include the use of architectural coatings, solvents, and asphalt paving. SCAQMD Rules 1108 and 1113 limit the amount of volatile organic compounds from cutback asphalt and architectural coatings and solvents, respectively. Based on mandatory compliance with SCAQMD Rules, construction activities and materials used in the construction of the Proposed Project and related projects would not combine to create objectionable construction odors. With respect to operations, SCAQMD Rules 402 (Nuisance) and Rule 1138 (Odor Reducing Equipment) would regulate any objectionable odor impacts from the related projects and the proposed Project's long-term operations phase. Thus, cumulative odor impacts would be less than significant.

#### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

a) Would the project 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 regulation, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** A project would normally have a significant impact on biological resources if it could result in: (a) the loss of individuals, or the reduction of existing habitat, of a state or federal listed endangered, threatened, rare, protected, candidate, or sensitive species or a Species of Special Concern; (b) the loss of individuals or the reduction of existing habitat of a locally designated species or a reduction in a locally designated natural habitat or plant community; or (c) interference with habitat such that normal species behaviors are disturbed (e.g., from the introduction of noise, light) to a degree that may diminish the chances for long-term survival of a sensitive species.

The Project Site is improved with three existing one-story commercial buildings and two auto repair buildings. The Project Site does not contain any critical habitat or support 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. Existing vegetation on the Project Site consists of shrubs and one tree (*Podocarpus gracilior*). There are no protected native tree

species located on the Project Site.<sup>9</sup> The existing tree on the Project Site will be removed for the Proposed Project.

The Proposed Project will result in the removal of vegetation and disturbances to the ground and therefore may result in take of nesting native bird species. Migratory nongame native bird species are protected by international treaty under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (50 C.F.R Section 10.13). Sections 3503, 3503.5 and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code prohibit take of all birds and their active nests including raptors and other migratory nongame birds (as listed under the Federal MBTA).Thus, the Project Applicant shall comply with the measure listed below as part of the Proposed Project to ensure that no significant impacts to nesting birds would occur due to the removal of the existing tree located on the Project Site. Therefore, with mitigation the Proposed Project would have not have a significant impact on sensitive biological species or habitat.

#### **Mitigation Measures:**

#### MM-BIO-1 Habitat Modification (Nesting Native Birds, Non-Hillside or Urban Areas)

- Proposed project activities (including disturbances to native and non-native vegetation, structures and substrates) should take place outside of the breeding bird season which generally runs from March 1- August 31 (as early as February 1 for raptors) to avoid take (including disturbances which would cause abandonment of active nests containing eggs and/or young). Take means to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture of kill (Fish and Wildlife Code Section 86).
- If project activities cannot feasibly avoid the breeding bird season, beginning thirty days prior to the disturbance of suitable nesting habitat, the applicant shall:
  - a. Arrange for weekly bird surveys to detect any protected native birds in the habitat to be removed and any other such habitat within properties adjacent to the project site, as access to adjacent areas allows. The surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist with experience in conducting breeding bird surveys. The surveys shall continue on a weekly basis with the last survey being conducted no more than 3 days prior to the initiation of clearance/construction work.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Primaterra, Tree Clearance Letter, dated March 9, 2016 and Primaterra, Tree Survey, dated March 10, 2016. See Appendix B of this IS/MND.

- b. If a protected native bird is found, the applicant shall delay all clearance/construction disturbance activities within 300 feet of suitable nesting habitat for the observed protected bird species until August 31.
- c. Alternatively, the Qualified Biologist could continue the surveys in order to locate any nests. If an active nest is located, clearing and construction within 300 feet of the nest or as determined by a qualified biological monitor, shall be postponed until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged and when there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. The buffer zone from the nest shall be established in the field with flagging and stakes. Construction personnel shall be instructed on the sensitivity of the area.
- d. The applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures described above to document compliance with applicable State and Federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds. Such record shall be submitted and received into the case file for the associated discretionary action permitting the project.

#### b) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

**No Impact.** A project would normally have a significant impact on biological resources if it could result in: (a) the loss of individuals, or the reduction of existing habitat, of a state or federal listed endangered, threatened, rare, protected, candidate, or sensitive species or a Species of Special Concern; (b) the loss of individuals or the reduction of existing habitat of a locally designated species or a reduction in a locally designated natural habitat or plant community; (c) the alternation of an existing wetland habitat; or (d) interference with habitat such that normal species behaviors are disturbed (e.g., from the introduction of noise, light) to a degree that may diminish the chances for long-term survival of a sensitive species. The Project Site is occupied by three existing one-story commercial buildings and two auto repair buildings. No riparian or other sensitive natural community is located on or adjacent to the Project Site. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in any adverse impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.

#### c) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

**No Impact.** A project would normally have a significant impact on biological resources if it could result in the alteration of an existing wetland habitat. The Project Site is entirely developed and covered with impermeable surfaces and does not contain any wetlands or natural drainage channels. Therefore, the

Project Site does not have the potential to support any riparian or wetland habitat, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (See Section 4(b), above) and no impacts to riparian or wetland habitats would occur with implementation of the Proposed Project.

d) Would the project 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?

**No Impact.** A project would normally have a significant impact on biological resources if it could result in the interference with wildlife movement/migration corridors that may diminish the chances for longterm survival of a sensitive species. The Project Site is improved with commercial and auto repair uses. Vegetation in the vicinity of the Project is limited to ornamental landscaping and street trees within the public sidewalk. Due to the highly urbanized surroundings, there are no wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites in the Proposed Project vicinity. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.

e) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (e.g., oak trees or California walnut woodlands)?

**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** A project-related significant adverse effect could occur if a project were to cause an impact that is inconsistent with local regulations pertaining to biological resources, such as the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Ordinance, 177,404. There is one existing tree located on the Project Site (*Podocarpus gracilior*). There are no protected native tree species located on the Project Site.<sup>10</sup> The existing tree on the Project Site will be removed for the Proposed Project. With implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-BIO-2, impacts resulting from the removal of the existing tree would be less than significant.

#### **Mitigation Measures:**

#### MM-BIO-2 Tree Removal (Non-Protected Trees)

• Prior to the issuance of any permit, a plot plan shall be prepared indicating the location, size, type, and general condition of all existing trees on the site and within the adjacent public right(s)-of-way.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Primaterra, Tree Clearance Letter, dated March 9, 2016 and Primaterra, Tree Survey, dated March 10, 2016. See Appendix B of this IS/MND.

- All significant (8-inch or greater trunk diameter, or cumulative trunk diameter if multi-trunked, as measured 54 inches above the ground) non-protected trees on the site proposed for removal shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio with a minimum 24-inch box tree. Net, new trees, located within the parkway of the adjacent public right(s)-of-way, may be counted toward replacement tree requirements.
- Removal or planting of any tree in the public right-of-way requires approval of the Board of Public Works. Contact Urban Forestry Division at: 213-847-3077. All trees in the public right-of-way shall be provided per the current standards of the Urban Forestry Division the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Street Services.

#### f) Would the project 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.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be inconsistent with mapping or policies in any conservation plans of the types cited. The Project Site and its vicinity are not part of any draft or adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, no impact would occur with implementation of the Proposed Project.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

Less Than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact upon biological resources with mitigation. Development of the Proposed Project in combination with related projects would not significantly impact wildlife corridors or habitat for any candidate, sensitive, or special status species identified in local plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or the USFWS as no such habitat occurs in the vicinity of the Project Site due to the existing urban development. Development of any of the related projects would be subject to the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Ordinance. Thus, cumulative impacts to biological resources would be considered less than significant.

#### V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

### a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic resource pursuant to §15064.5?

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would disturb historic resources, which presently exist within the Project Site. As concluded in the Historic Assessment performed by PCR Services Corporation (PCR), dated March 17, 2016 (See Appendix C of this IS/MND), the Project Site consists of five buildings, which includes: two one-story buildings used primarily as garages, located at 1511 Barrington Avenue and 11715 Santa Monica Boulevard (constructed in 1927 and 1948, respectively); two one-story commercial buildings, located at 11715 and 11711 Santa Monica Boulevard

(constructed in 1923 and 1928, respectively); and a one-story commercial building located at 11701 Santa Monica Boulevard (constructed in 1923). PCR's Historical Resources Division conducted a preliminary investigation, which included a pedestrian survey, research, and evaluation of the Project Site. As a result of the preliminary investigations, PCR did not identify any potential historic resources located at the addresses associated with the Project Site that were eligible for listing in the National Register, California Register, or local designation through survey evaluation. Additionally, none of the buildings were identified as historic resources by SurveyLA. Furthermore, a Records Search of the Project Site by the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) of California State University, Fullerton (See Appendix C of this IS/MND), indicates that the existing structures on the Project Site are not listed as historic. Thus no listed historic resources would be impacted by the redevelopment of the Project Site. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not cause an adverse change in the significance of an historic resource and no impact would occur.

### b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the Proposed Project would disturb archaeological resources, which presently exist within the Project Site. As concluded in the Records Search by the SCCIC, the Project Site does not contain any known archaeological resources, however two archaeological resources were identified within a half-mile radius of the Project Site. The Proposed Project includes subterranean parking requiring the excavation up to 20 feet below grade. Thus, the potential exists for the accidental discovery of any unknown archaeological materials that may lie below the surface. Because the presence or absence of such materials cannot be determined until the site is excavated, no further evaluation of this issue is warranted at this time. In the unlikely event any archeological resources are encountered during the construction of the project, regulatory compliance measure RC-CR-1, stated below, would ensure that potential impacts upon archeological resources are mitigated to less than significant levels:

#### **Regulatory Compliance Measures:**

#### **RC-CR-1** (Archaeological)

If archaeological resources are discovered during excavation, grading, or construction activities, work shall cease in the area of the find until a qualified archaeologist has evaluated the find in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Per AB 52, the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation shall be contacted at (626) 926-4131. Personnel of the proposed Modified Project shall not collect or move any archaeological materials and associated materials. Construction activity may continue unimpeded on other portions of the Project site. The found deposits would be treated in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2.

- Distinctive features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize an historic property shall be preserved.
- Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity if deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive historic feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
- Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
- Significant archaeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
- New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
- New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

### c) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the Proposed Project were to disturb paleontological resources or geologic features which presently exist within the Proposed Project site. The Proposed Project site has been previously graded and is currently improved with five buildings and parking. The Project Site and immediate surrounding areas do not contain any known vertebrate paleontological resources.<sup>11</sup> Although no paleontological resources are known to exist on site, there remains a possibility that paleontological resources exist at sub-surface levels on the Project Site and may be uncovered during excavation of the proposed subterranean parking levels. Potential impacts to paleontological resources would be mitigated to a less than significant impact through compliance with existing laws and regulations set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 in the event any such resources are found during construction of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: Vertebrate Paleontological Resources in the City of Los Angeles, September 1996.

the Proposed Project. Implementation of Regulatory Compliance Measure RC-CR-2, below, would ensure any potential impacts are reduced to less than significant levels.

#### **Regulatory Compliance Measures:**

#### RC-CR-2 (Paleontological)

If paleontological resources are discovered during excavation, grading, or construction, the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety shall be notified immediately, and all work shall cease in the area of the find until a qualified paleontologist evaluates the find. Construction activity may continue unimpeded on other portions of the Project site. The paleontologist shall determine the location, the time frame, and the extent to which any monitoring of earthmoving activities shall be required. The found deposits would be treated in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2.

### d) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less Than Significant Impact. A Project-related significant adverse effect could occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the Proposed Project would disturb previously interred human remains. No known human burials have been identified on the Proposed Project site or its vicinity. However, it is possible that unknown human remains could occur on the Project Site, and if proper care is not taken during construction, damage to or destruction of these unknown remains could occur. The following Regulatory Compliance Measure would reduce potential impacts related to the disturbance of unknown human remains to a less than significant level.

#### **Regulatory Compliance Measures:**

#### RC-CR-3 (Human Remains)

If human remains are encountered unexpectedly during construction demolition and/or grading activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98. In the event that human remains are discovered during excavation activities, the following procedure shall be observed:

Stop immediately and contact the County Coroner: 1104 N. Mission Road Los Angeles, CA 90033 323-343-0512 (8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday) or 323-343-0714 (After Hours, Saturday, Sunday, and Holidays)

If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the Coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC).

- The NAHC will immediately notify the person it believes to be the most likely descendent of the deceased Native American. Per AB 52, the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians Kizh Nation shall be contacted at (626) 926-4131.
- The most likely descendent has 48 hours to make recommendations to the owner, or representative, for the treatment or disposition, with proper dignity, of the human remains and grave goods.
- If the owner does not accept the descendant's recommendations, the owner or the descendent may request mediation by the NAHC.
- e) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe that is listed or determined eligible for listing on the California register of historical resources, listed on a local historical register, or otherwise determined by the lead agency to be a tribal cultural resource?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project includes subterranean parking requiring the excavation up to 20 feet below grade. The removal of soil on the Project Site would be done in compliance with state laws. Pursuant to AB 52, the City Planning Department sent pre-consultation request letters to nine recognized Native American Tribal Representatives within the Los Angeles region. The City has received one request, dated July 6, 2016, for tribal consultation from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation. While the letter requests consultation, it does not provide any substantial evidence indicating the presence of any Native American resources within the Project Site or immediate project vicinity. Without any substantial evidence indicating that the Project is likely to cause a significant impact to previously identified Native American resources, there is no nexus to warrant mitigation. Although the Project Site is not known to be associated with any Native American cultural site and no archaeological resources have been recorded on the Project Site, the accidental discovery of any Native American resources would fall under the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). Thus, adherence to the regulatory compliance measures referenced above (i.e., RC-CR-1 and RC-CR-3) would ensure the appropriate references are contacted in the event of an accidental discovery of any archaeological resources or human remains. In this instance, the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation would be contacted. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a known site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe and potential impacts to Native American resources would be avoided or reduced to less than significant levels.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with the other related projects in the Project Site vicinity, would result in the continued redevelopment and revitalization of the surrounding area. Impacts to cultural resources tend to be site-specific and are assessed on a site-by-site basis. The analysis of the Proposed Project's impacts to cultural resources concluded that the Proposed Project would have no significant impacts with respect to cultural resources following compliance with regulatory measures. Therefore, the Proposed Project's incremental contribution to a cumulative impact would not be considerable, and cumulative impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant.

#### VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The following section summarizes and incorporates by reference information from the <u>Preliminary</u> <u>Geotechnical Engineering Investigation, for 11701, 11711, 11715 Santa Monica Boulevard 1511</u> <u>Barrington Avenue Los Angeles,</u> dated October 21, 2015, prepared by SASSAN Geosciences, Inc. ("Geotechnical Report") and the Soils Report Approval Letter, prepared by the City of Los Angeles, Department of Building and Safety, dated December 8, 2015. The Geotechnical Report and Soil Report Approval Letter are included as Appendix D to this IS/MND.

a) Would the project expose people or structures to 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.

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a Proposed Project site is located within a State-designated Alquist-Priolo Zone or other designated fault zone. The Project Site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone nor is the Project Site located in a Preliminary Fault Rupture Study Area.<sup>12</sup> The nearest earthquake fault is located 0.18 miles to the north for the Santa Monica Fault.<sup>13</sup> The Project Site could be subjected to strong ground shaking in the event of an

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, City of Los Angeles Zoning Information and Map Access System (ZIMAS), website: http://zimas.lacity.org, accessed March 2016.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Engineering, Department of Public Works, Navigate LA, website: http://navigatela.lacity.org/navigatela/, accessed March 2016.

earthquake. However, this hazard is common in Southern California and the effects of ground shaking can be mitigated if the proposed structures are designed and constructed in conformance with current building codes and engineering practices. Based on these considerations, the potential for surface ground rupture at the Project Site is considered low. The Project Site is considered suitable for the construction of the Proposed Project provided that the recommendations specified in the Geotechnical Report are included in the design and construction of the Proposed Project to the satisfaction of the Department of Building and Safety. Sign off from the Department of Building and Safety would ensure that the Proposed Project meets the applicable performance measures. Accordingly, compliance with Regulatory Compliance Measure RC-GEO-1 (Seismic) would reduce impacts associated with seismic hazards to a less than significant level. Therefore, with implementation of the Regulatory Compliance Measure identified below, potential impacts associated with surface fault rupture would be reduced to a less than significant level.

#### **Regulatory Compliance Measures:**

#### RC-GEO-1 (Seismic)

The design and construction of the project shall conform to the California Building Code seismic standards as approved by the Department of Building and Safety.

### b) Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project represents an increased risk to public safety or destruction of property by exposing people, property, or infrastructure to seismically induced ground shaking hazards that are greater than the average risk associated with other locations in Southern California. As discussed above, the Project Site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone nor is the Project Site located in a Preliminary Fault Rupture Study Area. The nearest earthquake fault is located 0.18 miles to the north for the Santa Monica Fault. The Project Site could be subjected to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. However, this hazard is common in Southern California and the effects of ground shaking can be mitigated if the proposed structures are designed and constructed in conformance with current building codes and engineering practices. The construction of the proposed structure is considered feasible from a geotechnical engineering standpoint provided that the recommendations presented in their Geotechnical Report are followed and implemented during construction. Additionally, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the conditions contained within the Department of Building and Safety's Geology and Soils Report Approval Letter for the Proposed Project, as it may be subsequently amended or modified. Therefore, with implementation of the Regulatory Compliance Measure RC-GEO-1, identified above, potential impacts associated with seismic hazards would be reduced to a less than significant level.

## c) Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project site is located within a liquefaction zone. If a saturated sand is subjected to ground vibrations, it tends to compact and decrease in volume; if drainage is unable to occur, the tendency to decrease in volume results in an increase in pore water pressure, and if the pore water pressure builds up to the point at which it is equal to the overburden pressure, the effective stress becomes zero, the sand loses its strength completely, and it develops a liquefied state. The Project Site is shown within a potential liquefaction hazard zone on the "State of California Seismic Hazard Zones" map. The liquefaction potential of any given soil deposit is determined by a combination of the soil properties, environmental factors and characteristics of the earthquake to which it may be subjected. The Geotechnical Report performed analyses to evaluate the potential hazards of soil liquefaction at the subject property due to earthshaking during a major earthquake. The analyses were performed for all the soil layers encountered in the borehole utilizing the data obtained during the field exploration (depths of soil layers SPT tests; field blow count values from Standard Penetration Tests) and from the laboratory test results (unit weight of soil; percentage of the fine materials passing through #200 sieve). A copy of the liquefaction analysis is presented in Appendix E of the Geotechnical Report. The Geotechnical Report concludes that the native earth materials underlying the Project Site possess factors of safety in excess of minimum Code requirements and are not prone to liquefaction. The Project Site is considered to be suitable for the proposed construction from a geotechnical engineering standpoint, provided that the recommendations specified in the Geotechnical Report are included in the design and construction of the Proposed Project to the satisfaction of the Department of Building and Safety and the Proposed Project complies with Regulatory Compliance Measure RC-GEO-1 and RC-GEO-2. Therefore, impacts associated with the seismic related hazards including liquefaction would be less than significant.

#### **Regulatory Compliance Measures:**

#### **RC-GEO-2** (Liquefaction Area)

The project shall comply with the Uniform Building Code Chapter 18. Division1 Section 1804.5 Liquefaction Potential and Soil Strength Loss. Prior to the issuance of grading or building permits, the applicant shall submit a geotechnical report, prepared by a registered civil engineer or certified engineering geologist, to the Department of Building and Safety, for review and approval. The geotechnical report shall assess potential consequences of any liquefaction and soil strength loss, estimation of settlement, lateral movement or reduction in foundation soil-bearing capacity, and discuss mitigation measures that may include building design consideration. Building design considerations shall include, but are not limited to:

- ground stabilization
- selection of appropriate foundation type and depths
- selection of appropriate structural systems to accommodate anticipated displacements or any combination of these measures.

The project shall comply with the conditions contained within the Department of Building and Safety's Geology and Soils Report Approval Letter for the proposed project, and as it may be subsequently amended or modified.

### d) Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides?

**No Impact.** A project-related significant adverse effect may occur if the project is located in a hillside area with soil conditions that would suggest a high potential for sliding. As concluded in the Geotechnical Report, the Project Site and project area is generally level and is located outside of the seismically induced landslide hazard zones as designated by the "State of California Seismic Hazard Zones" map. Therefore, no impacts associated with landslides would occur.

#### e) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** Based upon the criteria established in the L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide, a project would normally have significant sedimentation or erosion impact if it would: (a) constitute a geologic hazard to other properties by causing or accelerating instability from erosion; or (b) accelerate natural processes of wind and water erosion and sedimentation, resulting in sediment runoff or deposition which would not be contained or controlled on-site. Although development of the Proposed Project has the potential to result in the erosion of soils during site preparation and construction activities, erosion would be reduced by implementation of stringent erosion controls imposed by the City of Los Angeles through grading and building permit regulations. Minor amounts of erosion and siltation could occur during grading. The potential for soil erosion during the ongoing operation of the Proposed Project is extremely low due to the generally level topography of the Project Site, and the fact that the Project Site would be mostly paved-over or built upon so little soil would be exposed. All grading activities require grading permits from the Department of Building and Safety, which include requirements and standards designed to limit potential impacts to acceptable levels. In addition, all on-site grading and site preparation would comply with applicable provisions of Chapter IX, Division 70 of the LAMC, which addresses grading, excavations, and fills. Potential impacts associated with soil erosion and loss of topsoil would remain less than significant with incorporation of the following Regulatory Compliance Measure and Mitigation Measure listed below. These measures are in addition to any conditions that may be imposed by the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety's Soils Report Approval Letter.

#### **Regulatory Compliance Measures:**

#### RC-GEO-3 (Grading)

Chapter IX, Division 70 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code addresses grading, excavations, and fills. All grading activities require grading permits from the Department of Building and Safety. Additional provisions are required for grading activities within Hillside areas. The application of BMPs includes but is not limited to the following measures:

- Excavation and grading activities shall be scheduled during dry weather periods. If grading occurs during the rainy season (October 15 through April 1), diversion dikes shall be constructed to channel runoff around the site. Channels shall be lined with grass or roughened pavement to reduce runoff velocity.
- Stockpiles, excavated, and exposed soil shall be covered with secured tarps, plastic sheeting, erosion control fabrics, or treated with a bio-degradable soil stabilizer.

#### **Mitigation Measures:**

#### MM-GEO-1 Erosion/Grading/Short-Term Construction Impacts

• The applicant shall provide a staked signage at the site with a minimum of 3-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.

## f) Would the project 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. A project would normally have a significant geologic hazard impact if it could cause or accelerate geologic hazards causing substantial damage to structures or infrastructure, or expose people to substantial risk of injury. For the purpose of this specific issue, a significant impact may occur if the Project is built in an unstable area without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for buildings, thus posing a hazard to life and property. The Geotechnical Report concluded that the potential hazards associated with liquefaction are low. Additionally, as discussed above, the probability of seismically induced landslides occurring on the Project Site is considered low due to the general lack of elevation difference across or adjacent to the Project Site. With the implementation of Building Code requirements as discussed above in Response VI (a), the potential for geologic hazards would be reduced to a less than significant level.

### g) Would the project be located on expansive soil, as identified in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project is built on expansive soils without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for buildings, thus posing a hazard to life and property. Expansive soils contain significant amounts of clay particles that swell considerably when wetted and which shrink when dried. Foundations constructed on these soils are subject to uplifting forces caused by the swelling. Without proper mitigation measures, heaving and cracking of both building foundations and slabs-on-grade could result. As discussed in the Geotechnical Report, subsurface exploration involved drilling three boreholes to a maximum depth of approximately fifty feet. The drilling operation was performed utilizing an eight-inch diameter hollow stem auger mounted on a drilling rig. Two and one-half-inch diameter split spoon ring samples and standard penetration test (SPT) samples were obtained from the boreholes with a thirty inch drop of a one-hundred-forty pound hammer. Earth materials encountered were classified in accordance with the visual-manual procedures of the Unified Soil Classification System. The earth materials encountered in the boreholes consist of native alluvium, which extends to the depths explored. With incorporation of the recommendations provided in the Geotechnical Report and compliance with the Building Code requirements, impacts related to expansive soil would be less than significant.

## h) Would the project 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.** This question would apply to the Proposed Project only if it was located in an area not served by an existing sewer system. The Project Site is located in a developed area of the City of Los Angeles, which is served by a wastewater collection, conveyance and treatment system operated by the City of Los Angeles. No septic tanks or alternative disposal systems neither are necessary, nor are they proposed. Thus, no impact would occur.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

Less Than Significant Impact. Geotechnical hazards are site-specific and there is little, if any, cumulative geological relationship between the Proposed Project and related projects in the project area. Similar to the Proposed Project, potential impacts related to geology and soils would be assessed on a case-by-case basis and, if necessary, the applicants of the related projects would be required to implement the appropriate mitigation measures. Furthermore, the analysis of the Proposed Project's geology and soils impacts concluded that, through the implementation of the Regulatory Compliance Measures recommended above, Proposed Project impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to any potential cumulative impacts, and cumulative geology and soil impacts would be less than significant.

#### VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

#### GHG and Global Climate Change Background

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are called greenhouse gases ("GHG"), since they have effects that are analogous to the way in which a greenhouse retains heat. Greenhouse gases are emitted by both natural processes and human activities. The accumulation of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere regulates the earth's temperature. The State of California has undertaken initiatives designed to address the effects of greenhouse gas emissions, and to establish targets and emission reduction strategies for greenhouse gas emissions in California.

The principal GHGs are carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), and water vapor (H<sub>2</sub>O). CO<sub>2</sub> is the reference gas for climate change because it is the predominant greenhouse gas emitted. To account for the varying warming potential of different GHGs, GHG emissions are often quantified and reported as CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e).

California has enacted several pieces of legislation that relate to GHG emissions and climate change, much of which sets aggressive goals for GHG reductions within the state. Per Senate Bill 97, the California Natural Resources Agency adopted amendments to the CEQA Guidelines, which address the specific obligations of public agencies when analyzing GHG emissions under CEQA to determine a project's effects on the environment. However, neither a threshold of significance nor any specific mitigation measures are included or provided in these CEQA Guideline amendments.

#### **Regulatory Environment**

#### Assembly Bill 32 (Statewide GHG Reductions)

The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, widely known as AB 32, requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop and enforce regulations for the reporting and verification of statewide GHG emissions. CARB is directed to set a statewide GHG emission limit, based on 1990 levels, to be achieved by 2020. The bill set a timeline for adopting a scoping plan for achieving GHG reductions in a technologically and economically feasible manner.

The heart of the bill is the requirement that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. As previously determined by CARB, California had to reduce GHG emissions to a level approximately 28.4% below CARB's 2020 "business-as-usual" GHG emission projections (as set forth in the 2008

Scoping Plan) to achieve this goal.<sup>14</sup> The bill requires CARB to adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective GHG reductions.

Emission reduction measures that could not be initiated in the 2007-2012 timeframe were considered in the Scoping Plan, which was published by CARB in December 2008. The Scoping Plan is defined by AB 32 as "achieving the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective reductions in GHG emissions from sources or categories of sources of GHGs by 2020." Scoping Plan measures include direct emission reductions, alternative compliance mechanisms, market-based compliance mechanisms, and potential monetary and non-monetary incentives for sources for categories. By January 1, 2014 and every five years thereafter, CARB will update its Scoping Plan.

In May 2014, CARB published the First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan, where it revised the previously adopted 1990 GHG emissions level from 427 MMTCO<sub>2</sub>e to 431 MMTCO<sub>2</sub>e based on the scientifically updated global warming potential (GWP) values in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC's) Fourth Assessment Report.<sup>15</sup> The total emissions expected in the 2020 BAU scenario were also updated from the previously adopted estimate of 596 MMTCO<sub>2</sub>e to 509 MMTCO<sub>2</sub>e. The updated 2020 BAU scenario includes reductions anticipated from Pavley I and the Renewable Electricity Standard which are now adopted into law. As shown in Table III-5, the State anticipates it will meet its 2020 GHG emissions limit of 431 MMTCO<sub>2</sub>e through reductions in energy, transportation, waste and high-GWP sectors. The Cap-and-Trade Regulation provides a firm cap, ensuring that the 2020 statewide emission limit will not be exceeded. Thus, the estimated emission reductions attributed to the Cap-and-Trade Program depend on the emissions forecast. For example, if the emissions forecast increases, the reductions associated with the Cap-and-Trade Program will increase.

#### California Senate Bills 1078, 107, and 2; Renewables Portfolio Standard

Established in 2002 under California Senate Bill 1078 and accelerated in 2006 under California Senate Bill 107, California's RPS requires retail suppliers of electric services to increase procurement from eligible renewable energy resources by at least 1 percent of their retail sales annually, until they reach 20 percent by 2010.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> CARB has not calculated the percent reduction required to achieve AB 32's mandate of returning to 1990 levels of GHG emissions by 2020. The value of 28.4% is the required reduction to achieve 1990 emissions in 2020 is an approximate value. Based on the Scoping Plan estimates and conservative rounding, the value could be 28.5%.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> The IPCC is the leading international body for the scientific assessment of climate change established in 1988 under the auspices of the United Nations.

On April 2, 2011, Governor Jerry Brown signed California Senate Bill 2 to increase California's RPS to 33 percent by 2020. This new standard also requires regulated sellers of electricity to procure 25 percent of their energy supply from certified renewable resources by 2016

Category	2020 CO <sub>2</sub> e Emissions (MMTOC <sub>2</sub> e ) <sup>[a]</sup>			
AB 32 Baseline 2020 Forecast Emissions (2020 BAU)	509			
Expected Reductions from Sector-Based Measures				
Energy	25			
Transportation	23			
High-GWP	5			
Waste	2			
Cap and Trade Reductions	23 [b]			
2020 Limit	431			
<sup>[a]</sup> Based on AR4 GWP values.				
<sup>[b]</sup> Cap and Trade emissions reductions depend on the emission forecast.				
Source: CARB, First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan, May 2014.				

 Table III-5

 Climate Change Scoping Plan 2020 Emissions Target

#### Low Carbon Fuel Standard

California Executive Order S-01-07 (January 18, 2007) requires a 10 percent or greater reduction in the average carbon intensity for transportation fuels in California regulated by CARB. CARB identified the LCFS as a Discrete Early Action item under AB 32, and the final resolution (09-31) was issued on April 23, 2009.

#### Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act (SB 375)

California's Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act, also referred to as Senate Bill (SB) 375, became effective January 1, 2009. The goal of SB 375 is to help achieve AB 32's GHG emissions reduction goals by aligning the planning processes for regional transportation, housing, and land use. SB 375 requires CARB to develop regional reduction targets for GHGs, and prompts the creation of regional plans to reduce emissions from vehicle use throughout the State. California's 18 Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) have been tasked with creating Sustainable Community Strategies (SCS) in an effort to reduce the region's vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in order to help meet AB 32 targets through integrated transportation, land use, housing and environmental planning. Pursuant to SB 375, CARB set per-capita GHG emissions reduction targets from passenger vehicles for each of the State's 18 MPOs. On

September 23, 2010, CARB issued a regional eight (8) percent per capita reduction target for the planning year 2020, and a conditional target of 13 percent for 2035.

With respect to motor vehicles, the 2008 Scoping Plan states that local governments will play a significant role in the regional planning process to reach passenger vehicle greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets. Local governments have the ability to directly influence both the siting and design of developments in a way that reduces greenhouse gases associated with vehicle travel, as well as energy, water, and waste. A partnership of local and regional agencies is needed to create a sustainable vision for the future that accommodates population growth in a carbon efficient way while meeting housing needs and other planning goals. Integration of the sustainable communities' strategies or alternative planning strategies with local general plans will be key to the achievement of these goals. State, regional, and local agencies must work together to prioritize and create the supporting policies, programs, incentives, guidance, and funding to assist local actions to help ensure regional targets are met. Enhanced public transit service combined with incentives for land use development that provides a better market for public transit will play an important role in helping to reach regional targets. Thus, based on the above targets noted in the Scoping Plan, a new development Project that can demonstrate it directly influences both the siting and design of new developments in a way that reduces greenhouse gases associated with vehicle travel would be considered consistent with statewide GHG-reduction goals and policies, including AB 32, and does not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to global warming.

#### 2012–2035 and 2016-2040 RTP/SCS

On April 4, 2012, the Regional Council of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) adopted the 2012–2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy: Towards a Sustainable Future (2012–2035 RTP/SCS). Within the RTP, the SCS demonstrates the region's ability to attain and exceed the GHG emission-reduction targets set forth by CARB. The SCS sets forth a regional plan for integrating the transportation network and related strategies with an overall land use pattern that responds to projected growth, housing needs, changing demographics, and transportation demands. The regional vision of the SCS maximizes current voluntary local efforts that support the goals of SB 375, as evidenced by several Compass Blueprint Demonstration Projects and various county transportation improvements. The SCS focuses the majority of new housing and job growth in high-quality transit areas and other opportunity areas in existing main streets, downtowns, and commercial corridors, resulting in an improved jobs-housing balance and more opportunity for transit-oriented development. This overall land use development pattern supports and complements the proposed transportation network that emphasizes system preservation, active transportation, and transportation demand management measures. Finally, the 2012–2035 RTP/SCS fully integrates the two subregional SCSs prepared by the Gateway Cities and Orange County Council of Governments. On June 4, 2012, CARB accepted SCAG's quantification of GHG emission reductions from the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS and the determination that the

2012–2035 RTP/SCS would, if implemented, achieve the 2020 and 2035 GHG emission reduction targets established by CARB.<sup>16</sup>

On April 2016, SCAG's Regional Council adopted the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS): A Plan for Mobility, Accessibility, Sustainability, and a High Quality of Life. The RTP/SCS is the culmination of a multi-year effort involving stakeholders from across the SCAG Region. The 2016-2040 RTP/SCS balances the Southern California region's future mobility and housing needs with economic, environmental, and public health goals. Although CARB has not adjusted SCAG's regional targets since the 2012 RTP/SCS, SCAG anticipates updated and more stringent regional greenhouse gas reduction targets may be forthcoming. The 2016 RTP/SCS achieves per capita GHG emissions reductions relative to 2005 of eight percent in 2020, 18 percent in 2035, and 21 percent in 2040, thereby exceeding the reductions that CARB currently requires.<sup>17</sup>

#### SCAQMD

SCAQMD has released draft guidance regarding interim CEQA GHG significance thresholds. In October 2008, SCAQMD proposed the use of a percent emission reduction target to determine significance for commercial/residential projects that emit greater than 3,000 metric tons of CO2e per year. On December 5, 2008, the SCAQMD Governing Board adopted the staff proposal for an interim GHG significance threshold for stationary source/industrial projects where SCAQMD is lead agency. However, SCAQMD has yet to formally adopt a GHG significance threshold for land use development projects (e.g., residential/commercial projects) and has formed a GHG Significance Threshold Working Group to further evaluate potential GHG significance thresholds.

#### Local Policies and Regulations

The City is addressing the issue of global climate change through implementation of the Green LA, An Action Plan to Lead the Nation in Fighting Global Warming (LA Green Plan), which outlines the goals and actions that the City has established to reduce the generation and emission of GHGs from public and private activities. According to the LA Green Plan, the City is committed to the goal of reducing emissions of  $CO_2$  to 35 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2030. To achieve this goal, the City is increasing the generation of renewable energy, improving energy conservation and efficiency, and changing transportation and land use patterns to reduce dependence on automobiles.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> CARB Executive Order G-12-039.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> SCAG, 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy, pg. 166, adopted April 2016.

#### LA Green Building Code

In 2010, the City adopted the 2010 California Green Building Standards Code, also known as CALGreen, with amendments, as Ordinance No. 181,480, thereby codifying provisions of CALGreen as the new Los Angeles Green Building Code ("LA Green Building Code"). As of January 2011, the LA Green Building Code is applicable to the construction of new buildings (residential and nonresidential), building alterations with a permit valuation of over \$200,000, and residential and nonresidential building additions. The LA Green Building Code contains both mandatory and voluntary green building Code requires for the reduction of GHG emissions through energy conservation. The L.A. Green Building Code requires projects to achieve a 20 percent reduction in potable water use and wastewater generation, meet and exceed Title 24 Standards adopted by the California Energy Commission on December 17, 2008, and meet 50 percent construction waste recycling levels. In addition, the Proposed Project is required to implement applicable energy conservation measures to reduce GHG emissions such as those described in AB 32, described above.

#### **GHG Significance Threshold**

The *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* does not provide any guidance as to how climate change issues are to be addressed in CEQA documents. Furthermore, neither the SCAQMD nor the State CEQA Guidelines Amendments provide any adopted thresholds of significance for addressing a mixed-use project's GHG emissions. Nonetheless, Section 15064.4 of the CEQA Guidelines Amendments serves to assist lead agencies in determining the significance of the impacts of GHGs. Because the City of Los Angeles does not have an adopted quantitative threshold of significance for a mixed-use project's generation of greenhouse gas emissions, the following analysis is based on a combination of the requirements outlined in the CEQA Guidelines.

As required in Section 15064.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, this analysis includes an impact determination based on the following: (1) an estimate of the amount of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the Proposed Project; (2) a qualitative analysis or performance based standards; (3) a quantification of the extent to which the Projects increase greenhouse gas emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting; and (4) the extent to which the Project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions. Guidelines Section 15064.4 states a lead agency "should consider," among other factors, "[t]he extent to which the project may increase or reduce greenhouse gas emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting" (id., subd. (b)(1)) and "[w]hether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applies to the project" (id., subd. (b)(2). The Guidelines, however, do not mandate the use of absolute numerical thresholds to measure the significance of greenhouse gas emissions.

For purposes of this analysis, a significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project's design features are not substantially consistent with the applicable policies and/or regulations outlined in the Scoping Plan, SB 375, SCAG's 2012-2035 RTP/CSC, and the LA Green Building Code.

### a) Would the project generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

#### Less Than Significant Impact.

#### Construction

Construction of the Proposed Project would emit GHG emissions through the combustion of fossil fuels by heavy-duty construction equipment and through vehicle trips generated by construction workers traveling to and from the Project Site. These impacts would vary day to day over the approximate 13-month duration of construction activities. Construction emissions represent an episodic, temporary source of GHG emissions. Emissions are generally associated with the operation of construction equipment and the disposal of construction waste. To be consistent with the guidance from the SCAQMD for calculating criteria pollutants from construction activities, only GHG emissions from onsite construction activities and off-site hauling and construction worker commuting are considered Project generated. As explained by California Air Pollution Controls Officers Association (CAPCOA) in its 2008 white paper, the information needed to characterize GHG emissions from manufacture, transport, and end-of-life of construction materials would be speculative at the CEQA analysis level. CEQA does not require an evaluation of speculative impacts (*CEQA Guidelines §15145*). Therefore, the construction activities and off-site hauling and construction worker trips. All GHG emissions are reported on an annual basis.

Emissions of GHGs were calculated using CalEEMod for each year of construction of the Proposed Project and the results of this analysis are presented in Table III-6, Proposed Project Construction-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions. As shown in Table III-6, the total GHG emissions from construction activities related to the Proposed Project would be approximately 232 metric tons. Pursuant to the guidance set forth in the draft SCAQMD GHG Threshold Guidance document released in October 2008, the Project's construction emissions are amortized for a project lifetime of 30 years to ensure that GHG reduction measures address construction GHG emissions as part of the operational reduction strategies.<sup>18</sup> Therefore, the project's total construction emissions were distributed over 30 years to yield an average of 7.73 MTCO2e per year.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 2008. Greenhouse Gases (GHG) CEQA Significance Thresholds. Website: http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-qualityanalysishandbook/ghg-significance-thresholds. March 5, 2014.

Year	CO2e Emissions (Metric Tons per Year) <sup>a</sup>			
2017	229			
2018	3			
<b>Total Construction GHG Emissions</b>	232			
<sup>a</sup> Construction CO <sub>2</sub> values were derived using CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2 Calculation data and results are provided in Greenhouse Gas Emissions Calculations Worksheets, (See Appendix C to this MND)				
Worksheets. (See Appendix C to this MND)				

 Table III-6

 Proposed Project Construction-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions

#### Operation

#### **Baseline GHG Emissions**

The average daily GHG emissions generated by the existing Project Site have been estimated utilizing the CalEEMod computer model recommended by the SCAQMD. Table III-7, Existing Project Site Greenhouse Gas Emissions, presents the GHG emissions associated with existing operations at the Project Site. As shown in Table III-7, the existing operations on the Project Site generate approximately  $235.29 \text{ CO}_{2} \text{e}$  MTY.

Existing Project Site Greenhouse Gus Emissions				
Emissions Source	CO2e Emissions (Metric Tons per Year)			
Area Emissions	<1			
Energy Demands	40.08			
Solid Waste Generation	5.53			
Water Consumption	5.10			
Motor Vehicles	184.58			
Total	235.29			
Calculation data and results provided in Greenhouse Gas Emissions Calculations Worksheets. (See Appendix C to this MND)				

 Table III-7

 Existing Project Site Greenhouse Gas Emissions

#### **Proposed Project GHG Emissions**

The GHG emissions resulting from operation of the Proposed Project, which involves the usage of onroad mobile vehicles, electricity, natural gas, water, landscape equipment and generation of solid waste and wastewater, were calculated under two separate scenarios in order to illustrate the effectiveness of the Project's compliance with the LA Green Building Code and other applicable plans such as SB 375 and SCAG's 2012-2035 RTP/SCS that aim to reduce the regions GHG emissions by encouraging mixed-use developments on infill lots that are in close proximity to transit. Consistent with these plans and policies, the Proposed Project incorporates the following design features and compliance actions that would reduce the carbon footprint of the development:
**1.** In Fill Development. The Proposed Project is located on an infill development site that is currently a commercial retail and auto repair facility. The Project Site is occupied by an approximate 4,926 square feet of commercial building floor area which generates GHG emissions estimated at approximately 235.29 CO<sub>2</sub>e MTY associated with its energy use and associated transportation emissions. The redevelopment of the site would eliminate these emissions resulting in a significant reduction to the GHG emissions which would otherwise continue if the project was located on a vacant site.

**2. GHG Emissions Associated with Energy Demand**. The Project must meet Title 24 2008 standards and include ENERGY STAR appliances. Energy Star-rated appliances would reduce the projects energy demand during the operational life of the 53 dwelling units. An approximate 10% reduction in energy demand and associated GHG emissions is attributable to compliance with Title 24 standards and the installation of Energy Start appliances.

**3. GHG Emissions Associated with Solid Waste Generation**. The Project is subject to construction waste reduction of at least 50 percent. In addition, Project Site operations are subject to AB 939 requirements to divert 50 percent of solid waste to landfills through source reduction, recycling, and composting. Finally, the Project is required by the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991 to provide adequate storage areas for collection and storage of recyclable waste materials.

**4. GHG Emissions Associated with Water Use**. As mandated by the LA Green Building Code, The Project would be required to provide a schedule of plumbing fixtures and fixture fittings that reduce potable water use within the development by at least 20 percent. It must also provide irrigation design and controllers that are weather- or soil moisture-based and automatically adjust in response to weather conditions and plants' needs. An approximate 22% reduction in water demand and associated GHG emissions is attributable to compliance with this measure.

The Proposed Project's operational GHG emissions are shown in Table III-8, Proposed Project Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions. For comparative purposes, and to demonstrate the effect of the Project's consistency with regional and local plans aimed at reducing GHG emissions, Table III-8 shows GHG emissions for a comparable sized project without the GHG-reducing features described above. As shown, the net increase in GHG emissions generated by the Proposed Project under the Project Without GHG Reduction Measures would be 697.76 CO<sub>2</sub>e MTY and the Proposed Project under the Project With GHG Reduction Measures scenario would result in a net increase of 400.12 CO<sub>2</sub>e MTY compared to

existing conditions.<sup>19</sup> The relatively low net increase in GHG emissions compared to existing conditions is due to the removal of an existing ice generation and food storage facility which has a high existing demand for water and electricity. As shown, an approximate 43% reduction in GHG emissions would occur as a result of the implementation of the LA Green Building Code, the Project's mixed-use design, in fill development characteristics, and proximity to transit.

Froposed Froject Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions							
	Estimated Project Generated CO <sub>2</sub> e Emissions (Metric Tons per Year)						
Emissions Source	Project Without GHG Reduction Measures	Project With GHG Reduction Measures	Percent Reduction				
Area	0.91	0.91	0%				
Energy	122.38	110.67	10%				
Waste	11.09	5.55	50%				
Water	42.87	33.60	22%				
Mobile (Motor Vehicles)	513.14	477.31	7%				
Construction Emissions <sup>a</sup>	7.37	7.37					
Project Total	697.76	635.41	9%				
Less Existing Project Site		-235.29					
Project Net Total	697.76	400.12	43%				
<sup>a</sup> The total construction GHG emissions were amortized over 30 years and added to the operation of the Project.							

Table III-8
Proposed Project Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<sup>a</sup> The total construction GHG emissions were amortized over 30 years and added to the operation of the Projec Calculation data and results provided in Greenhouse Gas Emissions Calculations Worksheets.

In addition to the GHG emission reductions described above, it is important to note that the CO2 estimates from mobile sources (particularly CO2, CH4, and N2O emissions) are likely much greater than the emissions that would actually occur. The methodology used assumes that all emissions sources are new sources and that emissions from these sources are 100 percent additive to existing conditions. This is a standard approach taken for air quality analyses. In many cases, such an assumption is appropriate because it is impossible to determine whether emissions sources, or whether they are sources that were already in the air basin and are in effect new emissions sources, or whether they are sources that were already in the air basin and just shifted to a new location. Because the effects of GHGs are global, a project that shifts the location of a GHG-emitting activity (e.g., where people live, where vehicles drive, or where companies conduct business) would result in no net change in global GHG emissions levels.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> As shown in Table IV-8, the Project's total combined annual GHG emissions would be well below the SCAQMD's draft threshold of 3,000 metric tons per year for commercial/residential projects. While the SCAQMD has not formally adopted this threshold, it provides further substantial evidence that the Project would not make a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts with respect to GHG emissions.

For example, if a substantial portion of California's population migrated from the South Coast Air Basin to the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin, this would likely decrease GHG emissions in the South Coast Air Basin and increase emissions in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin, but little change in overall global GHG emissions. However, if a person moves from one location where the land use pattern requires auto use (commuting, shopping, etc.) to a new development that promotes shorter and fewer vehicle trips, more walking, and overall less energy usage, then the new development would result in a potential net reduction in global GHG emissions.

### Consistency with AB 32 Scoping Plan

Consistency with Applicable AB 52 Scoping Plan Measures						
<i>Energy Efficiency.</i> Maximize energy efficiency building and appliance standards and pursue additional efficiency efforts including new technologies, and new policy and mechanisms. Pursue comparable investment in energy efficiency from all retail providers of electricity in California.	<b>Consistent</b> . The Project would be designed and constructed to meet LA Green Building Code standards by including several measures designed to reduce energy consumption.					
<i>Renewables Portfolio Standard.</i> Achieve 33 percent renewable energy mix statewide.	<b>Consistent</b> . The Project would use energy from the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), which has goals to diversify its portfolio of energy sources to increase the use of renewable energy.					
<i>Green Building Strategy.</i> Expand the use of green building practices to reduce the carbon footprint of California's new and existing inventory of buildings.	<b>Consistent</b> . The Project would be designed and constructed to meet Cal Green building standards and will include several measures designed to reduce energy consumption.					
<b>Recycling and Waste.</b> Reduce methane emissions at landfills. Increase waste diversion, composting and other beneficial uses of organic materials and mandate commercial recycling. Move toward zero waste.	<b>Consistent</b> . The Project would result in a less than significant impact on landfill capacity. (see response to Checklist Question 17(f), below)					
<i>Water</i> . Continue efficiency programs and use cleaner energy sources to move and treat water.	<b>Consistent</b> . The Project would use water- efficient landscaping including point-to-point irrigation and a smart controller drip system to reduce water use.					
Measures not listed are not applicable to this project. Source: Parker Environmental Consultants						

### Table III-9 Consistency with Applicable AB 32 Scoping Plan Measures

### Consistency with SB 375

California SB 375 requires integration of planning processes for transportation, land-use and housing. Under the bill, each Metropolitan Planning Organization would be required to adopt a Sustainable Community Strategy to encourage compact development that reduces passenger vehicle miles traveled and trips so that the region will meet the target provided in the Scoping Plan, created by CARB, for reducing GHG emissions. SB 375 requires SCAG to direct the development of the SCS for the region. A discussion of the Project's consistency with the SCS is provided further below.

### Consistency with 2012-2035 RTP/SCS

The Project would be consistent with the following key GHG reduction strategies in SCAG's 2012-2035 RTP/SCS which are based on changing the region's land use and travel patterns:

- Compact growth in areas accessible to transit;
- More multi-family housing;
- Jobs and housing closer to transit;
- New housing and job growth focused in High Quality Transit Areas (HQTA); and
- Biking and walking infrastructure to improve active transportation options, transit access.

The Project represents an infill development within an existing urbanized area that would concentrate new residential and neighborhood serving commercial uses in an area supported by urban infrastructure. In addition, the Project would also provide bicycle storage areas for Project residents and guests to facilitate and encourage alternative modes of transit. The Project would provide residents and visitors with convenient access to public transit and opportunities for walking and biking, which would facilitate a reduction in vehicle miles traveled and related vehicular GHG emissions. These and other measures would further promote a reduction in vehicle miles traveled and subsequent reduction in GHG emissions, which would be consistent with the goals of SCAG's 2012–2035 RTP/SCS.

### Consistency with L.A. Green Building Code

The Los Angeles Green Building Ordinance requires that all projects filed on or after January 1, 2014, must comply with the L.A. Green Building Code. Mandatory measures under the L.A. Green Building Code that would help reduce GHG emissions include short and long term bicycle parking measures; designated parking measure; and electric vehicle supply wiring. The Project would comply with these mandatory measures as the Project would provide 7 short-term bicycle parking spaces and 55 long-term bicycle parking spaces. Furthermore, the LA Green Building Code includes elective measures that would increase energy efficiency of the Project. The Project would include various elective measures including, but not limited to, installing Energy Star rated appliances and installation of water-conserving fixtures. Therefore, the Project is consistent with the L.A. Green Building Code.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

An individual project's GHG emissions typically would be relatively very small in comparison to state or global GHG emissions and, consequently, they would, in isolation, have no significant direct impact on climate change. Rather, it is the increased accumulation of GHG from more than one project and many sources in the atmosphere that may result in global climate change, which can cause the adverse environmental effects previously discussed. Accordingly, the threshold of significance for GHG emissions determines whether a project's contribution to global climate change is "cumulatively considerable." Many regulatory agencies, including the SCAQMD, concur that GHG and climate change

should be evaluated as a potentially significant cumulative impact, rather than a project direct impact. Accordingly, the GHG analysis presented in this Section analyzes whether the Proposed Project would be cumulatively considerable using a plan-based approach (supported by quantitative and qualitative analysis) to determine the projects' contributing effect on climate change.

Due to the complex physical, chemical, and atmospheric mechanisms involved in global climate change, it is speculative to identify the specific impact, if any, to global climate change from one project's incremental increase in global greenhouse gas emissions. The project's greenhouse gas emissions and the resulting level of significance is appropriately assessed in terms of the cumulative impact on global GHG emission on climate change. Accordingly, a quantified analysis of the GHG emissions anticipated to result from construction and operational activities was calculated as part of the cumulative impact analysis. As part of that analysis, the Proposed Project's GHG emissions were analyzed on a project-specific basis with respect to its impacts on global climate change.

As shown in the tables above, the Proposed Project is consistent with statewide goals and policies in place for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, including AB 32, SB 375, the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, and the LA Green Building Code. Therefore, the contributions of the Proposed Projects and the related projects to cumulative GHG emissions would not be cumulatively considerable.

# Conclusion

Through required implementation of the L.A. Green Building Code, the Project's mixed-use design, and the in-fill nature of the Proposed Project, the Proposed Project would be consistent with local and statewide goals and policies aimed at reducing the generation of GHGs, including CARB's AB 32 Scoping Plan aimed at achieving 1990 GHG emission levels by 2020, SB 375, the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, and the LA Green Building Code. Therefore, the Proposed Project's generation of GHG emissions would not make a project-specific or cumulatively considerable contribution to GHG emissions, and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less than Significant Impact. Although not specified in the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The Proposed Project will comply with the City of Los Angeles' Green Building Ordinance standards that are consistent with the AB 32 Scoping Plan's recommendation for communities to adopt building codes that go beyond the State's codes. As described above and in Question 7(a), the Proposed Project would be consistent with local and statewide goals and policies aimed at reducing the generation of GHGs, including CARB's AB 32 Scoping Plan, SB 375, the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, and the LA Green Building Code. Therefore, the Proposed Project's generation of GHG emissions would not make a project-specific or cumulatively

considerable contribution to conflicting with an applicable plan, policy or regulation for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases and, the Proposed Project's individual and cumulative impact would be less than significant.

### VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The following section summarizes and incorporates the reference information from the following reports:

- <u>Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report for the Single-Story Retail Building, 11701 Santa</u> <u>Monica Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90025</u>, prepared by iRealty Inspection Services, LLC ("IRIS"), dated April 29, 2011.
- <u>Report of Findings of Screening-Level Phase II Subsurface Investigation, Single-Story Retail</u> <u>Building, 11701 Santa Monica Boulevard, Los Angeles, California</u>, prepared by Quinn Environmental Strategies, Inc. ("QES"), dated May 24, 2011.
- <u>Report of Findings of Screening-Level Phase II Subsurface Investigation, Single-Story Retail</u> <u>Building, 11715 Santa Monica Boulevard, Los Angeles, California</u>, prepared by Quinn Environmental Strategies, Inc., dated May 25, 2011.
- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, 1511 S. Barrington Ave. and 11711 Santa Monica Blvd., Los Angeles, California 90025, prepared by Quinn Environmental Strategies, Inc., dated May 30, 2014.
- <u>Report of Findings, Phase II Environmental Investigation, 11711 Santa Monica Boulevard and 1511 Barrington Avenue, Los Angeles, California, prepared by Quinn Environmental Strategies, Inc., dated May 30, 2014.</u>

# a) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Proposed Project would not result in the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. No hazardous materials other than the modest amounts of typical cleaning supplies and solvents used for janitorial purposes would routinely be transported to the Project Site, and the use of these substances would comply with State Health Codes and Regulations.

Construction activities could involve the use of potential hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. However, all potentially hazardous materials would be contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturers' instructions and handled in compliance with applicable standards and regulations. There is nothing unique or specific about the operational activities of the Proposed Project or its location that would warrant any mitigation beyond general compliance. Therefore,

the Proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and impacts would be less than significant.

# b) Would the project create significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project utilizes quantities of hazardous materials as part of its routine operations and could potentially pose a hazard to nearby sensitive receptors under accident or upset conditions. A Phase I ESA and Phase II ESA were both prepared in 2011 for the property located at 11701 Santa Monica Boulevard. A Phase II ESA was prepared for the property located at 11715 Santa Monica Boulevard. A Phase I ESA was not prepared specifically for the property located at 11715 Santa Monica Boulevard, but the scope of the Phase II ESA was developed based on the Phase I ESA prepared for the property located at 11701 Santa Monica Boulevard at 11701 Santa Monica Boulevard. In addition, a Phase I ESA and Phase II ESA were prepared in 2014 for the properties located at 11711 Santa Monica Boulevard and 1511 S. Barrington Avenue. The aforementioned Environmental Site Assessments are included as Appendix F of this IS/MND.

The purposes of the Phase I ESAs were to assess existing site conditions and identify existing or potential Recognized Environmental Conditions (REC) affecting the Project Site. A REC refers to the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property due to any release to the environment, under conditions indicative of a release to the environment, or under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment. The purposes of the Phase II ESAs were to assess whether historical chemical usage of the properties identified in the Phase I ESAs may have impacted underlying soil or groundwater.

# Database Search

According to available historic sources, the buildings located at 11701 Santa Monica Boulevard and 11715 Santa Monica Boulevard were developed with a gas station and/or auto repair facility from at least 1924 to approximately 1962. There were four 550-gallon USTs installed in 1925, which were later filled with sand and closed in 1958. A dry cleaning operation was located on the Project Site at 11703 Santa Monica Boulevard, as early as 1933. The buildings located in 1511 Barrington Avenue and 11711 Santa Monica Boulevard were developed in 1924. Based on historical resources, the 1511 Barrington Avenue parcel was developed as an electronic service center as early as 1985, and the 11711 Santa Monica Boulevard parcel was developed as a restaurant as early as 1948. The existing auto body shop and auto body-painting booth have occupied these two addresses for approximately 20 years.

The 1511 Barrington Avenue parcel was identified in three regulatory database reports: EDR U.S. Historical Auto Stations, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Small Quantity Generator (SQG), and HAZNET. The 11711 Santa Monica Boulevard parcel is identified in one regulatory

database: EDR U.S. Historical Auto Station. The 11701 Santa Monica Boulevard parcel is identified in one regulatory database: EDR Historical Dry Cleaners.

As such, the Phase I ESA for the 11701 Santa Monica Boulevard parcel concluded that the presence of the gasoline station/auto repair facility and the dry cleaning operation both constitute as an REC. The Phase I ESA for the 11711 Santa Monica Boulevard and 1511 Barrington Avenue parcels identify the following four RECs pertaining to the existing auto body shop operations:

- An active floor drain was observed in the paint booth area of the 1511 Barrington Avenue parcel that accumulative run-off from paint booth activities;
- An abandoned drain was observed near the bathroom and office area of the building on 11711 Santa Monica Boulevard parcel. Due to the potential historical use of the property for auto repair and auto body painting, and its listing on an Historical Gas Station database, it is possible that chemicals may have been discharged to the drain prior to its abandonment;
- An abandoned structure, possibly a hoist or lift, was observed in the store front section of the building on the 11711 Santa Monica Boulevard parcel that the tenant reports was operated by the previous tenant over 20 years ago. If the hoist or lift used a hydraulic mechanism, it is possible that chemicals may have been used or released in the vicinity; and
- Due to the former operations of a gas station and three abandoned USTs on 11701 Santa Monica Boulevard, regional groundwater quality is a REC.

These identified RECs warranted the need for the Phase II ESAs in order to assess soil and groundwater conditions. In addition, due to the age of the on-site buildings, there is a potential that asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paints (LBPs) are present on-site. These do not qualify as RECs but require discussion. On-site ACMs and LBPs are further discussed below.

# Site Reconnaissance

IRIS performed a site reconnaissance in early 2011 for the 11701 Santa Monica Boulevard parcel to survey the interior portions and periphery of the former on-site flower shop. Chemicals, hazardous materials, and raw materials were not observed at the Project Site. There was no evidence of released hazardous substances or petroleum products. IRIS identified one pole-mounted utility-owned electrical transformer located in the middle of the eastern edge of the parcel. No aboveground or underground storage tanks were observed on-site. Three 55-gallon drums were identified which appeared to be part of the body shop operations. Asbestos was present in floor tiles and mastics of the storage room and in the caulking of the windows in the storage room. Based on the date of construction of the building, lead-based paints (LBPs) were likely used during construction and maintenance of the building. IRIS noted significant suspect mold growth and water-damaged building materials in the eastern storage rooms, the flower cold-storage case, and the sink room, likely as a result of rainy weather and poor roofing conditions.

QES performed a site reconnaissance on April 14, 2014 for the 1511 Barrington Avenue and 11711 Santa Monica Boulevard parcels to obtain information on the existing auto body shop. QES identified various small containers of aerosol paints and paint thinners, fiberglass resin, cleaning liquids, and polishing compounds in both on-site buildings. Some cans were stored in metal cabinets, and others stored in open shelves and on the floor. Two 55-gallon drums with unknown contents were found located in the alley adjacent to the building on 11711 Santa Monica Boulevard. One drum was closed with a "hazardous waste" label, and the contents of the other drum was unknown due to limited access. The tenant reported that these drums were present when the property was leased about 20 years ago. A floor drain was identified on-site located in the spray paint booth. An abandoned structure, which may have been a former electric lift or other subgrade structure was identified in the 11711 Santa Monica Boulevard parcel. Due to the age of the buildings, building materials such as wallboard systems may contain asbestos. It is also possible that lead-based paint is present.

Radon sampling was not conducted for both Phase I ESAs. According to the USEPA, the radon zone level for the area is Zone 2 (medium radon potential), which has a predicted average indoor screening level between 2.0 pCi/L and 4.0 pCi/L, equal to or below the action level of 4.0 pCi/L set forth by the EPA.

### Asbestos-Containing Materials (ACMs)

IRIS and OES identified the presence of materials that potentially contain ACMs, which include drywall systems, floor tiles, acoustical ceiling tiles, strayed-on acoustical ceiling, and roofing materials. Since the existing buildings on-site were constructed prior to the ban on the use of asbestos, there is the potential that demolition of these buildings could release ACMs present in the structures. Therefore, prior to demolition activities, a complete asbestos survey would be conducted to identify all sources of asbestos, as required by the U.S. EPA National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) regulation and the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD's) Rule 1403. Bulk samples of all materials that are suspected of containing asbestos would be collected and analyzed for asbestos content. Asbestos removal is stringently controlled by Federal Regulations and SCAQMD Rule 1403. Removal of asbestos in a building is not unusual and can be readily accomplished. In accordance with the EPA's NESHAP regulation and SCAQMD's Rule 1403, all materials that are identified as ACMs would be removed by a trained and licensed asbestos abatement contractor. The asbestos removal operations would be conducted in accordance with CAL-OSHA Asbestos for the Construction Industry Standard, SCAOMD and EPA rules and regulations and industry standards. The contractor selected for the removal process would be chosen based on experience, reputation, and relationship with local agencies such as SCAQMD and OSHA regional offices. Generally, asbestos removal operations are low risk. When following asbestos-related regulations, the possibility of exposure to airborne asbestos fibers from asbestos removal projects is limited. The SCAQMD has very specific regulations for asbestos emissions. Provided the removal and disposal of ACMs from the Project Site follows the various guidelines required by SCAQMD Rule 1403, as well as all other applicable state and federal rules and

regulations, hazardous materials impacts relative to exposure to asbestos would be less than significant.

# Lead Based Paint (LBP)

Due to the age of the existing buildings, lead-based paint may be present on site. Exposure of workers to lead-based paint during demolition of the existing structures would be a hazardous to the health of the construction workers. A qualified lead-paint abatement consultant would be required to comply with applicable state and federal rules and regulations governing lead paint abatement. Such regulations that would be followed during demolition include Construction Safety Orders 1532.1 (pertaining to lead) from Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations, and lead exposure guidelines provided by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Compliance with mandatory state and federal regulations would ensure that the potential lead-based paint on-site would be handled properly and impacts associated with the exposure to lead-based paint would be less than significant.

### Mold

IRIS noted significant suspect mold growth and water-damaged building materials in the eastern storage rooms, the flower cold-storage case, and the sink room of the 11701 Santa Monica Boulevard building, likely as a result of rainy weather and poor roofing condition. Exposure to such materials during demolition or construction activities could be hazardous to the health of the demolition workers, as well as area residents, employees, and future occupants. Prior to demolition activities, a mold inspection contractor shall conduct a survey of the building to identify and assist with compliance and applicable state and federal rules and regulation governing mold removal and disposal. Therefore, proper handling and disposal of mold removal would ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

# Polychlorinated Biphenyls

Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) were historically used as coolants and lubricants in transformers, capacitors, and other electrical equipment beginning in 1929 because they do not burn easily and serve as a good insulating material. IRIS identified one pole-mounted utility-owned electrical transformer located on the middle of the eastern perimeter of property on 11701 Santa Monica Boulevard. The transformer is owned by LADWP, and no spills or leaks were observed in the area of the transformer. The transformer is not expected to be an environmental concern, but should be handled in accordance with applicable regulations upon demolition or renovation. Prior to issuance of a demolition permit, a polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) abatement contractor shall conduct a survey of the Project Site to identify and assist with compliance with applicable state and federal rules and regulations governing PCB removal and disposal. Therefore, impacts with respect to handling and disposal of PCBs would be less than significant.

### Radon

Radon sampling was not conducted for both Phase I ESAs. According to the USEPA, the radon zone

level for the area is Zone 2 (medium radon potential), which has a predicted average indoor screening level between 2.0 pCi/L and 4.0 pCi/L, equal to or below the action level of 4.0 pCi/L set forth by the EPA. This information is not specific to the Project Site and site specific testing would be required to evaluate any risk from radon. Exposure to such materials during demolition or construction activities could be hazardous to the health of the demolition workers, as well as future residents and employees. Prior to demolition activities, specific testing would be required to evaluate any risk from radon. If the amount of radon exceeds the established threshold, the Applicant shall retain a licensed radon contractor to reduce the radon concentrations. The radon contractor shall develop language for proper maintenance of the radon monitoring systems that would be installed in each residence, as well as the radon monitoring and reduction system, if required. The maintenance instructions shall be included in the proposed project's covenants, conditions, and restrictions. The property disclosure statements shall indicate that the Project Site is within an area with a moderate potential for indoor radon levels. Therefore with proper handling and compliance to applicable regulations, any potential radon impacts would be less than significant.

### Soil and Groundwater Conditions

QES prepared Phase II ESAs for the parcel on 11701 Santa Monica Boulevard in May 2011, the parcel on 11715 Santa Monica Boulevard in May 2011, and the parcels on 1511 Barrington Avenue / 11711 Santa Monica Boulevard in May 2014, respectively. The Phase I ESAs for the Project Site recommended Phase II ESAs in order to assess whether historical chemical usage of the properties identified in the Phase I ESAs may have impacted underlying soil or groundwater. The overall objective of the screening level investigation was to assess the potential presence of impacts associated with possible chemical releases associated with historical land uses of the Project Site. Therefore, the investigations focused on identifying VOCs normally associated with such operations, including chlorinated VOCs and petroleum-related compounds in soil gas, with spot screening of soil matrix conditions, including metals in select areas. Nine borings were collected at the 11701 Santa Monica Boulevard parcel, three soil borings were collected at the 11711 Barrington Avenue parcels. One boring was advanced into the groundwater at approximately 90 feet below ground surface for the 11711 Santa Monica Boulevard and 1511 Barrington Avenue parcels.

No petroleum hydrocarbons or VOC were present in any of the borings of the three Phase II ESAs. However, dichlorodifluoromethane was identified at low concentrations in some soil gas samples for the borings in the 11701 property: adjacent to the floral refrigerator along the northern wall of the florist shop, in the northwestern storage room, near the northeastern corner of the parking lot, near refrigeration units inside the building, and along the sidewalk in front of the florist shop. Acetone, benzene, and tetrachloroethylene (PCE) concentrations was reported in soil gas collected from 20 feet below ground surface for one of the borings in the 11711 and 1511 parcels, near the existing floor drain in the paint booth area. These concentrations were below the threshold for industrial land use, and therefore, would

not indicate a significant risk for the present land use.

Arsenic and copper were also present in soil samples taken for all three Phase II ESAs. Arsenic was the only metal to exceed any regulatory threshold, and is known to be present in California soil at concentrations typically higher than regulatory threshold values. The presence of these concentrations 10 feet below the surface, the absence of data at the ground surface, and the concentrations of similar order magnitude as the background value reported by DTSC, likely do not signify an obvious concern.

In groundwater, the following compounds are reported at concentrations exceeding the applicable threshold, California Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs): arsenic, barium, beryllium, cadmium, chromium, lead, and nickel. However, metal concentrations reported in soil matrix samples collected near RECs identified in the Phase I ESAs are low (well below applicable regulatory thresholds) and were not reported above reporting limits. This suggests that metals, including total chromium, reported in groundwater likely represent a regional water quality condition, not a Project Site related condition. Although arsenic was reported above regulatory thresholds in soil matrix, the reported concentrations are similar to background concentrations naturally occurring in Southern California soils. The subsurface investigations did not discover evidence of chemical impacts related to historical chemical uses such as dry cleaning or automobile service or fueling.

A Soils Management Plan (SMP) would be prepared and implemented to provide a framework under which work can proceed safely and contaminated soils can be properly handled, segregated, stockpiled and disposed of at a licensed disposal facility. Proper handling of the contaminated media would be required regardless of the contamination source. Further, if the Proposed Project's subterranean development extends to depths in which groundwater is encountered, the groundwater would be properly handled and managed. If dewatering activities are required, such activities would comply with the requirements of the Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Groundwater from Construction and Project Dewatering to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties (Order No. R4-2008-0032, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System No. CAG994004) or subsequent permit. This would include submission of a Notice of Intent for coverage under the permit to the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board at least 45 days prior to the start of dewatering and compliance with all applicable provisions in the permit, including water sampling, analysis, and reporting of dewatering-related discharges.

The Proposed Project's compliance with mandatory state and federal Regulatory Compliance Measures identified below would ensure that potential impacts associated with the release of a hazardous material would be less than significant.

#### **Regulatory Compliance Measures:**

#### **RC-HAZ-1** Explosion/Release (Existing Toxic and Hazardous Construction Materials)

- (Asbestos) Prior to the issuance of the demolition permit, the applicant shall provide a letter to the Department of Building and Safety from a qualified asbestos abatement consultant that no ACM are present in the building. If ACM are found to be present, it will need to be abated in compliance with the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 1403 as well as other state and federal regulations.
- (Lead Paint) Prior to the issuance of any permit for demolition or alteration of the existing structure(s), a lead-based paint survey shall be performed to the written satisfaction of the Department of Building and Safety. Should lead-based paint materials be identified, standard handling and disposal practices shall be implemented pursuant to OSHA regulations.
- (Mold) Prior to demolition activities, a mold inspection contractor shall conduct a survey of the project site to identify and assist with compliance with applicable state and federal rules and regulation governing mold removal and disposal.
- (Polychlorinated Biphenyl Commercial and Industrial Buildings) Prior to issuance of a demolition permit, a polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) abatement contractor shall conduct a survey of the Project Site to identify and assist with compliance with applicable state and federal rules and regulations governing PCB removal and disposal.
- (Radon) Prior to demolition activities, specific testing would be required to evaluate any risk from radon. If the amount of radon exceeds the established threshold, the Applicant shall retain a licensed radon contractor to reduce the radon concentrations. The radon contractor shall develop language for proper maintenance of the radon monitoring systems that would be installed in each residence, as well as the radon monitoring and reduction system, if required. The maintenance instructions shall be included in the proposed project's covenants, conditions, and restrictions. The property disclosure statements shall indicate that the site is within an area with a moderate potential for indoor radon levels.

### **RC-HAZ-2** (Hazardous Materials Site)

Prior to the issuance of any use of land, grading, or building permit, the applicant shall obtain a sign-off from the Fire Department and the LARWQCB indicating that all on-site hazardous materials, including contamination of the soil and groundwater,

have been suitably remediated, or that the proposed project will not impede proposed or on-going remediation measures.

# c) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** Based upon the criteria established in the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have a significant impact to hazards and hazardous materials if: (a) the project involved a risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation); or (b) the project involved the creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard. The determination of significance shall be made on a case-by-case basis considering the following factors: (a) the regulatory framework for the health hazard; (b) the probable frequency and severity of consequences to people or property as a result of a potential accidental release or explosion of a hazardous substance; (d) the probable frequency and severity of consequences to people from exposure to the health hazard; and (e) the degree to which project design would reduce the frequency to the health hazard.

There is one Los Angeles Unified School District school within one quarter mile of the Project Site: University High School, located approximately 0.1 miles northwest of the Project Site. Localized construction impacts associated with noise, dust and localized air quality emissions, and construction traffic/hauling activities generally occur within an area of 500 feet or less of the Project Site. The Proposed Project would provide appropriate construction measures to reduce the Project's impacts upon the nearby school facility. Further, the proposed haul route would extend from the Project Site to the Santa Monica Boulevard freeway on-ramp to the San Diego (I-405) freeway, which would not pass by the aforementioned school. The Project's proposed haul route would be designed to minimize, to the greatest degree possible, hauling impacts on University High School. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-HAZ-1 and MM-HAZ-2, below, would reduce any construction impacts related to nearby schools to less than significant levels.

No hazardous materials other than the modest amounts of typical cleaning supplies and solvents used for maintenance and janitorial purposes would be present at the Project Site, and use of these substances would comply with State Health Codes and Regulations. The operational activities of the Proposed Project would not create a significant hazard through hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Operational impacts on nearby schools would be less than significant.

### **Mitigation Measures:**

### MM-HAZ-1 Construction Activity Near Schools

- The Applicant and contractors shall maintain ongoing contact with administrator of University High School. The administrative offices shall be contacted when demolition, grading and construction activity begin on the project site so that students and their parents will know when such activities are to occur. The developer shall obtain school walk and bus routes to the schools from either the administrators or from the LAUSD's Transportation Branch (323) 342-1400 and guarantee that safe and convenient pedestrian and bus routes to the school be maintained.
- The Applicant shall install appropriate traffic signs around the site to ensure pedestrian and vehicle safety.
- There shall be no staging or parking of construction vehicles, including vehicles to transport workers on any of the streets adjacent to the school.

### MM-HAZ-2 Schools affected by Haul Route

• Haul route scheduling shall be sequenced to minimize conflicts with pedestrians, school buses and cars at the arrival and dismissal times of the school day. Haul route trucks shall not be routed past the school during periods when school is in session especially when students are arriving or departing from the campus.

# d) Would the project 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. California Government Code Section 65962.5 requires various state agencies to compile lists of hazardous waste disposal facilities, unauthorized releases from underground storage tanks, contaminated drinking water wells, and solid waste facilities from which there is known migration of hazardous waste, and submit such information to the Secretary for Environmental Protection on at least an annual basis. A significant impact may occur if the Project Site is included on any of the above lists and poses an environmental hazard to surrounding sensitive uses.

As described above, the Project Site is identified on the following databases: HAZNET, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Small Quantity Generator (SQG), EDR Historic Auto Station and EDR Historic Cleaners. The Phase I ESAs determined that there were four RECs in connection with the Project Site. Three Phase II ESAs were later prepared in 2011 and 2014 after observations were made during the advancement of the Project's geotechnical investigation at the Project Site, which encountered soils impacted by organic and inorganic compounds. The subsurface investigations did not confirm evidence of chemical impacts related to historical chemical uses such as dry cleaning or automobile

service or fueling. A Soils Management Plan (SMP) would be prepared and implemented to provide a framework under which work can proceed safely and contaminated soils can be properly handled, segregated, stockpiled and disposed of at a licensed disposal facility. With the Project's compliance with mandatory state and federal regulatory compliance measures, potential impacts associated with the release of a hazardous material would be less than significant. Potential impacts would be further reduced to less than significant levels with incorporation of Regulatory Compliance Measure RC-HAZ-1 and RC-HAZ-2, above.

# e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

**No Impact.** A significant project-related impact may occur if the Proposed Project were placed within a public airport land use plan area, or within two miles of a public airport and subject to a safety hazard. The closest public airport to the Project Site is the Santa Monica Municipal Airport, located approximately 1.7 miles south of the Project Site. The Project Site is not located in an airport hazard zone or within an airport land use plan. The building proposes five stories and would reach a maximum height of approximately 56 feet above grade. The Project Site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

# f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

**No Impact.** This question would apply to the Proposed Project only if it were in the vicinity of a private airstrip and would subject area residents and workers to a safety hazard. The Project Site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and therefore, no impact would occur.

# g) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. Based upon the criteria established in the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have a significant impact to hazards and hazardous materials if: (a) the project involved possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. According to the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of significance shall be made on a case-by-case basis considering the degree to which the project may require a new, or interfere with an existing emergency response or evacuation plan, and the severity of the consequences. The Project Site is located in a disaster route along Santa Monica Boulevard according to the Santa Monica Area Disaster

Route Map of Los Angeles County.<sup>20</sup> Based on the City of Los Angeles Safety Element, the Project Site is not located on an identified disaster route or an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.<sup>21</sup> Development of the Project Site may require temporary and/or partial street closures due to construction activities. Nonetheless, while such closures may cause temporary inconvenience, they would not be expected to substantially interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans. The Proposed Project would not cause permanent alterations to vehicular circulation routes and patterns, impede public access, or travel upon public rights-of-way. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not be expected to interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and a less than significant impact would occur.

# h) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

**No Impact.** The Project Site is located in a highly urbanized area of Los Angeles and does not include wildlands or high fire hazard terrain or vegetation. The Project Site is not located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ).<sup>22</sup> Therefore, no impacts from wildland fires are expected to occur.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the Proposed Project in combination with related projects has the potential to increase to some degree the risks associated with the use and potential accidental release of hazardous materials in the City of Los Angeles. However, the potential impact associated with the Proposed Project would be less than significant and, therefore, not cumulatively considerable. With respect to related projects, the potential presence of hazardous substances would require evaluation on a case-by-case basis, in conjunction with the development proposals for each of those properties. Further, local municipalities are required to follow local, state, and federal laws regarding hazardous materials, which would further reduce impacts associated with the related projects. Therefore, with compliance with local, state, and federal laws pertaining to hazardous materials, the Proposed Project in conjunction with related projects would be expected to result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to hazardous materials.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, City of Santa Monica Area Disaster Route Map, July 10, 2008.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> City of Los Angeles, Safety Element Exhibit H, Critical Facilities and Lifeline Systems in the City of Los Angeles, April 1995.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, City of Los Angeles Zoning Information and Map Access System (ZIMAS), website: http://zimas.lacity.org, accessed January 2016.

# IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

### a) Would the Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Less Than Significant Impact. A project would normally have a significant impact on surface water quality if discharges associated with the project would create pollution, contamination, or nuisance as defined in Section 13050 of the California Water Code (CWC) or that cause regulatory standards to be violated, as defined in the applicable National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permit or Water Quality Control Plan for the receiving water body. For the purpose of this specific issue, a significant impact may occur if the project would discharge water which does not meet the quality standards of agencies which regulate surface water quality and water discharge into stormwater drainage systems. Significant impacts would also occur if the project does not comply with all applicable regulations with regard to surface water quality as governed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). These regulations include compliance with the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements to reduce potential water quality impacts.

#### Construction

Three general sources of potential short-term, construction-related stormwater pollution associated with the Proposed Project include: 1) the handling, storage, and disposal of construction materials containing pollutants; 2) the maintenance and operation of construction equipment; and 3) earth moving activities which, when not controlled, may generate soil erosion via storm runoff or mechanical equipment. As required under the NPDES, the Project Applicant is responsible for preparing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to mitigate the effects of erosion and the inherent potential for sedimentation and other pollutants entering the stormwater system. The primary objectives of the NPDES storm water program requirements are to: 1) effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges; and 2) reduce the discharge of pollutants from storm water conveyance systems to the Maximum Extent Practicable ("MEP" statutory standard). The SWPPP, which is required by law, would incorporate the required implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) for erosion control and other measures to meet the NPDES requirements for storm water quality. Implementation of the BMPs identified in the SWPPP and compliance with the NPDES and City discharge requirements would ensure that the construction of the Proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Thus, the Proposed Project's construction-related water quality impacts would be less than significant.

### **O**peration

The Project Site is generally covered with impervious surfaces, with the exception a small landscaped planter area fronting Santa Monica Boulevard on the parcel located at 11701 Santa Monica Boulevard. As such, the majority of surface water runoff from the Project Site is directed to adjacent storm drains located along Santa Monica Boulevard and does not percolate into the groundwater table beneath the Project Site.

The amount of surface water runoff from the Project Site will decrease with construction of the Proposed Project, as the Project would be required to demonstrate compliance with Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance standards and retain or treat the first <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> inch of rainfall in a 24-hour period. Compliance with this measure, either through on-site percolation, directing surface water flows to an on-site water tank, or a combination of both methods, would reduce the amount of surface water runoff leaving the Project Site as compared to the current conditions. City of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 172,176 and Ordinance No. 173,494 specify Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control which require the application of BMPs. Chapter IX, Division 70 of the LAMC addresses grading, excavations, and fills. The Proposed Project would also comply with water quality standards and wastewater discharge requirements set forth by the SUSMP for Los Angeles County and Cities in Los Angeles County and approved by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB). Full compliance with the SUSMP and implementation of design-related BMPs would ensure that the operation of the Proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Therefore, with implementation of the mandatory SUSMP requirements and compliance with the City of Los Angeles LID Ordinance, operational water quality impacts would be less than significant.

### **Regulatory Compliance Measures:**

# **RC-WQ-1:** (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit)

Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall obtain coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System No. CAS000002) (Construction General Permit) for the proposed project. The Applicant shall provide the Waste Discharge Identification Number to the City of Los Angeles to demonstrate proof of coverage under the Construction General Permit. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan shall be prepared and implemented for the proposed project in compliance with the requirements of the Construction Best Management Practices to be implemented to ensure that the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation is minimized and to control the discharge of pollutants in stormwater runoff as a result of construction activities.

# **RC-WQ-2:** (Low Impact Development Plan)

Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Applicant shall submit a Low Impact Development Plan and/or Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan to the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation Watershed Protection Division for review and approval. The Low Impact Development Plan and/or Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan shall be prepared consistent with the requirements of the Development Best Management Practices Handbook.

### **RC-WQ-3: (Development Best Management Practices)**

The Best Management Practices shall be designed to retain or treat the runoff from a storm event producing 0.75 inch of rainfall in a 24-hour period, in accordance with the Development Best Management Practices Handbook Part B Planning Activities. A signed certificate from a licensed civil engineer or licensed architect confirming that the proposed Best Management Practices meet this numerical threshold standard shall be provided.

b) Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

**No Impact.** A project would normally have a significant impact on groundwater level if it would change potable water levels sufficiently to: (a) reduce the ability of a water utility to use the groundwater basin for public water supplies, conjunctive use purposes, storage of imported water, summer/winter peaking, or respond to emergencies and drought; (b) reduce yields of adjacent wells or well fields (public or private); (c) adversely change the rate or direction of flow of groundwater; or (d) result in demonstrable and sustained reduction in groundwater recharge capacity. As discussed in Section VIII(a), the Project Site is largely impervious, and a majority of the surface water runoff from the Project Site is directed to adjacent storm drains. As concluded in the Geotechnical Report, Groundwater seepage was not encountered in boreholes to the depths explored. However, Seismic Hazard Evaluation for the Beverly Hills Quadrangle by the State of California indicates that the highest historic water level in this area was recorded at approximately twenty feet below the ground surface. Provided that the recommendations specified in the Geotechnical Report are included in the design and construction of the Proposed Project to the satisfaction of the Department of Building and Safety and the Proposed Project complies with Regulatory Compliance Measure RC-GEO-1, no impact to the groundwater table would occur.

# c) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

**No Impact.** A project would normally have a significant impact on surface water hydrology if it would result in a permanent, adverse change to the movement of surface water sufficient to produce a substantial change in the current or direction of water flow. The Project Site is located in a highly urbanized area of Los Angeles, and no streams or river courses are located on or within the Project vicinity. The Project Site is generally impervious. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not increase site runoff or

result any changes in the local drainage patterns. Implementation of the SWPPP, however, would reduce the amount of surface water runoff after storm events, as the Proposed Project would be required to implement stormwater BMPs to retain or treat the runoff from a storm event producing <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> inch of rainfall in a 24-hour period. Therefore, no impacts would occur to surface water hydrology or result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

# d) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

**No Impact.** A project would normally have a significant impact on surface water hydrology if it would result in a permanent, adverse change to the movement of surface water sufficient to produce a substantial change in the current or direction of water flow. The Proposed Project would not result in a significant increase in site runoff, or any changes in the local drainage patterns. The Project Site is currently developed and stormwater runoff is directed to the adjacent stormwater infrastructure serving the greater Project area. The Project Site is generally impervious and the rate of surface water runoff under the Proposed Project would not increase as compared to existing conditions. Therefore, as the Proposed Project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site, no impact would occur.

# e) Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less Than Significant Impact. A project would normally have a significant impact on surface water quality if discharges associated with the project would create pollution, contamination, or nuisance as defined in Section 13050 of the CWC or that cause regulatory standards to be violated, as defined in the applicable NPDES stormwater permit or Water Quality Control Plan for the receiving water body. For the purpose of this specific issue, a significant impact may occur if the volume of storm water runoff from the Project Site were to increase to a level which exceeds the capacity of the storm drain system serving the Project Site. A significant adverse effect would also occur if a project substantially increases the probability that polluted runoff would reach the storm drain system.

The Project Site is currently developed and a majority of the surface water is directed off site to the adjacent storm drain system on Santa Monica Boulevard. Pursuant to local practice and City policy, storm water retention will be required as part of the LID/SUSMP implementation features (despite no increased imperviousness of the site). Any contaminants gathered during routine cleaning of construction equipment would be disposed of in compliance with applicable stormwater pollution prevention permits. Further, any pollutants from the parking areas would be subject to the requirements and regulations of the NPDES and applicable LID Ordinance. Accordingly, the Proposed Project will be required to demonstrate compliance with Low Impact Development Ordinance standards and retain or treat the first

<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> inch of rainfall in a 24-hour period, which will reduce the Proposed Project's impact to the stormwater infrastructure. Therefore, Proposed Project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff and potential impacts to surface water quality would be less than significant.

# f) Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project includes potential sources of water pollutants that would have the potential to substantially degrade water quality. The Proposed Project does not include potential sources of contaminants, which could potentially degrade water quality and would comply with all federal, state and local regulations governing stormwater discharge. Therefore, no impact would occur.

# g) Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the Project was located within a 100-year flood zone, which would impede or redirect flood flows. The Project Site is not in an area designated as a 100-year flood hazard area.<sup>23</sup> A review of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), Map No. 06037C1590F, dated September 26, 2008, indicates that the site is located in an area designated as "Zone X", described as "Areas determined to be outside the 0.2 percent flood plain." The Project Site is located in a highly urbanized area and, as no changes to the local drainage pattern would occur with implementation of the Proposed Project, the Proposed Project would not have the potential to impede or redirect floodwater flows. No impact would occur.

# h) Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the Project was located within a 100-year flood zone, which would impede or redirect flood flows. The Project Site is not in an area designated as a 100-year flood hazard area. The Project Site is located in a highly urbanized area and, as no changes to the local drainage pattern would occur with implementation of the Proposed Project, the Proposed Project would not have the potential to impede or redirect floodwater flows. No impact would occur.

# i) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, General Plan Elements, Safety Element Exhibit F, website: http://cityplanning.lacity.org/cwd/gnlpln/saftyelt.pdf, accessed March 2016.

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project exposes people or structures to a significant risk of loss or death caused by the failure of a levee or dam, including but not limited to a seismically-induced seiche. Seiches are large waves generated in very large enclosed bodies of water or partially enclosed arms of the sea in response to ground shaking. Tsunamis are waves generated in large bodies of water by fault displacement or major ground movement. Based on the lack of such large enclosed water bodies nearby, seiches and tsunami risks are considered nil. Thus, the Proposed Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam and no impact would occur.

# j) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the Project Site is sufficiently close to the ocean or other water body to be potentially at risk of the effects of seismically-induced tidal phenomena (i.e., seiche and tsunami), or if the Project Site is located adjacent to a hillside area with soil characteristics that would indicate potential susceptibility to mudslides or mudflows. The Project Site is not located in an inundation and tsunami hazard area.<sup>24</sup> The Project Site is relatively flat, there are no adjacent bodies of water, and the site is not located within a State Earthquake Induced Landslide Zone. The Project Site is located approximately 3.35 miles east from the coastline. Therefore, the Project Site is not subject to slope instability, tsunamis, and seiches. Due to the relatively level topography and developed properties within the project area, the potential for mudflow to impact the Project Site is relatively low. Therefore, no impact would occur.

# **Cumulative Impacts**

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the Proposed Project in combination with related projects would result in the further infilling of uses in an already dense urbanized area. As discussed above, the Project Site and the surrounding areas are served by the existing City storm drain system. Runoff from the Project Site and adjacent urban uses is typically directed into the adjacent streets, where it flows to the nearest drainage improvements. It is likely that most, if not all, of the related projects in the project vicinity would also drain to the surrounding street system. However, little if any additional cumulative runoff is expected from the Project Site, and the related project sites, since this part of the City is already fully developed with impervious surfaces. Under the requirements of the LID Ordinance, each related project would be required to implement stormwater BMPs to retain or treat the runoff from a storm event producing <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> inch of rainfall in a 24-hour period. Mandatory structural BMPs in accordance with the NPDES water quality program will therefore result in a cumulative reduction to surface water

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, General Plan Elements, Safety Element Exhibit G, website: http://cityplanning.lacity.org/cwd/gnlpln/saftyelt.pdf, accessed March 2016.

runoff, as the development in the surrounding area is limited to infill developments and redevelopment of existing urbanized areas. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to impacting the volume or quality of surface water runoff, and cumulative impacts to the existing or planned stormwater drainage systems would be less than significant. Therefore, cumulative water quality impacts would be less than significant.

# X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

### a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project would be sufficiently large enough or otherwise configured in such a way as to create a physical barrier within an established community. The determination of significance shall be made on a case-by-case basis considering the following factors: (a) the extent of the area that would be impacted, the nature and degree of impacts, and the types of land uses within that area; (b) the extent to which existing neighborhoods, communities, or land uses would be disrupted, divided or isolated, and the duration of the disruptions; and (c) the number, degree, and type of secondary impacts to surrounding land uses that could result from implementation of the Proposed Project.

The Proposed Project Site is located within an urbanized area of the City of Los Angeles and is consistent with the existing physical arrangement of the properties within the vicinity of the site. No separation of uses or disruption of access between land use types would occur as a result of the Proposed Project. The Project is consistent with the Zoning designation and General Plan land use designation on the Project Site. Accordingly, implementation of the Proposed Project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the established community, and no impact would occur.

b) Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project is inconsistent with the General Plan or zoning designations currently applicable to the Project Site, and would cause adverse environmental effects, which the General Plan and zoning ordinance are designed to avoid or mitigate. At the regional level, the Project Site is located within the planning area of SCAG, the Southern California region's federally designated metropolitan planning organization. The Proposed Project is also located within the South Coast Air Basin and, therefore, is within the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD. At the local level, development of the Project Site is guided by the General Plan of the City of Los Angeles, the West Los Angeles Community Plan, the West Los Angeles Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Specific Plan and the LAMC, which are intended to guide local land use decisions and development patterns.

# **Regional Plans**

# SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan

The Proposed Project is located within the South Coast Air Basin and, therefore, falls under the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD. In conjunction with SCAG, the SCAQMD is responsible for formulating and implementing air pollution control strategies. The AQMP was updated in 2012 to establish a comprehensive air pollution control program leading to the attainment of State and federal air quality standards in the Basin, which is a non-attainment area. The Proposed Project generally conforms to the zoning and land use designations for the Project Site as identified in the General Plan, and, as such, would not add emissions to the Basin that were not already accounted for in the approved AQMP.

# SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide

The Project Site is located within the six-county region that comprises the SCAG planning area. The SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) includes growth management policies that strive to improve the standard of living, maintain the regional quality of life, and provide social, political, and cultural equity. The Proposed Project would be consistent with policies set forth in the RCP, as the Proposed Project would redevelop an existing infill lot with a high density mixed-use multi-family residential and commercial development, thereby maximizing a property that is easily accessible to mass transit, and that is least likely to cause an adverse environmental impact. Furthermore, as the Proposed Project would add approximately 53 residential units in the community, generating as many as 98 new residents<sup>25</sup>, the Proposed Project would be consistent with SCAG growth projections. As discussed above, the Proposed Project is substantially consistent with all regional plans that are applicable to the Project Site.

# Local Plans

# City of Los Angeles General Plan

The Proposed Project would conform to the objectives outlined in the City of Los Angeles General Plan (General Plan). The General Plan is a comprehensive, long-range declaration of purposes, policies and programs for the development of the City. The General Plan is a dynamic document consisting of a General Plan Framework and 11 other elements; 10 Citywide elements (Air Quality Element, Conservation Element, Historic Preservation and Cultural Resources Element, Housing Element, Infrastructure Systems Element, Noise Element, Open Space Element, Public Facilities and Services

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> Based on a generation rate of 1.85 residents per dwelling unit. Los Angeles Department of City Planning Demographic Research Unit, Local Estimates (Effective October 1, 2009), West Los Angeles Community Plan Area,website:http://planning.lacity.org/DRU/Locl/LocFrame.cfm?geo=CP&loc=WLA&sgo=ct&rpt=PnH&yrx =Y09, accessed March 2016.

Element, Safety Element, and Transportation Element) and the Land Use Element, which provides individual plans for each of the City's 35 Community Planning Areas.

Those elements that would be most applicable to the Proposed Project are the Housing Element, the Land Use Element, and the Transportation Element. Housing Element objectives with which the Proposed Project would conform include: encouraging production and preservation of an adequate supply of rental and ownership housing to meet the identified needs of persons of all income levels and special needs; encouraging the location of housing, jobs, and services in mutual proximity; and accommodation of a diversity of uses that support the needs of the City's existing and future residents. Transportation Element objectives with which the Proposed Project conforms include: focus of future growth of the City around public transit opportunities; reduced reliance on the automobile; and creation of a pedestrian-friendly environment. The Proposed Project would introduce a mixed-use residential development in close proximity to a variety of public transportation options.

### West Los Angeles Community Plan

The Project Site is located within the West Los Angeles Community area. Therefore, all development activity on-site is subject to the land use goals, objectives and policies of the West Los Angeles Community Plan (Community Plan). The Project Site has a General Plan land use designation of General Commercial. While the Community Plan does not mandate mixed-use projects, it encourages them in commercially designated areas that have the potential for such uses. The General Commercial land use designation contains numerous policies designed to enhance commercial activity, it also contains many policies designed to stimulate the development of residential uses within certain commercial and residential uses within certain commercial zones at a density commensurate with the R4 zone.

As discussed in the Community Plan, the intent of mixed-use development is to provide housing in proximity to jobs and services, to reduce vehicular trips, congestion and air pollution, to provide for rental housing, and to stimulate pedestrian-oriented areas. Policies of the Community Plan applicable to new mixed-use residential development include: (i) promote mixed-use projects along transit corridors and in appropriate commercial areas and; (ii) require that mixed use projects and development in pedestrian oriented districts be designated and developed to achieve a high level of quality, distinctive character, and compatibility with existing uses. The Proposed Project would construct an infill high-density residential mixed-use development near commercial, employment and public transportation opportunities, and thus would conform to the goals, objectives, policies and land uses identified in the Community Plan. Accordingly, the Project does not conflict with and is consistent with the Community Plan's goals, policies and objectives.

West Los Angeles Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Specific Plan

The West Los Angeles Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Specific Plan ("WLA TIMP") consists of an area that includes all or parts of the Westwood, West Los Angeles, Brentwood-Pacific Palisades, and the Palms Mar Vista-Del Rev District Plan Areas generally bounded by the City of Beverly Hills/Beverwil Drive/Castle Heights Avenue/National Boulevard/Hughes Avenue on the east; Sunset Boulevard on the north; the City of Santa Monica and Centinela Avenue on the west; and Venice Boulevard on the south. Goals of the WLA TIMP include; Provide a mechanism to fund specific transportation improvements due to transportation impacts generated by the projected new development within the WLA TIMP Area; Require that new development mitigate Significant Transportation Impacts caused by development in the R-3 and less restrictive zones; Regulate the phased development of land uses, insofar as the transportation infrastructure can accommodate such uses; Promote area wide transit enhancement through additional transit lines, shuttles, transit centers and facilities, which expedite transit flow; Prevent Peak Hour Level of Service ("LOS") on streets and intersections from reaching LOS "F" or, if presently at LOS "F" preclude further deterioration in the Level of Service; Promote neighborhood protection programs to minimize intrusion of commuter traffic through residential neighborhoods and; Promote the development of coordinated and comprehensive transportation plans and programs with other jurisdictions and public agencies.

As discussed further in Section XVI. Transportation and Traffic, checklist question (a), per the WLA TIMP and *Traffic Study Policies and Procedures* ("TSPP"), a Traffic Study is required when a project is likely to add 43 or more peak-hour trips to the local street system. The TSPP requires a technical memorandum (scaled-down version of a traffic study) when a project is likely to add between 25 and 42 peak hour trips. Given that the Proposed Project would add no more than 22 trips to the local street system during either weekday peak hour, the Proposed Project is not expected to result in a significant traffic impact to any of the surrounding intersections or roadway segments. Therefore, no further analysis of traffic impacts is required and the Proposed Project is exempt from the Trip Fees set forth in the WLA TIMP.

# LAMC

The Project Site is currently occupied by three existing one-story commercial buildings and two auto repair shops. The Project Site is zoned C2-1VL, which permits commercial and multi-family residential uses. Pursuant to the General Plan, the existing land use designation is General Commercial, which corresponds to the C2 zone. The Project Site is located within the C2 zone and Height District 1VL, which allows a maximum permitted floor area ratio ("FAR") to be 1.5 times the buildable area of the lot. In the C2 zone, the Height District 1VL limits projects with commercial uses to a maximum height of 45-feet and 3 stories. In addition, residential density in the C2 zone corresponds to the R4 zone (400 square feet per unit).

The Proposed Project includes the demolition of the existing buildings on the Project Site and the construction of a 53-unit mixed-use apartment building, including six joint Live/Work units, with a

minimum of five units (11% of the base density) designated as "Very Low Income" restricted affordable units. The proposed structure would be five stories high (approximately 56 feet above grade). The proposed total floor area consists of 45,429 square feet for a 3 to 1 Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The Proposed Project includes up to 1,500 square feet of neighborhood serving commercial space and the remaining 43,920 square feet of floor area will contain residential units and amenities. The Proposed Project would include on level of fully automated parking with two racks.

# Floor Area And Height

Based on the maximum permitted floor area ratio of 1.5 to 1 in Height District 1VL in the C2 zone, the total permitted floor area is approximately 22,715 square feet. The Applicant is proposing to provide 11% of the Project's units as "Very Low Income" restricted affordable units, which grants a 35% density bonus. In accordance with LAMC 12.22.A.25(f)(4)(ii), the Applicant requests an incentive to increase maximum permitted floor area ratio to 3 to 1. The total maximum floor area with a 3 to 1 FAR is approximately 45,429 square feet. In accordance with the Density Bonus Ordinance in LAMC 12.22 A.25(g)(3), the Applicant requests an "off-menu" modification to increase the maximum height to 56 feet (an 11 foot increase) and 5 stories.

# Density

According to LAMC 12.22.C.16, the lot area for the purposes of calculating density includes one-half the alley. Including one-half of the adjacent alley area, the total lot area is 15,879 square feet. The C2 zone permits the minimum lot area per dwelling unit to be 400 square feet consistent with R4 Zone regulations. The base density of the Project Site is 39 residential apartment units (15,879/400 = 39.70). The Applicant is proposing to provide 11% of the Project's units as "Very Low Income" restricted affordable units, which permits a density bonus increase of 35% in accordance with the Density Bonus Ordinance in LAMC Sec. 12.22 A.25(c)(1), which grants a 35% Density Bonus for a project that provides 11% Very Low Income Units. A Density Bonus of 35% yields 14 additional units for a total of 53 units.

# Open Space

The Proposed Project will provide open space areas consisting of private open space on balconies and common open space areas, which includes a 3,520 rooftop deck and 920 square foot common outdoor terrace. Additionally, the Proposed Project includes an approximate 910 square foot residential amenity room on the ground floor. Additionally, the Proposed Project is required to provide 14 trees on the Project Site (one tree per four dwelling units). The Proposed Project will provide up to 27 trees on site. The Proposed Project would satisfy the minimum open space requirements of the LAMC. As summarized in Table II-3 of the Project Description, the Proposed Project will provide 5,600 square feet of open space.

# Parking

The Proposed Project would meet the minimum LAMC code requirements for on-site parking. Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A.25 (d)(1), the minimum number of residential parking spaces shall be provided at the following ratio: 1-bedroom units shall provide 1 stall for each unit and for 2 to 3 bedroom units, shall provide 2 stalls per unit. Therefore, the forty-seven proposed 1-bedroom units (including Live/Work units, studio units, and 1-bedroom units) would require 47 stalls and the six proposed 2-bedroom units would require 12 stalls for a total of 65 required off-street residential parking stalls. The commercial component of the Proposed Project would require parking at a maximum of four spaces for every 1,000 square feet, and as such six parking spaces would be required for such uses.

At maximum, the total required parking for the proposed project is 65 parking stalls. The Applicant proposes 80 parking stalls in a fully automated subterranean parking garage. The parking garage will have two parking bays and one automated lift. Each parking level will have two automated shuttles. Access to the automated parking bay is from the adjacent alley.

Bicycle parking is required in accordance with LAMC Section 12.21 A.16, including 5 short-term residential spaces (at 1 per 10 units) and 53 long-term residential spaces (at 1 per unit), for a total of 58 residential bicycle spaces. An additional 2 short-term (at 1 per 2,000 sf, minimum 2) and 2 long-term (at 1 per 2,000 sf minimum 2) commercial bicycle parking spaces are required for the 1,500 square feet of ground floor retail uses for a total of 62 bicycle spaces. The Proposed Project will meet this requirement by providing 7 short-term bicycle parking spaces (located within 50 feet of the main entrance to the building, as required) and 55 long-term bicycle parking spaces for a total of 62 bicycle parking spaces. A summary of the proposed parking plan is provided in Table II-4 of the Project Description.

# Regional and Local Plan Consistency

The Proposed Project would be in substantial compliance with local and regional plans applicable to the Project Site, including the City of Los Angeles General Plan, the West Los Angeles Community Plan, the 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), the Final 2010 Congestion Management Plan (CMP), and the 2016/2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). In addition to the requests for a Density Bonus of 35%, an "on-menu" incentive to increase the Floor Area Ratio to 3:1, and an off-menu incentive to permit a building height of five stories and 56 feet, the Applicant will request approvals and permits from the Department of Building and Safety (and other municipal agencies) for project construction activities that may include, but are not limited to the following: demolition, excavation, shoring, grading, foundation, haul route, building and tenant improvements. Upon granting these requests, land use impacts would be less than significant.

# c) Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

**No Impact.** A project-related significant adverse effect could occur if the Project Site were located within an area governed by a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. As discussed in Section IV(f) above, no such plans presently exist which govern any portion of the Project Site. Further, the Project Site is located in an area, which is already fully developed with commercial and residential uses, and is also within a heavily urbanized area of Los Angeles. Therefore the project would not have the potential to conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan and no impact would occur.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of any related project is expected to occur in accordance with adopted plans and regulations. It is also expected that most of the related projects would be compatible with the zoning and land use designations of each related project site and its existing surrounding uses. In addition, it is reasonable to assume that the projects under consideration in the surrounding area would implement and support local and regional planning goals and policies. Therefore, the Proposed Project's land use impacts would not be cumulatively considerable since the Proposed Project with applicable local or regional plans and the Proposed Project's land use impacts would be compared by the proposed Project's land use impacts would be compared by the proposed Project's land use impacts would not conflict with applicable local or regional plans and the Proposed Project's land use impacts would be compared by the proposed Project's land use impacts would be less than significant.

# XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

# a) Would the project 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.** A significant impact may occur if the Project Site is located in an area used or available for extraction of a regionally-important mineral resource, or if the project development would convert an existing or future regionally-important mineral extraction use to another use, or if the project development would affect access to a site used or potentially available for regionally-important mineral resource extraction. The determination of significance shall be made on a case-by-case basis considering: (a) whether, or the degree to which, the project might result in the permanent loss of, or loss of access to, a mineral resource that is located in a State Mining and Geology Board Mineral Resource Zone MRZ-2 zone or other known or potential mineral resource area, and (b) whether the mineral resource is of regional or statewide significance, or is noted in the Conservation Element as being of local importance. the Project Site is not located within a Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2) Area, an Oil Drilling/Surface

Mining Supplemental Use District, or an Oil Field/Drilling Area.<sup>26</sup> Therefore, no impact associated with the loss of availability of a known mineral resource would occur.

# b) Would the project 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.** A significant impact may occur if the Project Site is located in an area used or available for extraction of a regionally-important mineral resource, or if the development would convert an existing or future regionally-important mineral extraction use to another use, or if the development would affect access to a site used or potentially available for regionally-important mineral resource extraction. The Project Site is not located within a Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2) Area.<sup>27</sup> Therefore, no impact associated with the loss of availability of a known mineral resource would occur.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

**No Impact.** Development of the Proposed Project in combination with the related projects in the project vicinity would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or locally-important mineral resource recovery site. The Project Site, and the surrounding urbanized area, are not zoned for extraction of a mineral resource, and would not convert an existing or future mineral extraction use to another use. Therefore, no cumulative impact would occur.

### XII. NOISE

### Fundamentals of Noise

Sound is technically described in terms of amplitude (loudness) and frequency (pitch). The standard unit of sound amplitude measurement is the decibel (dB). The decibel scale is a logarithmic scale that describes the physical intensity of the pressure vibrations that make up any sound. The pitch of the sound is related to the frequency of the pressure vibration. Since the human ear is not equally sensitive to a given sound level at all frequencies, a special frequency-dependent rating scale has been devised to relate noise to human sensitivity. The A-weighted decibel scale (dBA) provides this compensation by discriminating against frequencies in a manner approximating the sensitivity of the human ear.

Noise, on the other hand, is typically defined as unwanted sound. A typical noise environment consists of a base of steady "background" noise that is the sum of many distant and indistinguishable noise sources.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Environmental and Public Facilities Maps, September 1996.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: Areas Containing Significant Mineral Deposits in the City of Los Angeles, September 1996.

Superimposed on this background noise is the sound from individual local sources. These can vary from an occasional aircraft or train passing by to virtually continuous noise from, for example, traffic on a major highway.

Several rating scales have been developed to analyze the adverse effect of community noise on people. Since environmental noise fluctuates over time, these scales consider that the effect of noise upon people is largely dependent upon the total acoustical energy content of the noise, as well as the time of day when the noise occurs. Those that are applicable to this analysis are as follows:

- L<sub>eq</sub> An L<sub>eq</sub>, or equivalent energy noise level, is the average acoustic energy content of noise for a stated period of time. Thus, the L<sub>eq</sub> of a time-varying noise and that of a steady noise are the same if they deliver the same acoustic energy to the ear during exposure. For evaluating community impacts, this rating scale does not vary, regardless of whether the noise occurs during the day or the night.
- L<sub>max</sub> The maximum instantaneous noise level experienced during a given period of time.
- $L_{min}$  The minimum instantaneous noise level experienced during a given period of time.
- CNEL The Community Noise Equivalent Level is a 24-hour average  $L_{eq}$  with a 5 dBA "weighting" during the hours of 7:00 P.M. to 10:00 P.M. and a 10 dBA "weighting" added to noise during the hours of 10:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M. to account for noise sensitivity in the evening and nighttime, respectively. The logarithmic effect of these additions is that a 60 dBA 24 hour  $L_{eq}$  would result in a measurement of 66.7 dBA CNEL.

Noise environments and consequences of human activities are usually well represented by median noise levels during the day, night, or over a 24-hour period. For residential uses, environmental noise levels are generally considered low when the CNEL is below 60 dBA, moderate in the 60–70 dBA range, and high above 70 dBA. Noise levels greater than 85 dBA can cause temporary or permanent hearing loss. Examples of low daytime levels are isolated, natural settings with noise levels as low as 20 dBA and quiet suburban residential streets with noise levels around 40 dBA. Noise levels above 45 dBA at night can disrupt sleep. Examples of moderate level noise environments are urban residential or semi-commercial areas (typically 55–60 dBA) and commercial locations (typically 60 dBA). People may consider louder environments adverse, but most will accept the higher levels associated with more noisy urban residential or residential areas (60–75 dBA) or dense urban or industrial areas (65–80 dBA).

It is widely accepted that in the community noise environment the average healthy ear can barely perceive CNEL noise level changes of 3 dBA. CNEL changes from 3 to 5 dBA may be noticed by some individuals who are extremely sensitive to changes in noise. A 5 dBA CNEL increase is readily noticeable, while the human ear perceives a 10 dBA CNEL increase as a doubling of sound.

Noise levels from a particular source generally decline as distance to the receptor increases. Other factors, such as the weather and reflecting or barriers, also help intensify or reduce the noise level at any given location. A commonly used rule of thumb for roadway noise is that for every doubling of distance from the source, the noise level is reduced by about 3 dBA at acoustically "hard" locations (i.e., the area between the noise source and the receptor is nearly complete asphalt, concrete, hard-packed soil, or other solid materials) and 4.5 dBA at acoustically "soft" locations (i.e., the area between the source and receptor is normal earth or has vegetation, including grass). Noise from stationary or point sources is reduced by about 6 to 7.5 dBA for every doubling of distance at acoustically hard and soft locations, respectively. In addition, noise levels are also generally reduced by 1 dBA for each 1,000 feet of distance due to air absorption. Noise levels may also be reduced by intervening structures – generally, a single row of buildings between the receptor and the noise source reduces the noise level by about 5 dBA, while a solid wall or berm reduces noise levels by 5 to 10 dBA. The normal noise attenuation within residential structures with open windows is about 17 dBA, while the noise attenuation with closed windows is about 25 dBA.<sup>28</sup>

### Ambient Noise Levels

To assess the existing ambient noise conditions in the Project area, ambient noise measurements were taken with a Larson Davis 831 sound level meter, which conforms to industry standards set forth in ANSI S1.4-1983 (R2001) - American National Standard Specification for Sound Level Meters. Figure III-1, Noise Monitoring and Sensitive Receptor Location Map, depicts the noise measurement locations fronting the adjacent residential uses as the most likely sensitive receptors to experience noise level increases during construction. The detailed noise monitoring data are presented in Appendix G, Noise Monitoring Data, and are summarized in Table III-10, Existing Ambient Daytime Noise Levels in Project Site Vicinity. As shown in Table III-10, the ambient noise in the vicinity of the Project Site ranges from 69.7 to 72.6 L<sub>eq</sub>. The maximum noise level during the two 15-minute recordings was 93.5 dB L<sub>max</sub>. The primary noise source at Location 1 was heavy vehicle traffic including buses and delivery trucks along Santa Monica Boulevard. Residential activity and vehicle activity contributed to the ambient noise levels at Location 2. Pedestrian traffic also contributed to the ambient noise levels, though to a lesser extent than the vehicle noise. The Project Site is currently occupied by three vacant commercial properties and an active auto body shop.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 117, Highway Noise: A Design Guide for Highway Engineers, 1971.

			Noise Level Statistics a				
No.	Location	Primary Noise Sources	$L_{eq}$	L <sub>min</sub>	L <sub>max</sub>		
1	Southwest corner of Project Site on	Heavy vehicular traffic, buses/bus stop,	72.6	58.7	82.1		
1	north side of Santa Monica Boulevard	pedestrian activity.					
2	Northeast corner of Project Site along	Vahiela traffic, light padastrian activity	69.7	56.3	93.5		
Δ.	west side of Barrington Avenue	venicie traffic, light pedestrian activity.					
<sup>a</sup> Noise measurements were taken on Wednesday February 10, 2016 at each location for a duration of 15 minutes.							
See Appendix G of this IS/MND for noise monitoring data sheets.							

 Table III-10

 Existing Ambient Daytime Noise Levels in Project Site Vicinity

### Sensitive Receptors

Several noise sensitive land uses are located adjacent to and in the vicinity of the Proposed Project. For purposes of assessing noise impacts on sensitive populations, the following sensitive receptors within 500 feet of the Project Site were identified:

- 1. 1507 S. Barrington Avenue, (single-family residence immediately north of Project Site);
- 2. 11706 11712 W. Ohio Avenue, (single-family residences south of W. Ohio Avenue);
- 3. 11722 W. Ohio Avenue (multi-family residential building, northwest of Project Site);
- 4. 1506-1510 S. Barrington Avenue and 11680 W. Ohio Avenue (multi-family residential buildings);
- 5. 11651-11727 W. Ohio Avenue (multi- and single-family residential buildings north of Ohio Avenue);
- 6. University High School, located at 11800 Texas Avenue; and
- 7. Multi-family residential buildings south of Santa Monica Boulevard fronting Stoner Avenue and S. Barrington Avenue.

The identified sensitive receptors within close proximity are located to the northwest, north, and northeast of the Project Site. The locations of these land uses relative to the Project Site are depicted in Figure III-1, Noise Monitoring and Sensitive Receptor Location Map. For purposes of assessing construction-generated vibration impacts, the single family residence immediately abutting the Project Site to the north (1507 S. Barrington Avenue) and the commercial building to the west of the Project Site across the alleyway (11717 W. Santa Monica Boulevard) were identified as buildings that are potentially susceptible to vibration impacts.



Source: Google Earth, Aerial View, 2016



a) Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project would generate excess noise that would cause the ambient noise environment at the Project Site to exceed noise level standards set forth in the City of Los Angeles General Plan Noise Element (Noise Element) and the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance (Noise Ordinance). Development of the Proposed Project would result in an increase in ambient noise levels during both construction and operation, as discussed in further detail below.

# Construction Noise

Construction-related noise impacts upon adjacent land uses would be significant if, as indicated in LAMC Section 112.05, noise from construction equipment within 500 feet of a residential zone exceeds 75 dBA at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source. However, the above noise limitation does not apply where compliance is technically infeasible. Technically infeasible means that the above noise limitation cannot be complied with despite the use of mufflers, shields, sound barriers and/or any other noise reduction device or techniques during the operation of the equipment. Additionally, as defined in the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* for construction noise impacts, a significant impact would occur if construction activities lasting more than one day would increase the ambient noise levels by 10 dBA or more at any off-site noise-sensitive location. Furthermore, the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* also states that construction activities lasting more than ten days in a three-month period, which would increase ambient exterior noise levels by 5 dBA or more at a noise sensitive use, would also normally result in a significant impact.

Construction of the Proposed Project would require the use of heavy equipment for demolition/site clearing, grading, the installation of utilities, and building construction. During each construction phase, there would be a different mix of equipment operating and noise levels would vary based on the amount of equipment in operation and the location of each activity. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has compiled data regarding the noise generating characteristics of specific types of construction equipment and typical construction activities. The data pertaining to the types of construction equipment and activities that would occur at the Project Site are presented in Table III-11, Typical Outdoor Construction Noise Levels, respectively, at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source (i.e., reference distance).

The noise levels shown in Table III-11 represent composite noise levels associated with typical construction activities, which take into account both the number of pieces and spacing of heavy
- <b>JF</b>							
Construction Phase	Noise Levels at 50 Feet with Mufflers (dBA L <sub>eq</sub> )	Noise Levels at 60 Feet with Mufflers (dBA L <sub>eq</sub> )	Noise Levels at 100 Feet with Mufflers (dBA L <sub>eq</sub> )	Noise Levels at 200 Feet with Mufflers (dBA L <sub>eq</sub> )			
Ground Clearing	82	80	76	70			
Excavation, Grading	86	84	80	74			
Foundations	77	75	71	65			
Structural	83	81	77	71			
Finishing	86	84	80	74			
Source: United States Environmental Protection Agency, Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment and Home Appliances, PB 206717, 1971.							

 Table III-11

 Typical Outdoor Construction Noise Levels

construction equipment that are typically used during each phase of construction. Construction noise during the heavier initial periods of construction could be expected to be 86 dBA Leq when measured at a reference distance of 50 feet from the center of construction activity.<sup>29</sup> These noise levels would diminish rapidly with distance from the construction site at a rate of approximately 6 dBA per doubling of distance. For example, a noise level of 84 dBA Leq measured at 50 feet from the noise source to the receptor would reduce to 78 dBA Leq at 100 feet from the source to the receptor, and reduce by another 6 dBA Leq to 72 dBA Leq at 200 feet from the source to the receptor. Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would be expected to generate similar noise levels to those shown in Table III-11, below during the approximate 13-month construction period.

As set forth in the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a significant construction noise impact would occur if construction activities lasting more than one day would increase the ambient noise levels by 10 dBA or more at any off-site noise-sensitive location. Construction activities lasting more than ten days in a three-month period, which would increase ambient exterior noise levels by 5 dBA or more at a noise sensitive use, would also normally result in a significant impact. Since construction activities associated with the proposed development at the Project Site would last for more than ten days in a three-month period, is possible that the Proposed Project could cause a significant noise impact during construction if the ambient exterior noise levels at the identified off-site sensitive receptors increase by 5 dBA or more. The ambient exterior noise levels at the identified off-site sensitive receptors would likely be exceeded by 5 dBA or more on a temporary and intermittent basis during the construction period. Thus, based on criteria established in the *L.A. CEQA Threshold Guide*, a substantial temporary or periodic

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> Although the peak noise levels generated by certain construction equipment may be greater than 86 dBA at a distance of 50 feet, the equivalent noise level would be approximately 86 dBA  $L_{eq}$  (i.e., the equipment does not operate at the peak noise level over the entire duration).

increase in ambient noise levels would occur at the identified off-site sensitive receptors.

The City of Los Angeles Building Regulations Ordinance No. 178048 requires a construction site notice to be provided that includes the following information: job site address, permit number, name and phone number of the contractor and owner or owner's agent, hours of construction allowed by code or any discretionary approval for the site, and City telephone numbers where violations can be reported. The notice is required to be posted and maintained at the construction site prior to the start of construction and displayed in a location that is readily visible to the public. Pursuant to LAMC Section 41.40, exterior demolition and construction activities that generate noise are prohibited between the hours of 9:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. Monday through Friday, and between 6:00 P.M. and 8:00 A.M. on Saturday. Demolition and construction are prohibited on Sundays and all federal holidays. The construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would comply with these LAMC requirements. Mitigation Measure N-1 would further restrict the permissible hours of construction to the hours of 7:00 am to 6:00 pm Monday through Friday, and 8:00 am to 6:00 pm on Saturday. In accordance with LAMC Section 112.05, construction noise levels are considered exempt from the 75 dBA noise threshold if all technically feasible noise attenuation measures are implemented.

Although the estimated construction-related noise levels associated with the Proposed Project would exceed the numerical noise threshold of 75 dBA at 50 feet from the noise source as outlined in the City Noise Ordinance, and the typical construction noise levels associated with the Proposed Project would exceed the existing ambient noise levels at all of the identified off-site sensitive receptors by more than the 5 dBA threshold established by the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* during all construction phases, implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the noise levels associated with construction of the Proposed Project to the maximum extent that is technically feasible. Implementation of noise control measures such as temporary noise barriers or sound blankets around the noise generating equipment would be capable of attenuating the noise level by approximately 10 dBA. Thus, based on the provisions set forth in LAMC 112.05, implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-NOISE-1 would ensure impacts associated with construction-related noise levels are mitigated to the maximum extent feasible, and temporary construction-related noise impacts would be considered less than significant in accordance with City requirements and standards.

#### **Mitigation Measures:**

#### MM-NOISE-1 Increased Noise Levels (Demolition, Grading, and Construction Activities)

- Construction and demolition shall be restricted to the hours of 7:00 am to 6:00 pm Monday through Friday, and 8:00 am to 6:00 pm on Saturday.
- To the maximum extent practical, demolition and construction activities shall be scheduled so as to avoid operating several pieces of equipment simultaneously, which causes high noise levels.

- The project contractor shall use power construction equipment with technically feasible noise shielding and muffling devices.
- The project contractor shall install a temporary noise barrier around the perimeter of the Project Site throughout the duration of the construction period.

#### **Operational** Noise

# HVAC Equipment Noise

Upon completion and operation of the Proposed Project, on-site operational noise would be generated by heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment installed on the new structures. However, the noise levels generated by these equipment types are not anticipated to be substantially greater than those generated by the current HVAC equipment serving the existing building on the Project Site and the residential buildings in the Project vicinity. As such, the HVAC equipment associated with the Proposed Project would not represent a new source of noise in the Project Site vicinity. In addition, the operation of this and any other on-site stationary sources of noise would be required to comply with the LAMC Section 112.02, which prohibits noise from air conditioning, refrigeration, heating, pumping, and filtering equipment from exceeding the ambient noise level on the premises of other occupied properties by more than five decibels.

### Noise from Mixed Use Commercial and Residential Land Uses

Due to the mixed-use nature of the Proposed Project, noise generated from the operation of proposed commercial uses on the ground floor have the potential to impact the proposed residential uses. In order to ensure that on-site residences would not be adversely impacted by ambient urban noise levels, dwelling units associated with the Proposed Project would be constructed in accordance with Title 24 insulation standards of the California Code of Regulations for residential buildings, which serves to provide an acceptable interior noise environment for sensitive uses. With implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-NOISE-2, impacts associated with interior noise levels at the proposed residences would be less than significant.

#### **Mitigation Measures:**

#### MM-NOISE-2 Increased Noise Levels (Mixed-Use Development)

• Wall and floor-ceiling assemblies separating commercial tenant spaces, residential units, and public places, shall have a Sound Transmission Coefficient (STC) value of at least 50, as determined in accordance with ASTM E90 and ASTM E413.

# b) Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** Vibration is sound radiated through the ground. Vibration can result from a source (e.g., subway operations, vehicles, machinery equipment, etc.) causing the adjacent ground to move, thereby creating vibration waves that propagate through the soil to the foundations of nearby buildings. This effect is referred to as groundborne vibration. The peak particle velocity (PPV) or the root mean square (RMS) velocity is usually used to describe vibration levels. PPV is defined as the maximum instantaneous peak of the vibration level and is typically used for evaluating potential building damage. RMS is defined as the square root of the average of the squared amplitude of the level. RMS velocity in decibels (VdB) is typically more suitable for evaluating human response.

The background vibration velocity level in residential areas is usually around 50 VdB. The vibration velocity level threshold of perception for humans is approximately 65 VdB. A vibration velocity level of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels for most people. Most perceptible indoor vibration is caused by sources within buildings such as operation of mechanical equipment, movement of people, or the slamming of doors. Typical outdoor sources of perceptible groundborne vibration are construction equipment, steel-wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads. If a roadway is smooth, the groundborne vibration from traffic is rarely perceptible. The range of interest is from approximately 50 VdB, which is the typical background vibration velocity level, to 100 VdB, which is the general threshold where minor damage can occur in fragile buildings.

# Construction

Excavation and earthwork activities for the Proposed Project have the potential to generate low levels of groundborne vibration. The operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that propagate through the ground and diminishes in intensity with distance from the source. Vibration impacts can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibration at moderate levels, to slight damage of buildings at the highest levels. Thus, construction activities associated with the Proposed Project could have an adverse impact on both sensitive structures (i.e., building damage) and populations (i.e., annoyance).

For purposes of addressing construction-related vibration impacts on buildings, the City of Los Angeles has not adopted any policies or guidelines relative to groundborne vibration impacts. While the Los Angeles County Code (LACC Section 12.08.350) states a presumed perception threshold of 0.01 inch per second RMS, this threshold applies to groundborne vibrations from long-term operational activities, not construction. Consequently, as both the City of Los Angeles and the County of Los Angeles do not have a significance threshold to assess vibration impacts during construction, the FTA and Caltrans adopted vibration standards for buildings which are used to evaluate potential impacts related to project construction. This analysis uses the Caltrans adopted vibration standards for buildings. Based on Caltrans

criteria, construction impacts relative to structural damage from groundborne vibration would be considered significant if the following thresholds were to occur as shown in Table III-12 below.

	Maximum PPV (in/sec)						
Threshold Criteria	<b>Transient Sources</b>	Continuous/Frequent Intermittent Sources					
Structure and Condition							
Extremely fragile historic buildings, ruins, ancient monuments	0.12	0.08					
Fragile buildings	0.2	0.1					
Historic and some old buildings	0.5	0.25					
Older residential structures	0.5	0.3					
New residential structures	1.0	0.5					
Modern industrial/commercial buildings	2.0	0.5					
Source: California Department of Transportation, Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual, Chapter 7: Vibration Prediction and Screening Assessment for Construction Equipment, Table 19. September 2013.							

Table III-12Vibration Damage Potential Threshold Criteria

For purposes of addressing vibration impacts relative to human annoyance, the following analysis relies on the FTA's vibration impact thresholds, which are 80 VdB and above at residences and buildings where people normally sleep (e.g., nearby residences) and 83 VdB and above at institutional buildings, which includes schools and churches. No thresholds have been adopted or recommended for commercial and office uses.

Table III-13, Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment, identifies various PPV and RMS velocity (in VdB) levels for the types of construction equipment that would operate at the Project Site during construction. As shown in Table III-13, vibration velocities could range from 0.003 to 0.089 inch/sec PPV at 25 feet from the source activity, with corresponding vibration levels ranging from 58 VdB to 87 VdB at 25 feet from the source activity, depending on the type of construction equipment in use.

	1 1									
Fauinment	Approximate PPV (in/sec)					Approximate RMS (VdB)				
Equipment	25 Feet	50 Feet	60 Feet	75 Feet	100 Feet	25 Feet	50 Feet	60 Feet	75 Feet	100 Feet
Large Bulldozer	0.089	0.031	0.024	0.017	0.011	87	78	76	73	69
Caisson Drilling	0.089	0.031	0.024	0.017	0.011	87	78	76	73	69
Loaded Trucks	0.076	0.027	0.020	0.015	0.010	86	77	75	72	68
Jackhammer	0.035	0.012	0.009	0.007	0.004	79	70	68	65	61
Small Bulldozer	0.003	0.001	0.0008	0.0006	0.0004	58	49	47	44	40
Source: Federal Transi	it Adminis	tration, Tr	ransit Nois	e and Vibr	ation Impa	ct Assessn	nent, Fina	l Report,	2006.	

 Table III-13

 Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

To assess the construction vibration impacts on buildings, there are two identified adjacent structures in the Project vicinity that would be exposed to vibration damage. The vibration impacts on adjacent structures are shown in Table III-14, Project Vibration Impacts on Adjacent Structures. The single-family home north of the Project Site, located at 1507 S. Barrington Avenue, and the commercial property to the west, located at 11717 W. Santa Monica Boulevard, are observed to be older buildings that could be susceptible to damage during construction. As shown in Table III-14, the construction phase of the Proposed Project would not have the potential to exceed the PPV ground-borne vibration level for the properties surrounding the Project Site. Therefore, the Proposed Project's groundborne vibration and impacts upon buildings would be less than significant.

Table III-14Project Vibration Impacts on Adjacent Structures

Adjacent Structure	Distance to Construction	Maximum Vibration Level during Construction (in/sec)	Vibration Threshold (in/sec) <sup>a</sup>	Significant Impact?			
<ol> <li>1507 S. Barrington Ave. (Single-family residence)</li> </ol>	10	0.24	0.3	No			
<ol> <li>11717 W. Santa Monica Blvd. (Commercial Building)</li> </ol>	15	0.16	0.25	No			
(Commercial Building)       Notes: in/sec = inches per second         Source:       a         California Department of Transportation, Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual, Chapter 7: Vibration Prediction and Screening Assessment for Construction Equipment, Table 19. September 2013.         It should be noted that the peak vibration levels at the nearby sensitive receptors during Project construction represents the highest composite vibration level that would be generated periodically during a worst-case construction activity and does not represent continuous vibration levels occurring the construction day or pariod.							

In terms of human annoyance resulting from vibration generated during construction, residents in the sensitive receptors previously identified in this section could be exposed to increased vibration levels on a

temporary and intermittent basis during the construction period, especially for the residents abutting the Project Site to the north and northwest. Due to the close proximity, the residents in the single-family home immediately abutting the Project Site to the north and the residents in the multi-family building to the northwest would most likely experience vibration impacts above the 80 VdB threshold from the Project's construction. Implementation of the measures identified under MM-NOISE-1 would serve to reduce construction related vibration levels to the maximum extent feasible, and thus would reduce the annoyance factor to an acceptable level. Furthermore, all construction activity would be restricted to the hours of 7:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. Monday through Friday, and 8:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. on Saturday. Because any vibration level increases experienced at the residential uses in close proximity to the Project Site would occur during the acceptable time periods for construction activities, and would only occur on a temporary and intermittent basis during the construction period, impacts associated with groundborne vibration would be mitigated to less than significant levels.

#### **O**peration

The Proposed Project is a mixed-use development and would not involve the use of stationary equipment that would result in high vibration levels. Although groundborne vibration at the Project Site and immediate vicinity may currently result from heavy-duty vehicular travel (e.g., refuse trucks and transit buses) on Santa Monica Boulevard and Barrington Avenue, the proposed land uses would not result in a substantial increased in the use of these heavy-duty vehicles on the public roadways. While refuse trucks would be used for the removal of solid waste at the Project Site, these trips would typically only occur once a week and would not be any different than those presently occurring in the vicinity of the Project Site. As such, vibration impacts associated with operation of the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

# c) Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project were to result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels above existing ambient noise levels without the Proposed Project. As defined in the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* threshold for operational noise impacts, a project would normally have a significant impact on noise levels from Proposed Project operations if the Proposed Project causes the ambient noise level measured at the property line of affected uses that are shown in Table III-15, Community Noise Exposure (CNEL), to increase by 3 dBA in CNEL to or within the "normally unacceptable" or "clearly unacceptable" category, or any 5 dBA or greater noise increase. Thus, a significant impact would occur if noise levels associated with operation of the Proposed Project would be at least 70 dBA CNEL. In addition, any long-term increase of 5 dBA CNEL or more is considered to cause a significant impact. Generally, in order to achieve a 3 dBA CNEL increase in ambient noise from traffic, the volume on any given roadway would need to double. In addition to analyzing potential impacts in terms of CNEL, the analysis also addresses increases in on-site noise sources per the

provisions of the LAMC, which establishes a  $L_{eq}$  standard of 5 dBA over ambient conditions as constituting a LAMC violation.

### **Operational Noise**

### Traffic Noise

According to the L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide, if a project would result in traffic that is less than double the existing traffic, then the Proposed Project's mobile noise impacts can be assumed to be less than significant. In order for a new noise source to be audible, there would need to be a 3 dBA or greater CNEL noise increase. The existing traffic volumes would need to double with the development of a project in order for traffic noise to increase by 3 dBA CNEL. The Proposed Project would increase traffic volumes on the surrounding roadways, which in turn has the potential to increase roadway noise. According to the Trip Generation Analysis, prepared by Crain & Associates, the proposed development would result in a slightly higher vehicle trip compared to the existing trips generated from the Project Site. The Proposed Project would not have the potential to double the traffic volumes on any of the surrounding intersections or roadways within the Project vicinity. As such, the Proposed Project would not have the potential to double the existing traffic volumes or increase roadway noise levels by 3 dBA, and thus traffic generated noise impacts would be considered less than significant.

#### Stationary Noise Sources

New stationary sources of noise, such as mechanical HVAC equipment would be installed for the proposed residences at the Project Site. As discussed in Question XI(a) above, the design of this equipment would be required to comply with LAMC Section 112.02, which prohibits noise from air conditioning, refrigeration, heating, pumping, and filtering equipment from exceeding the ambient noise level on the premises of other occupied properties by more than five decibels. Thus, because the noise levels generated by the HVAC equipment serving the Proposed Project would not be allowed to exceed the ambient noise level by five decibels on the premises of the adjacent properties, a substantial permanent increase in noise levels would not occur at the nearby sensitive receptors. This impact would be less than significant.

Land Use	Normally Acceptable <sup>a</sup>	Conditionally Acceptable <sup>b</sup>	Normally Unacceptable <sup>c</sup>	Clearly Unacceptable <sup>d</sup>
Single-family, Duplex, Mobile Homes	50 - 60	55 - 70	70 - 75	above 75
Multi-Family Homes	50 - 65	60 - 70	70 - 75	above 75
Schools, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals, Nursing Homes	50 - 70	60 - 70	70 - 80	above 80
Transient Lodging – Motels, Hotels	50 - 65	60 - 70	70 - 80	above 75
Auditoriums, Concert Halls, Amphitheaters		50 - 70		above 70
Sports Arena, Outdoor Spectator Sports		50 - 75		above 75
Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks	50 - 70		67 - 75	above 75
Golf Courses, Riding Stables, Water Recreation, Cemeteries	50 - 75		70 - 80	above 80
Office Buildings, Business and Professional Commercial	50 - 70	67 - 77	above 75	
Industrial, Manufacturing, Utilities, Agriculture	50 - 75	70 - 80	above 75	

Table III-15Community Noise Exposure (CNEL)

<sup>a</sup> <u>Normally Acceptable</u>: Specified land use is satisfactory, based upon the assumption that any buildings involved are of normal conventional construction without any special noise insulation requirements.

<sup>b</sup> <u>Conditionally Acceptable</u>: New construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features included in the design. Conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning will normally suffice.

<sup>c</sup> <u>Normally Unacceptable</u>: New construction or development should generally be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design.

<sup>d</sup> <u>Clearly Unacceptable</u>: New construction or development should generally not be undertaken.

Source: Office of Planning and Research, State of California Genera Plan Guidelines, October 2003 (in coordination with the California Department of Health Services); City of Los Angeles, General Plan Noise Element, adopted February 1999.

# d) Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project were to result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels above existing ambient noise levels without the Proposed Project. As defined in the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* for construction noise impacts, a significant impact would occur if construction activities lasting more than one day would increase the ambient noise levels by 10 dBA or more at any off-site noise-sensitive location. In addition, the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* also states that construction activities lasting more than ten days in a three-month period, which would increase ambient

exterior noise levels by 5 dBA or more at a noise sensitive use, would also normally result in a significant impact. As discussed above, impacts are expected to be mitigated to less than significant levels for construction noise and vibration, and operational noise and vibration. Implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-NOISE-1 and MM-NOISE-2 would ensure the Proposed Project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity, and these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

# e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project were located within an airport land use plan and would introduce substantial new sources of noise or substantially add to existing sources of noise within or in the vicinity of the Project Site. The closest airport to the Project Site is the Santa Monica Municipal Airport located approximately 1.7 miles south of the Project Site. The Project Site is not located within any airport land use plan or airport hazard zone. The Proposed Project would not significantly expose people to excessive noise levels associated with airport uses. Therefore, no impact would occur.

# f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

**No Impact.** This question would apply to a project only if it were in the vicinity of a private airstrip and would subject area residents and workers to a safety hazard. The Project Site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. As no such facilities are located in the vicinity of the Project Site, no impact would occur.

# **Cumulative Impacts**

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the Proposed Project in conjunction with any related project in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site would result in an increase in construction-related and traffic-related noise as well as on-site stationary noise sources in the already urbanized area of the City of Los Angeles. The Project Applicant has no control over the timing or sequencing of related projects that are proposed within the project study area. Therefore, any quantitative analysis that assumes multiple, concurrent construction projects would be speculative. Construction-period noise for the Proposed Project and each related project (that has not yet been built) would be localized. In addition, each of the related projects would be required to comply with the City's noise ordinance, as well as mitigation measures that may be prescribed pursuant to CEQA provisions that require potentially significant impacts to be reduced to the extent feasible. Thus, the cumulative impact associated with construction noise would be less than significant.

With respect to cumulative operational noise impacts, each of the related projects would be required to comply with LAMC Section 112.02, which prohibits noise from air conditioning, refrigeration, heating, pumping, and filtering equipment from exceeding the ambient noise level on the premises of other occupied properties by more than five decibels. Nevertheless, the siting and development of related projects would be subject to further CEQA review and evaluated on a case-by-case basis. As such, the Proposed Project's noise volumes would not be cumulatively considerable. Cumulative noise impacts would be less than significant.

# XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

a) Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project would locate new development such as homes, businesses, or infrastructure, with the effect of substantially inducing growth in the Proposed area that would otherwise not have occurred as rapidly or in as great a magnitude. The Proposed Project is an infill development project located in an area that is currently developed and served by local and regional infrastructure including public roads, public utilities (sewers, water, natural gas, electricity), services (fire, police, schools, parks), and public transit. As shown in Table III-16, SCAG SCAG Population and Housing Projections, below, the forecast from 2012 through 2040 envisions growth of 763,900 additional persons, yielding an approximate 20% percent growth rate.

SCAG I opulation and housing i rojections								
Projection Year	Population	Households	Person/Households					
2012	3,845,500	1,325,500	2.90					
2040	4,609,400	1,690,300	2.73					
	Net Change from 2012 to 2	2040						
No. of Population/Households	763,900	364,800						
Percent Change	20%	28%						
Source: SCAG, SCAG, 2016-2040 R April 2016.	Source: SCAG, SCAG, 2016-2040 RTP/SCS Growth Forecast, Demographics and Growth Forecast Appendix, adopted April 2016.							

Table III-16SCAG Population and Housing Projections

Based on the community's current household demographics (e.g., an average of 1.85 persons per multifamily household for the West Los Angeles Community Plan area), the construction of 53 additional residential dwelling units would result in an increase in approximately 98 net permanent residents in the City of Los Angeles.<sup>30</sup>

The proposed increase in housing units and population would be consistent with SCAG's forecast of 364,800 additional households and approximately 763,900 persons in the City of Los Angeles between 2012 and 2040. As such, the Proposed Project would not cause growth (i.e., new housing or employment generators) or accelerate development in an undeveloped area that exceeds projected/planned levels for the year of Proposed Project occupancy/buildout, and that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment; or introduce unplanned infrastructure that was not previously evaluated in the adopted Community Plan or General Plan. Therefore, impacts related to housing would be less than significant.

# b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project would result in the displacement of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The Proposed Project would consist of the development of new housing on a site that is currently occupied by commercial and automotive repair uses. No displacement of existing housing would occur with the Proposed Project. Thus, no impact would occur.

# c) Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

**No Impact.** The Proposed Project would consist of the development of new housing uses on a site that is currently occupied by commercial and automotive repair uses. No displacement of existing housing would occur with the Proposed Project. Therefore, no impact would occur.

# **Cumulative Impacts**

Less Than Significant Impact. The construction of related projects would introduce additional development to the City of Los Angeles. As discussed in Question XIII(a), the Proposed Project would not exceed the growth projections of SCAG's RTP/SCS for the City of Los Angeles. Furthermore, the Proposed Project is the type of project encouraged by SCAG and City policies to accommodate growth in urban centers that are close to existing employment centers and mass transit. Because the Proposed Project would not displace any residents, and the population growth potentially associated with the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup> Based on a generation rate of 1.85 residents per dwelling unit. Los Angeles Department of City Planning Demographic Research Unit, Local Estimates (Effective October 1, 2009), West Los Angeles Community Plan Area, website: http://planning.lacity.org/DRU/Locl/LocFrame.cfm?geo=CP&loc=WLA&sgo=ct&rpt=PnH&yrx=Y09, accessed March 2016.

Proposed Project has already been anticipated and planned for within the West Los Angeles Community Plan area, the Proposed Project's population growth would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the Proposed Project's contribution to cumulative population and housing growth would be less than significant.

### XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government 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 objective for fire protection?

#### Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.

#### Construction

Construction of the Proposed Project would increase the potential for accidental on-site fires from the operation of construction equipment and the use of flammable construction materials. The implementation of best management practices (BMPs) for the operation of mechanical equipment and the use of flammable construction materials by construction contractors and work crews would minimize fire hazards associated with the construction of the Proposed Project. The BMPs that would be implemented during construction of the Project would include: keeping mechanical equipment in good operating condition, and as required by law, carefully storing flammable materials in appropriate containers, and the immediate and complete cleanup of spills of flammable materials when they occur.

Construction activities also have the potential to affect fire protection services, such as emergency vehicle response times, by adding construction traffic to the street network and potentially requiring partial lane closures during street improvements and utility installations. Thus, construction could have the potential to adversely affect fire access. However, these impacts are considered to be less than significant because emergency access would be maintained to the Project Site during construction through marked emergency access points approved by the LAFD, construction impacts are temporary in nature and do not cause lasting effects, and no complete lane closures are anticipated. Additionally, if any partial street closures are required, flagmen would be used to facilitate the traffic flow until construction is complete.

#### **O**peration

Based on the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have a significant impact on fire protection if it requires the addition of a new fire station or the expansion, consolidation or relocation of an existing facility to maintain service. Section 15382 of the CEQA guidelines defines "significant effect on the environment" as "a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical

conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant." Thus, the addition of a new fire station or the expansion, consolidation or relocation of an existing facility to maintain service would only be considered significant if such activities result in a physical adverse impact upon the environment.

The City of Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) considers fire protection services for a project adequate if a project is within the maximum response distance for the land use proposed. Pursuant to Section 57.09.07A of the LAMC, the maximum response distance between residential land uses and a LAFD fire station that houses an engine or truck company is 1.5 miles. If the distance is exceeded, all structures located in the applicable residential or commercial area would be required to install automatic fire sprinkler systems. With such systems installed, fire protection would be considered adequate even if the project is located beyond the maximum response distance.

The Proposed Project would include up to 53 dwelling units and up to 1,500 square feet of ground floor retail and would generate approximately 98 new residents and 3 employees.<sup>31</sup> The Proposed Project would increase the utilization of the Project Site, which is occupied by commercial and automotive repair uses. The Proposed Project would potentially increase the demand for LAFD services. The Project Site is served by LAFD Station No. 59, located at 11505 Olympic Boulevard, which is approximately 1.3 miles (driving distance) south of the Project Site. Based on the response distance criteria specified in LAMC 57.09.07A and the relatively short distance from Fire Station No. 59 to the Project Site, fire protection response would be considered adequate. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-PS-1 below, would ensure impacts upon fire services are reduced to less than significant levels.

#### **Mitigation Measures:**

#### MM-PS-1 (Fire)

The recommendations of the Fire Department relative to fire safety shall be incorporated into the building plans, which includes the submittal of a plot plan for approval by the Fire Department either prior to the recordation of a final map or the approval of a building permit. The plot plan shall include the following minimum design features: fire lanes, where required, shall be a minimum of 20 feet in width; all structures must be within 300 feet of an

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> Based on a generation rate of 1.85 residents per dwelling unit. Los Angeles Department of City Planning Demographic Research Unit, Local Estimates (Effective October 1, 2009), West Los Angeles Community Plan Area. Based on a generation rate of 588 square feet per employee. San Diego Association of Governments, Building Area Per Employee By Business Type, Neighborhood Retail. 2008.

approved fire hydrant, and entrances to any dwelling units or guest room shall not be more than 150 feet in distance in horizontal travel from the edge of the roadway of an improved street or approved fire lane.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

Less Than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project, in combination with related projects, could increase the demand for fire protection services in the Project area. Specifically, there could be increased demands for additional LAFD staffing, equipment, and facilities over time. This need would be funded via existing mechanisms (e.g., property taxes, government funding, and developer fees) to which the Proposed Project and related projects would contribute. Similar to the Proposed Project, each of the related projects would be individually subject to LAFD review and would be required to comply with all applicable fire safety requirements of the LAFD in order to adequately mitigate fire protection impacts. Specifically, any related project that exceeded the applicable response distance standards described above would be required to install automatic fire sprinkler systems in order to mitigate the additional response distance. To the extent cumulative development causes the need for additional fire stations to be built throughout the City, the development of such stations would be on small infill lots within existing developed areas and would not likely cause a significant impact upon the environment. Nevertheless, the siting and development of any new fire stations would be subject to further CEQA review and evaluated on a case-by-case basis. However, as the LAFD does not currently have any plans for new fire stations to be developed in proximity to the Project Site, no impacts are currently anticipated to occur. On this basis, the Proposed Project would not make a cumulatively considerable impact to fire protection services, and, as such cumulative impacts on fire protection would be less than significant.

b) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government 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 objective for police protection?

**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated**. A significant impact may occur if the City of Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) could not adequately serve a project, necessitating a new or physically altered station. Section 15382 of the CEQA guidelines defines "significant effect on the environment" as "a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant." Thus, the addition of a new police station or police substation, if warranted, would only be considered significant if the construction or operation of a new facility results in a physical adverse impact upon the environment. Based on the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of whether the project results in a

significant impact on police protection shall be made considering the following factors: (a) the population increase resulting from the Proposed Project, based on the net increase of residential units or square footage of non-residential floor area; (b) the demand for police services anticipated at the time of project buildout compared to the expected level of service available. Consider, as applicable, scheduled improvements to LAPD services (facilities, equipment, and officers) and the project's proportional contribution to the demand; and (c) whether the project includes security and/or design features that would reduce the demand for police services.

The Proposed Project would include up to 53 dwelling units and 1,500 square feet of ground floor retail and would generate approximately 98 new residents and 3 employees. The Proposed Project would increase the utilization of the Project Site, which is currently occupied by commercial and automotive repair uses. The Proposed Project would potentially increase the demand for LAPD services. The Project Site is located in the West Los Angeles Area division of the LAPD's West Bureau. The Project Site is served by the West Los Angeles Community Police Station located at 1663 Butler Avenue, which is approximately 0.4 miles east of the Project Site. Within the West Los Angeles Area, the Proposed Project is located within Reporting District (RD) 852.<sup>32</sup> Table III-17, West Los Angeles Area Crime Statistics, provides crime statistics for local Project Site area in the City of Los Angeles.

Construction sites, if left unsecured, have the potential to attract trespassers and/or vandals that would potentially result in graffiti, excess trash, and potentially unsafe conditions for the public. Such occurrences would adversely affect the aesthetic character of the Project Site and surrounding area and could potentially cause public health and safety concerns. With implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-PS-3 below, Project impacts would be less than significant during the construction period.

Development of the Proposed Project would result in an increase of site visitors, residents, and employees to the Project Site, thereby generating a potential increase in the number of service calls from the Project Site. Responses to thefts, vehicle burglaries, vehicle damage, traffic-related incidents, and crimes against persons would be anticipated to escalate as a result of the increased on-site activity and increased traffic on adjacent streets and arterials. The Proposed Project would include adequate and strategically positioned functional and thematic lighting to enhance public safety. Visually obstructed and infrequently accessed "dead zones" would be limited and, where possible, security controlled to limit public access. The building and layout design of the Proposed Project would also include crime prevention features, such as nighttime security lighting and secure parking facilities. In addition, the continuous visible and non-visible presence of residents at all times of the day would provide a sense of security during evening and early morning hours. As such, the Project residents would be able to monitor suspicious activity at the building entry points. These preventative and proactive security measures would decrease the amount of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> Los Angeles Times Local, Mapping L.A. LAPD Rampart Division, Reporting District 852, website: http://maps.latimes.com/lapd/reporting-district/852/, accessed January 2016.

service calls to the LAPD. With incorporation of the mitigation measures identified below, the Proposed Project's potential impact upon LAPD services would be mitigated to a less than significant level.

west Lus Angeles Arta Crime Statistics								
Crimes	2016 (Year to Date) <sup>a</sup>	2015 (Year to Date)	2014 (Year to Date)					
Violent Crimes								
Homicide	0	0	0					
Rape	1	1	1					
Robbery	3	3	5					
Aggravated Assault	5	7	4					
Total Violent Crimes	9	11	10					
Property Crimes								
Burglary	22	33	17					
Motor Vehicle Theft	13	8	6					
BTFV	28	37	29					
Personal / Other Theft	34	30	40					
Total Property Crimes	97	108	92					
Total Part 1 Crimes	106	119	102					
Child / Spousal Abuse (Part I & II) <sup>b</sup>	9	11	9					
Shots Fired	0	1	0					
Shooting Victims	0	0	0					
Notes.								

Table III-17West Los Angeles Area Crime Statistics

<sup>a</sup> Crime Statistics for week ending January 9, 2016.

<sup>b</sup> Part II Child/Spousal Abuse Simple Assaults not included in Part 1 Aggravated Assaults above to comply with the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting guidelines.

Source: LAPD, COMPSTAT Unit, West Los Angeles Area Profile, accessed January 15, 2016.

#### **Mitigation Measures:**

#### MM-PS-2 (Police)

The plans shall incorporate the Design Guidelines (defined in the following sentence) relative to security, semi-public and private spaces, which may include but not be limited to access control to building, secured parking facilities, walls/fences with key systems, well-illuminated public and semi-public space designed with a minimum of dead space to eliminate areas of concealment, location of toilet facilities or building entrances in high-foot traffic areas, and provision of security guard patrol throughout the project site if needed. Please refer to "Design Out Crime Guidelines: Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design", published by the Los Angeles Police Department. Contact the Community Relations Division, located at 100 W. 1<sup>st</sup> Street, #250, Los Angeles, CA

90012; (213) 486-6000. These measures shall be approved by the Police Department prior to the issuance of building permits.

### MM-PS-3 Public Services (Police – Demolition/Construction Sites)

Temporary construction fencing shall be placed along the periphery of the active construction areas to screen as much of the construction activity from view at the local street level and to keep unpermitted persons from entering the construction area.

# **Cumulative Impacts**

Less Than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project, in combination with the related projects, would increase the demand for police protection services in the project area. Specifically, there would be an increased demand for additional LAPD staffing, equipment, and facilities over time. This need would be funded via existing mechanisms (e.g., sales taxes, government funding, and developer fees), to which the Proposed Project and related projects would contribute. In addition, each of the related projects would be individually subject to LAPD review and would be required to comply with all applicable safety requirements of the LAPD and the City of Los Angeles in order to adequately address police protection service demands. Furthermore, each of the related projects would likely install and/or incorporate adequate crime prevention design features in consultation with the LAPD, as necessary, to further decrease the demand for police protection services. To the extent cumulative development causes the need for additional police stations to be built throughout the City, the development of such stations would be on small infill lots within existing developed areas and would not likely cause a significant impact upon the environment. Nevertheless, the siting and development of any new police stations would be subject to further CEQA review and evaluated on a case-by-case basis. However, as the LAPD does not currently have any plans for new police stations to be developed in proximity to the Project Site. No impacts are currently anticipated to occur. On this basis, the Proposed Project would not make a cumulatively considerable impact to police protection services, and cumulative impacts on police protection would be less than significant.

c) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government 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 objective for schools?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project includes substantial employment or population growth, which could generate a demand for school facilities that would exceed the capacity of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). The Project Site is located in LAUSD Board District 4. The Project Site is currently served by one elementary school, one middle school, and

one high school. Table III-18, Resident Schools Serving the Project Site, details the names, grades served, and location of each school.

Kesident Schools Serving the Project Site							
School Name	Grades	Address					
Brockton Avenue Elementary	K-5	1309 Armacost Avenue					
Emerson Community Center	6-8	1650 Selby Avenue					
University Senior High School	9-12	11800 Texas Avenue					
Source: Los Angeles Unified School District, Resident School Identifier, website: http://rsi.lausd.net/ResidentSchoolIdentifier							
/, accessed January 2016.							

Table III-18Resident Schools Serving the Project Site

As shown in Table III-18, Proposed Project Estimated Student Generation, the Proposed Project would generate approximately 9 elementary students, 2 middle school students and 5 high school students, for a total of approximately 16 students. The Project Applicant would be required to pay all applicable developer fees to the LAUSD to offset the Proposed Project's demands upon local schools. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65995, the development fees authorized by SB 50 are deemed to be "full and complete school facilities mitigation." Thus, the Proposed Project's potential impact upon public school services would be less than significant by the following regulatory compliance measure:

		Elementary School	Middle School	High School	Total
Land Use	Size	Students	Students	Students	Students
Existing Uses (to be removed)					
Commercial/Retail	4,962	0	0	0	0
Total Exist	ting Students	0	0	0	0
Proposed Project					
Multi-Family Residential <sup><i>ab</i></sup>	53 du	8.7	2.4	5.0	16.1
Retail <sup>cd</sup>	1,500 sf	0	0	0	0
Total Estima	8.7	2.4	5.0	16.1	
	0	0	0	0	
	Net Increase	8.7	2.4	5.0	16.1

Table III-19Proposed Project Estimated Student Generation

Notes:

sf = square feet; du = dwelling units

<sup>a</sup> Student generation rates are as follows for multi-family residential uses: .1649 elementary, .0450 middle and .0943 high school students per unit.

<sup>b</sup> Source: Los Angeles Unified School District, School Facilities Needs Analysis for Los Angeles Unified School District, September 2012.

<sup>c</sup> Student generation rates are as follows for retail/commercial uses: .0149 elementary, .0069 middle and .0067 high school students per 1,000 square feet.

<sup>d</sup> Source: Los Angeles Unified School District, School Fee Justification Study, September 2002.

### **Regulatory Compliance Measures:**

### **RC-PS-3** (Payment of School Development Fee)

Prior to issuance of a building permit, the General Manager of the City of Los Angeles, Department of Building and Safety, or designee, shall ensure that the Applicant has paid all applicable school facility development fees in accordance with California Government Code Section 65995.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Proposed Project, in combination with related projects is expected to result in a cumulative increase in the demand for school services. Development of the related projects would likely generate additional demands upon school services. These related projects would have the potential to generate students that would attend the same schools as the Proposed Project. However, each of the new housing units would be responsible for paying mandatory school fees to mitigate the increased demand for school services. Cumulative impacts on schools would be less than significant.

d) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government 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 objective for parks?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the recreation and park services available could not accommodate the projected population increase resulting from implementation of a project or if the proposed project resulted in the construction of new recreation and park facilities that create significant direct or indirect impacts to the environment. Based on the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of whether the project results in a significant impact on recreation and parks shall be made considering the following factors: (a) the net population increase resulting from the Proposed Project; (b) the demand for recreation and park services anticipated at the time of project buildout compared to the expected level of service available. Consider, as applicable, scheduled improvements to recreation and park services (renovation, expansion, or addition) and the project's proportional contribution to the demand; and (c) whether the project includes features that would reduce the demand for park services (e.g., on-site recreation facilities, land dedication, or direct financial support to the Department of Recreation and Parks).

The Public Recreation Plan (PRP), a portion of the Service Systems Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan, provides standards for the provision of recreational facilities throughout the City and includes Local Recreation Standards. The desired long-range standard for local parks is based on two acres per 1,000 persons for neighborhood parks and two acres per 1,000 persons for community parks or four acres per 1,000 persons of combined neighborhood and community parks. However, the PRP also

notes that these long-range standards may not be reached during the life of the plan, and, therefore, includes more attainable short- and intermediate-range standards of one (1) acre per 1,000 persons for neighborhood parks and one (1) acre per 1,000 persons for community parks, or two (2) acres per 1,000 people of combined neighborhood and community parks. These standards are Citywide goals and are not intended to be requirements for individual development projects. The Public Recreation Element of the City's General Plan also recognizes that the achievement of such goals is not the responsibility of individual development projects and that such goals will be met by "seek[ing] federal, state and private funds to implement acquisition and development of parks and recreational facilities."

The Proposed Project is located within a highly urbanized area within the West Los Angeles Community Plan Area. As shown in Table III-20, there are over 61 acres of parkland and public recreation facilities within a 2-mile radius of the Project Site. These facilities range from 4.4-acres (Felicia Mahood Multipurpose Center) to 27.6 acres (Westwood Park and Recreation Center).

-	Recreation	and Fark Facilities within the Froject Area	
Park Name	Park Size (acres)	Park Amenities	Approx. Distance to Project Site (miles)
1. Stoner Recreation Center	8.9	Skate park, pool, barbecue pits, baseball diamond (lighted/unlighted), basketball courts (lighted/outdoor), children's play area, lighted football field, indoor gym without weights, picnic tables, lighted soccer field, unlighted tennis courts, lighted volleyball courts	0.38
2. Felicia Mahood Multipurpose Center	4.4	Auditorium, community room, classroom spaces, backyard outdoor patio area	0.40
3. Westwood Park and Recreation Center	27.6	Pool, barbecue pits, lighted baseball diamond, basketball courts (lighted/outdoor, unlighted/indoor), children's play area, community room, indoor gym with weights, picnic table, lighted tennis courts	0.64
4. Barrington Recreation Center and Dog Park	20.5	Dog park, auditorium, baseball diamond (lighted/unlighted), basketball courts (lighted/indoor/outdoor), children's play area, community room, lighted football field, indoor gym without weights, picnic tables, lighted soccer field, lighted tennis courts, lighted volleyball courts.	1.36
Total Parkland:	61.4		
Sources: (1) Parks and amenitie	s were based	on City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, Facility Loca	tor,

 Table III-20

 Recreation and Park Facilities Within the Project Area

Sources: (1) Parks and amenities were based on City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, Facility Locator, http://www.laparks.org/, accessed January 2016. (2) Park distance and size were estimated using City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, NavigateLA, http://navigatela.lacity.org/navigatela/, accessed January 2016.

As discussed in Checklist Question XIII (a), it is estimated that the development of the Proposed Project would result in an increase of 98 new residents to the area. Based on the standard parkland ratio goal of 4 acres per 1,000 residents, the Proposed Project would generate a Citywide goal of serving such residents with approximately 0.4 acres of additional public parkland. The Project would contribute towards the

achievement of such goal through a combination of (1) on-site open space proposed within the Project, (2) payment of applicable taxes in accordance with LAMC Section 21.10.3(a)(1), and (3) the availability of existing park and recreation facilities within the area. The Proposed Project would provide approximately 5,600 square feet (0.13 acres) of total common open space and amenities on-site available exclusively to serve Project residents and their guests.

The Project may include a variety of on-site amenities including, but not limited to, 5<sup>th</sup> floor outdoor terrace, a residential amenity room, and rooftop area. In addition to the on-site open space provided within the Proposed Project, the Proposed Project is subject to a tax of \$200 per dwelling unit pursuant to LAMC Section 21.10.3(a)(1) (Dwelling Unit Construction Tax). This tax, payable to the Department of Building and Safety, shall be deposited into a "Park and Recreational Sites and Facilities Fund" to be used exclusively for the acquisition and development of park and recreational sites. In accordance with LAMC Section 21.10.3(a)(1), this tax may be offset or reduced based on the amount of on-site open space and recreational amenities provided on-site. Therefore, under the City's mandatory Dwelling Unit Construction Tax, which is collected prior to a certificate of occupancy for residential land uses (see Regulatory Compliance Measure RC-PS-4, below), the Proposed Project's impact upon parks and recreational facilities would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

### **Regulatory Compliance Measures:**

# **RC-PS-4** (Increased Demand For Parks Or Recreational Facilities)

Pursuant to Section 21.10 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, the applicant shall pay the Dwelling Unit Construction Tax for construction of apartment buildings.

# **Cumulative Impacts**

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the Proposed Project in conjunction with related projects could result in an increase in permanent residents residing in the greater Project area. Additional cumulative development would contribute to lowering the City's existing parkland to population ratio, which is currently below the preferred standard. However, each of the residential related projects are required to comply with payment of Quimby (for townhome units) and Parks and Recreation Fee (for apartment units). Each residential related project would also be required to comply with the on-site open space requirements of the LAMC. Therefore, with payment of the applicable recreation fees on a project-by-project basis, the Proposed Project would not make a cumulatively considerable impact to parks and recreational facilities, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

e) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government 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 objective for other public facilities? **Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project includes substantial employment or population growth that could generate a demand for other public facilities (such as libraries), which would exceed the capacity available to serve the Project Site. Based on the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of whether the project results in a significant impact on libraries shall be made considering the following factors: (a) the net population increase resulting from the Project; (b) the demand for library services anticipated at the time of project buildout compared to the expected level of service available. Consider, as applicable, scheduled improvements to library services (renovation, expansion, addition or relocation) and the project's proportional contribution to the demand; and (c) whether the project includes features that would reduce the demand for library services (e.g., onsite library facilities or direct financial support to the Los Angeles Public Library).

Within the City of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Public Library (LAPL) provides library services at the Central Library, seven regional branch libraries, 56 community branches and two bookmobile units, consisting of a total of five individual bookmobiles. Approximately 6.5 million books and other materials comprise the LAPL collection. The LAPL branches currently serving the Project Site include:

- West Los Angeles Regional Library, located at 11360 Santa Monica Boulevard, approximately 0.4 miles east of the Project Site;
- Donald Bruce Kaufman Brentwood Branch Library, located at 11820 San Vicente Boulevard, approximately 0.9 miles northwest of the Project Site;
- Westwood Branch Library, located at 1246 Glendon Avenue, approximately 1.3 miles northeast of the Project Site.<sup>33</sup>

The Proposed Project would result in an increase of approximately 98 residents. The three libraries within a 2-mile radius of the Project Site currently meet the library demands of the surrounding community and would be able to meet the Proposed Project's demand for library services. Therefore, the Proposed Project's impacts upon library services would be less than significant.

# **Cumulative Impacts**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Development of the related projects is projected to generate additional housing and residents within the study area, which would likely generate additional demands upon library services. This increase in resident population, combined with the 98 additional residents generated by the Proposed Project, would result in a cumulative increase in demands upon public library services. To meet the increased demands upon the City's Public Library system, Los Angeles voters passed a Library Bond Issue for \$178.3 million to improve, renovate, expand, and construct 32 branch libraries. Since the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup> City of Los Angeles Public Library, Hours and Locations, website: http://www.lapl.org/branches, accessed January 2016.

Program's inception in 1998, the Library Department and the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering have made considerable progress in the design and construction of the branch library facilities. Based on the growth forecasts utilized in the 2007-2010 Strategic Plan, much of this growth has already been accounted for in planning new and expanded library facilities. In addition, Measure L, the Public Library Funding Charter Amendment, was approved in March of 2011. Measure L increases the Los Angeles Public Library's share of existing city funds to restore library service hours. Measure L restored operation of the Central Library and eight regional branch libraries on Sundays, and also provided funds to purchase additional books and materials.<sup>34</sup> Thus, the 98 additional residents generated by the Proposed Project would not make a cumulatively considerable impact upon the City's library system. Therefore, the cumulative impacts related to library facilities would be reduced to a less than significant level.

#### XV. RECREATION

# a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Less Than Significant Impact. For the purpose of this Initial Study, a significant impact may occur if the project would include substantial employment or population growth, which would 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. Based on the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of whether the project results in a significant impact on recreation and parks shall be made considering the following factors: (a) the net population increase resulting from the proposed project; (b) the demand for recreation and park services anticipated at the time of project buildout compared to the expected level of service available. Consider, as applicable, scheduled improvements to recreation and park services (renovation, expansion, or addition) and the project's proportional contribution to the demand; and (c) whether the project includes features that would reduce the demand for park services (e.g., on-site recreation facilities, land dedication, or direct financial support to the Department of Recreation and Parks).

It is reasonable to assume that the future occupants of the Proposed Project would utilize recreation and park facilities in the surrounding area. As noted in Table III-20, above, there are 4 existing new and recently improved parks within the Project Area totaling more than 61 acres that are available to serve the future residents and retail visitors to the Project Site. In addition, the Proposed Project would provide approximately 5,600 square feet (0.13 acres) of open space that would be available exclusively to serve

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> City of Los Angeles Public Library, Measure L, website: http://www.lapl.org/measure-l, accessed February 2016.

Project residents and their guests. The Proposed Project may include a variety of on-site amenities including, but not limited to, a 5<sup>th</sup> level outdoor terrace, a residential amenity room, and rooftop area. The availability of these on-site recreation amenities and opportunities would serve to reduce the demand for off-site park services, and accordingly the Proposed Project would not substantially 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. In addition, the Project would pay the City's mandatory Dwelling Unit Construction Tax, which is collected prior to a certificate of occupancy for residential land uses, and comply with regulatory code compliance measure RC-PS-4 (above). Accordingly, the Proposed Project's impact upon parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant.

# 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project includes or requires the construction or expansion of park facilities and such construction would have a significant adverse effect on the environment. As noted above, there are 4 existing, new, or recently improved parks within the Project Area totaling more than 61 acres that are available to serve the future residents and retail visitors to the Project Site. The Proposed Project would also provide approximately 5,600 square feet of open space and recreational facilities on-site. As discussed in Section XIV (iv) above, Citywide park standards are Citywide goals and are not intended to be requirements for individual development projects. The Public Recreation Element of the City's General Plan also recognizes that the achievement of such goals is not the responsibility of individual development projects and that such goals will be met by "seek[ing] federal, state and private funds to implement acquisition and development of parks and recreational facilities." The Proposed Project itself does not include the expansion of park facilities and does not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse impact on the environment. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed above, the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on recreational resources. The Proposed Project in combination with related projects would be expected to increase the cumulative demand for parks and recreational facilities in the City of Los Angeles. Similar to the Proposed Project's requirement to pay a Dwelling Unit Construction Tax to improve recreation and park facilities, the related projects that include residential units would be required to pay similar recreation taxes and/or applicable Quimby fees to mitigate impacts upon park and recreational facilities and to provide additional funds to meet Citywide park goals. Additionally, each related project would be subject to the provisions of the LAMC for providing on-site open space, which is proportionately based on the amount of new development. Because the Proposed Project would have a less than significant incremental contribution to the potential cumulative impact on recreational resources, the Proposed Project would have a less than significant cumulative impact on such resources.

# XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

The following section summarizes and incorporates by reference the information provided in the Traffic Memo, *Markwood Enterprises Mixed-Use Project Trip Generation Assessment NW Corner of Santa Monica Boulevard and Barrington Avenue, City of Los Angeles*, prepared by Crain and Associates, dated February 23, 2016. The Traffic Study and related correspondence from the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (DOT) are provided as Appendix H to this IS/MND.

a) Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated**. The Project Site is located in the West Los Angeles Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Specific Plan area (WLA TIMP). In order to determine the level of traffic analysis required for the Proposed Project, a trip generation assessment was performed based on the WLA TIMP and latest City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) *Traffic Study Policies and Procedures* (TSPP), August 2014.

### **Estimated Trip Generation**

The trip generation rates listed in Appendix A of the WLA TIMP were utilized for the PM peak hour to develop the traffic characteristics of the Project. Since daily AM peak hour rates are not specified in the WLA TIMP, the latest version of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (9th Edition, 2012) was used for those time periods. The trip generation equations and rates in the ITE manual are nationally recognized and are used as the basis for most traffic studies conducted in the City of Los Angeles. Information was obtained from the WLA TIMP and Trip Generation Manual for ITE Land Use Code (LUC) 220 – Apartments, LUC 826 Specialty Retail Center and LUC 942 Automobile Care Center. These were selected from the descriptions of the available LUCs as best matching the existing and proposed uses of multi-family residential, and body shop, respectively. Table III-21 presents the trip generation rates used to estimate the weekday daily and peak-hour traffic generation for the Proposed Project. As shown in Table III-22, once completed and occupied, the Proposed Project is expected to generate approximately 318 daily trips, with 22 AM peak-hour trips and 22 PM peak-hour trips.

# **Project Impacts**

Per the WLA TIMP and TSPP, a Traffic Study is required when a project is likely to add 43 or more peak-hour trips to the local street system. The TSPP requires a technical memorandum (scaled-down version of a traffic study) when a project is likely to add between 25 and 42 peak hour trips. Given that

the Proposed Project would add no more than 22 trips to the local street system during either weekday peak hour, the Proposed Project is not expected to result in a significant traffic impact to any of the surrounding intersections or roadway segments. Therefore, no further analysis of traffic impacts is required.

I rattic Generation Kates								
Description	ITE	Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
-	Code	Trips	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Apartment	220	6.65	0.51	20%	80%	0.49	65%	35%
Specialty Retail	826	44.32	2.71	44%	56%	5	50%	50%
Automobile Care Center	942	23.72	2.25	66%	34%	2.87	48%	52%
Source: Crain and Associates, Markwood Enterprises Mixed-Use Project Trip Generation Assessment NW Corner of Santa								
Monica Boulevard and Barrington Avenue	, City of Lo	os Angeles, F	ebruary 23,	2016.				

Table III-21Traffic Generation Rates

		Daily Trin		AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
Land Use	Size	Traffic		Volume	es	Volumes			
		ITanic	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	
Proposed Project									
Apartment	53 Units du	352	5	22	27	17	9	26	
Specialty Retail	3,000 sf	133	4	4	8	8	7	15	
Subtotal		485	9	26	35	25	16	41	
Existing to be Removed									
Specialty Retail	2,404 sf	(107)	(3)	(4)	(7)	(6)	(6)	(12)	
Automobile Care Center	2,522 sf	(60)	(4)	(2)	(6)	(3)	(4)	(7)	
Subtotal		(167)	(7)	(6)	(13)	(9)	(10)	(19)	
Net Project Trips							•		
Residential		352	5	22	27	17	9	26	
Commercial		(34)	(3)	(2)	(5)	(1)	(3)	(4)	
TOTAL		318	2	20	22	16	6	22	
Source: Crain and Associates, Mark	kwood Enterprises N	lixed-Use Project	t Trip Ge	neration	Assessmen	nt NW C	orner of l	Santa	
Monica Boulevard and Barrington	Avenue, City of Los .	Angeles, February	y 23, 201	6.					
For purposes of a conservative anal	lysis up to 3,000 squ	are feet of retail v	was assu	med.					

Table III-22 Project Trip Generation

#### **Bicycle Plan Improvements**

The City of Los Angeles adopted a 2010 Bicycle Master Plan to encourage alternative modes of transportation throughout the City of Los Angeles. The Master Plan was developed to provide a network

system that is safe and efficient to use in coordination with the vehicle and pedestrian traffic on the City street systems. The Master Plan has mapped out the existing, funded and potential future Bicycle Paths, Bicycle Lanes, and Bicycle Routes. Santa Monica Boulevard is identified as part of the backbone bikeway network. However, construction and operation of the Proposed Project will not impede expanding this bikeway network.

# **Construction Traffic**

The Proposed Project would require the use of haul trucks during site clearing and excavation and the use of a variety of other construction vehicles throughout the construction of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project includes two levels of automated subterranean parking requiring the excavation up to 20 feet below grade. Approximately 11,217 cubic yards (cy) of soil will be excavated and hauled off-site. Based on an average load capacity of 16 cy per haul truck, soil export activities will generate a total of approximately 702 haul trips, or approximately 18 trips per day for a projected duration of 40 hauling days. The addition of these vehicles onto the street system would contribute to increased traffic in the Project vicinity. As noted in Section II, Project Description of this IS/MND, the anticipated haul route would include entering/exiting the Project Site from Santa Monica Boulevard. The haul route would then extend northeast to the 405 Freeway or southbound to the 10 Freeway. The haul route may be modified provided DOT and/or Street Services approves any such modification. The Proposed Project's construction trip traffic would be a fraction of the operational traffic. Therefore, it is not anticipated that they would contribute to a significant increase in the overall congestion in the Project vicinity. In addition, any truck trips would be limited to the length of time required for the Project's construction. Due to the temporary nature of the traffic, construction impacts would be less than significant with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure MM-TR-1 below.

#### **Mitigation Measures**

#### MM-TR-1 Construction Management Plan

• A Construction work site traffic control plan shall be submitted to DOT for review and approval in accordance with the LAMC prior to the start of any construction work. The plans shall show the location of any roadway or sidewalk closures, traffic detours, haul routes, hours of operation, protective devices, warning signs and access to abutting properties, and if applicable, the location of off-site staging areas for haul trucks and construction vehicles. All construction related traffic shall be restricted to off-peak hours.

# b) Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

**No Impact.** The CMP TIA guidelines require that intersection monitoring locations must be examined if the Project adds 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours. As concluded in the Traffic Memo, the Proposed Project is expected to generate 22 AM peak-hour trips and 22 PM peak-hour trips. As such, the Proposed Project will not add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours (i.e., of adjacent street traffic) at CMP monitoring intersection in the Project vicinity, which is stated in the CMP manual as the threshold criteria for a traffic impact assessment. Therefore, no further review of potential impacts to intersection monitoring locations that are part of the CMP highway system is required and no impact would occur.

# c) Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

**No Impact.** This question would apply to the Proposed Project only if it involved an aviation-related use or would influence changes to existing flight paths. The Proposed Project does not include any aviation-related uses and would have no airport impact. It would also not require any modification of flight paths for the existing airports in Los Angeles. Therefore, no impact would occur.

# d) Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project includes new roadway design or introduces a new land use or features into an area with specific transportation requirements and characteristics that have not been previously experienced in that area, or if project site access or other features were designed in such a way as to create hazard conditions. The Proposed Project would not include unusual or hazardous design features. However the Proposed Project will include new vehicular access to the Project Site, which, if not properly designed and constructed, could potentially conflict with pedestrian circulation in the Project area. Environmental impacts may result from Project implementation due to hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses. However, the following Mitigation Measure can mitigate the potential impacts to a less than significant level:

# **Mitigation Measures:**

# MM-TR-2 Transportation (Safety Hazards)

• The developer shall install appropriate traffic signs around the site to ensure pedestrian and vehicle safety.

• The applicant shall submit a parking and driveway plan that incorporates design features that reduce accidents, to the Bureau of Engineering and the Department of Transportation for approval.

#### e) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the project design would not provide emergency access meeting the requirements of the LAFD, or in any other way threatened the ability of emergency vehicles to access and serve the Project Site or adjacent uses. The Project Site is located in a disaster route along Santa Monica Boulevard according to the Santa Monica Area Disaster Route Map of Los Angeles County.<sup>35</sup> Based on the City of Los Angeles Safety Element, the Project Site is not located on an identified disaster route or an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.<sup>36</sup> Development of the Project Site may require temporary and/or partial street closures due to construction activities. Nonetheless, while such closures may cause temporary inconvenience, they would not be expected to substantially interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans. The Proposed Project would not cause permanent alterations to vehicular circulation routes and patterns, impede public access or travel upon public rights-of-way. Further, the Proposed Project would be developed in a manner that satisfies the emergency response requirements of the LAFD. There are no hazardous design features included in the access design or site plan for the Proposed Project that could impede emergency access. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would be subject to the site plan review requirements of the LAFD and the LAPD to ensure that all access roads, driveways and parking areas would remain accessible to emergency service vehicles. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not be expected to result in inadequate emergency access and impacts would be less than significant.

# f) Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycles, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project would conflict with adopted policies or involve modification of existing alternative transportation facilities located on- or off-site. The Proposed Project would not require the disruption of public transportation services or the alteration of public transportation routes. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would not interfere with any class I or class II bikeway systems. Since the Proposed Project would not modify or conflict with any alternative transportation policies, plans or programs, it would have no impact on such programs.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, City of Santa Monica Area Disaster Route Map, July 10, 2008.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> City of Los Angeles, Safety Element Exhibit H, Critical Facilities and Lifeline Systems in the City of Los Angeles, April 1995.

# **Cumulative Impacts**

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the Proposed Project in conjunction with related projects would result in an increase in average daily vehicle trips and peak hour vehicle trips in the West Los Angeles Community Planning area. As noted in Table III-22 above, the Proposed Project is not expected to result in a significant traffic impact to any of the surrounding intersections or roadway segments and the Proposed Project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than significant for all of the study intersections analyzed. Furthermore, the West Los Angeles Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Specific Plan (WLA TIMP) was established to fund specific transportation improvements due to transportation impacts generated by projected new development within the WLA TIMP area. As such, each related project would be subject to pay the applicable Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) Fees associated with the WLA TIMP and therefore, cumulative impacts would be considered less than significant.

# XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

# a) Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if a project exceeds wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. Section 13260 of the California Water Code states that persons discharging or proposing to discharge waste that could affect the quality of the waters of the State, other than into a community sewer system, shall file a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) containing information which may be required by the appropriate Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The RWQCB then authorizes an NPDES permit that ensures compliance with wastewater treatment and discharge requirements. The LARWQCB enforces wastewater treatment and discharge requirements.

Wastewater from the Project Site is conveyed via municipal sewage infrastructure maintained by the Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation to the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP). The HTP is a public facility and, therefore, is subject to the State's wastewater treatment requirements. Wastewater from the Project Site is and would continue to be treated according to the wastewater treatment requirements enforced by the LARWQCB. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

# b) Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project would increase water consumption or wastewater generation to such a degree that the capacity of facilities currently serving the Project Site would be exceeded. The determination of whether a project results in a significant impact on

water shall be made considering the following factors: (a) the total estimated water demand for the project; (b) whether sufficient capacity exists in the water infrastructure that would serve the project, taking into account the anticipated conditions at project buildout; (c) the amount by which the project would cause the projected growth in population, housing or employment for the Community Plan area to be exceeded in the year of the project completion; and (d) the degree to which scheduled water infrastructure improvements or project design features would reduce or offset service impacts.

### Water Treatment Facilities and Existing Infrastructure

The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) ensures the reliability and quality of water supply through an extensive distribution system that includes more than 7,100 miles of pipes, more than 100 storage tanks and reservoirs within the City, and eight storage reservoirs along the Los Angeles Aqueducts. Much of the water flows north to south, entering Los Angeles at the Los Angeles Aqueduct Filtration Plant (LAAFP) in Sylmar, which is owned and operated by LADWP. Water entering the LAAFP undergoes treatment and disinfection before being distributed throughout the LADWP's Water Service Area. The LAAFP has the capacity to treat approximately 600 million gallons per day (mgd).<sup>37</sup> The average plant flow is approximately 450 mgd during the non-summer months and 550 mgd during the summer months, and operates at between 75 and 90 percent capacity. Therefore, the LAAFP has a remaining capacity of treating approximately 50 to 150 mgd, depending on the season.<sup>38</sup>

As shown in Table III-23, the Proposed Project would generate a demand for approximately 7,447 gallons per day of water, as compared to the existing uses on the Project Site, which is significantly below available capacity. In accordance with the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the base estimated water demand was based on 120 percent of the sewerage generation factors for residential and commercial categories (Bureau of Sanitation, 1996). Consequently, implementation of the Proposed Project is not expected to measurably reduce the LAAFP's capacity; therefore, no new or expanded water treatment facilities would be required. With respect to water treatment facilities, the Proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact.

Although no further upgrades are anticipated at this time, in the event that water main and/or other infrastructure upgrades are required for the proposed development, such infrastructure improvements would be conducted within the right-of-way easements serving the Project area, and would not create a significant impact to the physical environment. This is largely due to the fact that (a) any disruption of service would be of a short-term nature, (b) the replacement of the water mains would be within public rights-of-way, and (c) any foreseeable infrastructure improvements would be limited to the immediate

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup> Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, website: http://www.ladwp.com/, accessed March 2016.
 <sup>38</sup> Ibid.

project vicinity. Therefore, potential impacts resulting from water infrastructure improvements would be less than significant.

Proposed Project Estimated water Demand				
Type of Use	Size	Water Demand Rate (gpd/unit) <sup>a</sup>	Total Water Demand (gpd)	
Existing Uses (to be removed)				
Retail	2,404 sf	96 gpd/1,000 sf	231	
Auto Repair	2,522 sf	96 gpd/1,000 sf	242	
	Total Existing Water Demand 473			
Proposed Project				
Residential Units (53 total)				
Studio	9 du	96 gpd/du	864	
One Bedroom	32 du	144 gpd/du	4,608	
Two Bedroom <sup>b</sup>	12 du	192 gpd/du	2,304	
Retail	1,500 sf	96 gpd/1,000 sf	144	
	7,920			
Less Existing			(473)	
		Net Increase	7,447	
<i>Notes:</i> <i>sf</i> = <i>square feet; du</i> = <i>dwelling units</i>				
<ul> <li><sup>a</sup> City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds wastewater generation.</li> <li><sup>b</sup> Includes Joint/Live Work units Source: Parker Environmental Consultants, 20</li> </ul>	Guide (2006), Exhibit M 016.	1.2-12. Water consumption is a	assumed to be 120% of	

Table III-23	
<b>Proposed Project Estimated</b>	Water Demand

#### Wastewater Treatment Facilities and Existing Infrastructure

Based upon the criteria established in the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have a significant wastewater impact if: (a) the project would cause a measurable increase in wastewater flows to a point where, and a time when, a sewer's capacity is already constrained or that would cause a sewer's capacity to become constrained; or (b) the project's additional wastewater flows would substantially or incrementally exceed the future scheduled capacity of any one treatment plant by generating flows greater than those anticipated in the Wastewater Facilities Plan or General plan and its elements.

The Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation provides sewer service to the Proposed Project area. Sewage from the Project Site is conveyed via sewer infrastructure to the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP). The HTP treats an average daily flow of 362 million gallons per day (mgd), and has capacity to treat 450 mgd. This

equals a remaining capacity of 88 mgd of wastewater able to be treated at the HTP.<sup>39</sup> In accordance with the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the base estimated sewer flows were based on the sewerage generation factors for residential and commercial categories (Bureau of Sanitation, 1996). As shown in Table III-24 below, the Proposed Project would generate approximately 6,207 gpd of wastewater, as compared to the existing uses on the Project Site, representing a fraction of one percent of the available capacity. Therefore, the HTP would have adequate capacity to serve the Proposed Project. As such, with respect to the capacities of wastewater treatment facilities, the Proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact.

-1	<u> </u>		
Type of Use	Size	Wastewater Demand Rate (gpd/unit) <sup>a</sup>	Total Wastewater Demand (gpd)
Existing Uses (to be removed)			
Retail	2,404 sf	80 gpd/1,000 sf	192
Auto Repair	2,522 sf	80 gpd/1,000 sf	201
	Total Existing Water Demand 393		
Proposed Project			
Residential Units (53 total)			
Studio	9 du	80 gpd/du	720
One Bedroom	32 du	120 gpd/du	3,840
Two Bedroom <sup>b</sup>	12 du	160 gpd/du	1,920
Retail	1,500 sf	80 gpd/1,000 sf	120
Total Project Wastewater Generation			6,600
		Less Existing	(393)
		Net Increase	6,207
Notes: sf =square feet; du = dwelling units <sup>a</sup> City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds <sup>b</sup> Includes Joint/Live Work units Source: Parker Environmental Consultant	Guide (2006), Exhibit M 's, 2016.	.2-12.	

 Table III-24

 Proposed Project Estimated Wastewater Generation

Through the rules and regulations established in the City of Los Angeles Sewer Allocation Ordinance (Ord. 166,060), the Bureau of Sanitation does not make a determination of sewer treatment capacity until LADBS has established that the Proposed Project's plans and specifications are acceptable for plan check. This process ensures the system can accept the anticipated wastewater flows from the Proposed Project at the time of connection, as opposed to prematurely committing to projects that are in the environmental

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation, Hyperion Treatment Plant, website: https://www.lacitysan.org, accessed March 2016.

review or entitlement process. At the time of connection, the Bureau of Sanitation will verify the gauging of the sewer lines and make the appropriate decisions on how best to connect to the local sewer lines at the time of construction. If it is determined that the local sewer system has insufficient capacity to serve the Proposed Project, the Applicant will be required to replace or build new sewer lines to a point in the sewer system with sufficient capacity to accommodate the Proposed Project's increased flows. Any infrastructure improvements to update or expand the sewer lines in the Project vicinity, if necessary, would be limited to trenching, excavating and backfilling the sewer lines beneath the public right-of way. Such construction activities would be localized in nature and would generally involve partial lane closures for a relatively short duration of time typically lasting a few days to a few weeks. Therefore, impacts to sewer capacity and infrastructure would be less than significant.

# c) Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

**No Impact**. A significant impact may occur if the volume of storm water runoff would increase to a level exceeding the capacity of the storm drain system serving a Project Site, resulting in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities. As described in Section 8(c) the Proposed Project would not result in a significant increase in site runoff, or any changes in the local drainage patterns. The Proposed Project will be required to demonstrate compliance with Low Impact Development Ordinance standards and retain or treat the first <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> inch of rainfall in a 24-hour period. The Project Site is currently developed and stormwater runoff is directed to the adjacent stormwater infrastructure serving the greater Project area. Since the Project Site is currently improved with asphalt parking, the site's imperviousness will not be increasing with development. With the City's requirements for stormwater quality treatment and not allowing an increase in runoff with development, it can be assumed the existing City storm drain system will have sufficient capacity to carry the proposed Project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems and no impact would occur.

# d) Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project would increase water consumption to such a degree that new water sources would need to be identified. Based on the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of whether the project results in a significant impact on water shall be made considering the following factors: (a) the total estimated water demand for the project; (b) whether sufficient capacity exists in the water infrastructure that would serve the project, taking into account the anticipated conditions at project buildout; (c) the amount by which the project would cause the projected growth in population, housing or employment for the Community Plan area to be exceeded

in the year of the project completion; and (d) the degree to which scheduled water infrastructure improvements or project design features would reduce or offset service impacts.

As shown in Table III-23, the Proposed Project's net increase for water demand would be 7,447 gallons per day. The Project is consistent with the existing zoning and General Plan land use designation for the Project Site. The Project is consistent with the allowable land uses and density that are planned for the Project Site and is therefore within the growth projections of the City's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). Thus, implementation of the Proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact upon the LADWP's regional water supply. Furthermore, pursuant to LAMC Section 122.03(a), the Proposed Project is required to utilize water saving devices including, but not limited to, urinals equipped with flush-o-meter valves, which flush with a maximum of 1.28 gallons, which would further reduce impacts associated with this issue to a level that is less than significant. Environmental impacts would further be reduced by implementation of Ordinance No. 170,978 (Water Management Ordinance), which imposes numerous water conservation measures in landscape, installation, and maintenance (e.g, use drip irrigation and soak hoses in lieu of sprinklers to lower the amount of water lost to evaporation and overspray, set automatic sprinkler systems to irrigate during the early morning or evening hours to minimize water loss due to evaporation, and water less in the cooler months and during the rainy season).

Furthermore, if conditions dictate pursuant to the LAMC, the Department of Water and Power may postpone new water connections for this project until water supply capacity is adequate. Therefore, with adherence to regulatory Compliance Measures RC-WS-1 and RC-WS-2, impacts with respect to water supply would be reduced to a less than significant level.

#### **Regulatory Compliance Measures:**

# RC-WS-1 (Green Building Code)

The Project shall implement all applicable mandatory measures within the LA Green Building Code that would have the effect of reducing the Project's water use.

#### RC-WS-2 (Landscape)

The Project shall comply with Ordinance No. 170,978 (Water Management Ordinance), which imposes numerous water conservation measures in landscape, installation, and maintenance (e.g., use drip irrigation and soak hoses in lieu of sprinklers to lower the amount of water lost to evaporation and overspray, set automatic sprinkler systems to irrigate during the early morning or evening hours to minimize water loss due to evaporation, and water less in the cooler months and during the rainy season).

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with cumulative
growth throughout the City of Los Angeles, would further increase the demand for potable water within the City. Through the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, the LADWP has demonstrated that it can provide adequate water supplies for the City through the year 2035. This estimate is based in part on demographic projections obtained for the LADWP service area from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). The MWD utilizes a land-use based planning tool that allocates projected demographic data from the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) into water service areas for each of MWD's member agencies. Demographic data from SCAG's 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as well as billing data for each major customer class, weather, conservation, price of water, personal income, family size, economy, and drought conservation effect were factors used in forecasting future water demand growth. Thus, projects that are consistent with the underlying zoning and allowable density requirements of the LAMC and General Plan, and the associated growth projections of the 2008 RCP and 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, are inherently consistent with the future water demands established in the 2010 UWMP. As discussed previously in this section under the Population and Housing subheading, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the regional and local population and housing growth projections. The Proposed Project is consistent with the underlying allowable uses per the LAMC and would not exceed the allowable density for the Project Site. As such, the additional water demands generated by the Project are accounted for in the 2010 Water Management Plan and impacts associated with increased water demand would be less than significant.

# e) Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Less Than Significant Impact. A project would normally have a significant wastewater impact if: (a) the project would cause a measurable increase in wastewater flows to a point where, and a time when, a sewer's capacity is already constrained or that would cause a sewer's capacity to become constrained; or (b) the project's additional wastewater flows would substantially or incrementally exceed the future scheduled capacity of any one treatment plant by generating flows greater than those anticipated in the Wastewater Facilities Plan or General plan and its elements. As stated in Checklist Question XVII(b), above, the sewage flow will ultimately be conveyed to the Hyperion Treatment Plant, which has sufficient capacity for the Proposed Project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

# **Cumulative Impacts**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Implementation of the Proposed Project in conjunction with cumulative growth throughout the City of Los Angeles would further increase demands for sewer service. As discussed in Question XVII (b), sewage from the Project Site is conveyed via sewer infrastructure to the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP). The HTP treats an average daily flow of 362 million gallons per day (mgd), and has capacity to treat 450 mgd. This equals a remaining capacity of 88 mgd of wastewater able to be treated at the HTP. As shown in Table III-24, the Proposed Project would generate approximately

6,180 gpd of wastewater, representing a fraction of one percent of the available capacity. As the HTP would have capacity to serve the Proposed Project, the Project's contribution to cumulative wastewater impacts will be less than cumulatively considerable. Additionally, the City conducts several levels of planning studies to assess current capacity and future capacity needs that includes the Wastewater Integrated Resources Plan (WIRP), which provides a 20-year horizon facilities plan.<sup>40</sup> The population projections in the WIRP Five-Year Review report are based on the SCAG 2008 population projections (adjusted from 2000).<sup>41</sup> As discussed previously in this section under the Population and Housing subheading, the proposed Project would be consistent with the regional and local population and housing growth projections. The Proposed Project is consistent with the underlying allowable uses per the LAMC and would not exceed the allowable density for the Project Site. As such, the additional wastewater generated by the Project are accounted for in the 2011 WIRP and impacts associated with increased water demand would be less than significant. Additionally, similar to the Proposed Project, each related project would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and would be required to consult with the Bureau of Sanitation and comply with all applicable city and state water conservation programs and sewer allocation ordinances. Therefore, cumulative impacts on wastewater services would be less than significant.

# f) Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project were to increase solid waste generation to a degree such that the existing and projected landfill capacity would be insufficient to accommodate the additional solid waste. The determination of whether a project results in a significant impact on solid waste shall be made considering the following factors: (a) amount of projected waste generation, diversion, and disposal during demolition, construction, and operation of the Project, considering proposed design and operational features that could reduce typical waste generation rates; (b) need for additional solid waste collection route, or recycling or disposal facility to adequately handle project-generated waste; and (c) whether the Project conflicts with solid waste policies and objectives in the Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) or its updates, the Solid Waste Management Policy Plan (CiSWMPP), Framework Element of the Curbside Recycling Program, including consideration of the land use-specific waste diversion goals contained in Volume 4 of the SRRE.

The Sunshine Canyon Landfill and the Chiquita Canyon Landfill serve land uses within the City. Both landfills accept residential, commercial, and construction waste. The Sunshine Canyon Landfill is jointly operated by the City and the County, has a remaining capacity of 65.78 million tons. Chiquita Canyon Landfill currently has a remaining capacity of 2.94 million tons. Thus, the Sunshine Canyon Landfill and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup> City of Los Angeles, Sewer System Management Plan, February 2015.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup> City of Los Angeles Water IRP 5-Year Review Final Documents, June 2012

the Chiquita Canyon Landfill combined have a remaining permitted capacity of approximately 68.72 million tons. The Sunshine Canyon Landfill has an estimated remaining life of 19 years, and the Chiquita Canyon Landfill has an estimated remaining life of 3 years. However, an expansion of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill is currently proposed and would add a capacity of 48,114,000 tons (a 46-year life expectancy based on 2013 average daily disposal of 3,364 tons per day).<sup>42</sup>

The Proposed Project would follow all applicable solid waste policies and objectives that are required by law, statute, or regulation. The Project's solid waste disposal needs would be directed to the local recycling facilities and landfills described above. Based on the calculations provided in Table III-25, it is estimated that the proposed construction activities would generate approximately 482 tons of debris during the construction process. Additionally, the Project would require approximately 11,217 cubic yards of soil export for the construction of the subterranean parking. Under the requirements of the hauler's AB 939 Compliance Permit from the Bureau of Sanitation, all construction and demolition debris would be delivered to a Certified Construction and Demolition Waste Processing Facility. Therefore, Proposed Project's impacts on solid waste during construction would be less than significant.

Estimated Construction and Demonstration Deptis			
Construction Activity	Size	Rate <sup><i>a</i></sup> (lbs./sf)	Generated Waste (tons)
Demolition			
Existing Uses (Non Residential)	4,926 sf	155	382
Construction			
Proposed Residential Uses	43,920 sf	4.38	97
Commercial	1,500 sf	3.89	3
		Total C& D Debris	482
Notes: sf= square feet <sup>a</sup> USEP4 Report No FP4530-98-010 (	Characterization of Building Relate	d Construction and Demol	lition Debris in the
United States, July 1998.	nurucienzation of buttaing Keiner	u Construction and Demoi	mon Deons in me
Source <sup>•</sup> Parker Environmental Consulta	ints 2016		

Table III-25Estimated Construction and Demolition Debris

As shown in Table III-26, Estimated Operational Solid Waste Generation, the Proposed Project's net generation during operation of the Proposed Project would be 596 pounds per day, as compared to the existing uses on the Project Site. This estimate is conservative, as it does not factor in any recycling or waste diversion programs. The Proposed Project's solid waste would be handled by private waste collection services. The amount of solid waste generated by the Proposed Project is within the available capacities at area landfills and project impacts to regional landfill capacity would be less than significant.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>42</sup> County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 2013 Annual Report, Los Angeles Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, pgs. 31,32 and 58.

Implementation of the code compliance measures RC-WS-1 through RC-WS-3 would further reduce the Project's impacts on solid waste generation.

Expected Ope	Tational Sonu	waste Generation	
		Solid Waste	Tatal Calid Wasts
<b>T AU</b>	a h	Generation Kate	1 otal Solid waste
Type of Use	Size	(lbs/unit/day)	Generated (lbs/day)
Existing Uses (to be removed)			
Retail (2,404 sf)	4	10.53 lbs/employee/day	42
Auto Repair (2,522 sf)	4	10.53 lbs/employee/day	42
	Total Existing	Solid Waste Generation	84
Proposed Project			
Multi-Family Residential	53 du	12.23 lbs/du/day	648
Retail (1,500 sf)	3 employees	10.53 lbs/employee/day	32
	<b>Total Project</b>	t Solid Waste Generation	680
		Less Existing	(84)
		Net Increase	596
Notes:			
du = dwelling units, sf = square feet			

Table III-26	
Expected Operational Solid Waste Generation	

<sup>a</sup> Includes all materials discarded, whether or not they are later recycled or disposed of in a landfill.

<sup>b</sup> Employees were projected based on 1 employee per 588 square feet of retail space.

Source: Parker Environmental Consultants, 2016.

# **Regulatory Compliance Measures:**

# RC-SW-1 (Designated Recycling Area)

In compliance with Los Angeles Municipal Code, the proposed Modified Project shall provide readily accessible areas that serve the entire building and are identified for the depositing, storage, and collection of nonhazardous materials for recycling, including (at a minimum) paper, corrugated cardboard, glass, plastics, and metals.

# RC-SW-2 (Construction Waste Recycling)

In order to meet the diversion goals of the California Integrated Waste Management Act and the City of Los Angeles, which will total 70 percent by 2013, the Applicant shall salvage and recycle construction and demolition materials to ensure that a minimum of 70 percent of construction-related solid waste that can be recycled is diverted from the waste stream to be landfilled. Solid waste diversion would be accomplished though the on-site separation of materials and/or by contracting with a solid waste disposal facility that can guarantee a minimum diversion rate of 70 percent. In compliance with the Los Angeles Municipal Code, the General Contractor shall utilize solid waste haulers, contractors, and recyclers who have obtained an Assembly Bill (AB) 939 Compliance Permit from the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation.

#### RC-SW-3 (Commercial/Multifamily Mandatory Recycling)

In compliance with AB341, recycling bins shall be provided at appropriate locations to promote recycling of paper, metal, glass and other recyclable material. These bins shall be emptied and recycled accordingly as a part of the Proposed Project's regular solid waste disposal program. The Project Applicant shall only contract for waste disposal services with a company that recycles solid waste in compliance with AB341.

# g) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project would generate solid waste that was not disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations. The Proposed Project would generate solid waste that is typical of a mixed-use residential building and would comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations regarding proper disposal. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Implementation of the Proposed Project in conjunction with related projects would further increase regional demands on landfill capacity. The impact of the continued growth of the region would likely have the effect of diminishing the daily excess capacity of the existing landfills serving the City of Los Angeles. Although there are several proposals for new landfills in the region, there are currently few viable options for City of Los Angeles waste past 2029. The Proposed Project would contribute approximately 109 tons of solid waste per year, which represents a fraction of one percent of the current remaining capacity of the Sunshine Canyon Landfill and the Chiquita Canyon Landfill, which combined have a remaining permitted daily intake of approximately 68.72 million tons.

While in the short-term adequate landfill capacity exists to accommodate solid waste generated by the Proposed Project, in the future there will be a need to develop additional landfills and other waste disposal options to accommodate future growth. These options include diversion or transformation as the preferred methods for addressing solid waste and specific and practical applications (i.e., market development, public education and public policy initiatives) within the City.

The City of Los Angeles Solid Waste Management Plan (AB 939) sets forth strategies that would provide adequate landfill capacity through 2037 to accommodate anticipated growth. The Bureau of Sanitation has projected the need for waste disposal capacity based on SCAG's regional population growth

projections. The growth associated with Proposed Project is within those projections. Furthermore, projects within the City of Los Angeles must comply with the City's SRRE.

As reported by the Bureau of Sanitation in 2012, the City had achieved a waste diversion rate of 76.4%, based upon the calculation methodology adopted by the State of California. The City is exceeding the state-mandated diversion goal of 50 percent by 2000 set by the CIWMA of 1989.<sup>43</sup> New programs are being implemented to increase the amount of waste diverted by the City, including: multi-family recycling, food waste recycling, commercial recycling and technical assistance and support for City departments to help meet their waste reduction and recycling goals. The City is also developing the Solid Waste Integrated Resources Plan (SWIRP) to ultimately meet a goal of zero waste by 2030. Thus, the Proposed Project's contribution to cumulative impacts will continue to decrease as it increases waste diversion rates in accordance with City goals. Therefore, the Project's contribution to cumulative solid waste impacts will be less than cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts with respect to solid waste would be less than significant.

#### XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** A significant impact would occur only if the Proposed Project results in potentially significant impacts for any of the above issues. The Proposed Project is located in a densely populated urban area and would have no unmitigated significant impacts with respect to biological resources or California's history or pre-history. As noted in the analysis above, mitigation measures are identified to mitigate the loss of one onsite tree and any potential impacts that may occur upon bird species during the breeding season (Mitigation Measure BIO-1). Additionally, although no known direct impacts to historic resources are anticipated, compliance with existing regulations would ensure any impacts upon cultural resources are mitigated to less than significant levels in the unlikely event any such historic, archaeological, or paleontological materials are accidentally discovered during the construction process. (See Regulatory Compliance Measures RC-CR-1, RC-CR-2, and RC-CR-3). Therefore, with mitigation and adherence to regulatory compliance measures, the Proposed Project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, reduce or threaten any fish or wildlife species (endangered or otherwise), or eliminate important examples of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup> The City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Sanitation, Zero Waste Progress Report, March 2013.

major periods of California history or pre-history.

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)?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project, in conjunction with other related projects in the area of the Project Site, would result in impacts that would be less than significant when viewed separately, but would be significant when viewed together. As concluded in this analysis, the Proposed Project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts related to aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, green house gas emissions, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, mineral resources, noise, population/housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, and utilities would be less than significant. As such, the Proposed Project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project has the potential to result in significant impacts, as discussed in the preceding sections. Based on the preceding environmental analysis, the Proposed Project would not have significant environmental effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly after mitigation (for a complete list of applicable mitigation measures, see Summary of Mitigation Measures in the Initial Study Checklist Form of this Addendum). Thus, with mitigation, any potentially significant impacts to humans would be less than significant.

# V. PREPARERS AND PERSONS CONSULTED

#### PREPARERS OF THE INITIAL STUDY

#### Lead Agency

City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning 200 North Spring Street, Room 750 Los Angeles, California 90012

> Jordann Turner, City Planner Lilian Rubio, Planning Assistant

#### **Project Applicant**

Markwood Enterprises, Inc. 8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 336 Beverly Hills, CA 90211

Simon Aftalion, Development Director

#### **Environmental Consultants**

Parker Environmental Consultants 23822 Valencia Boulevard, Suite 301 Valencia, CA 91355

> Shane E. Parker, President Jennifer Kelley, Environmental Analyst Elise Lorenzana, Assistant Environmental Analyst

#### Land Use Entitlement Consultants

Craig Lawson & Co 3221 Hutchison Avenue, Suite D Los Angeles, CA 90034

Noah Adler, Associate Project Manager

#### Architect

R&A Architecture + Design, Inc. 4200 Sepulveda Boulevard, Suite 100 Culver City, CA 90230

Benjamin Anderson, Principal

#### **Geotechnical Engineers**

SASSAN Geosciences, Inc. 1290 North Lake Avenue, Suite 204 Pasadena, CA 91104

Sassan A. Salehipour, G.E, President Janan Anayi, Ph.D., Project Manager

### **Environmental Engineers**

Quinn Environmental Strategies, Inc.. 2618 San Miguel Drive, 400 Newport Beach, CA 92660

Catherine Quinn, P.G., C.HG., President

# **Traffic Consultant**

Crain and Associates 300 Corporate Pointe, Suite 470 Culver City, CA 90230

George Rhyner, P.E., Senior Transportation Engineer

# **Historic Consultant**

PCR Services Corporation 2121 Alton Parkway, Suite 100 Irvine, CA 92606

Margarita J. Wuellner, Ph.D., Director of Historic Resources

South Central Coastal Information Center California State University, Fullerton Department of Anthropology MH-426 800 North State College Boulevard Fullerton, CA 92834

> Stacy St. James, Coordinator Lindsey Noyes, Lead Staff Researcher

# Arborist

Primaterra 8850 Cadillac Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90034

Steven Edwards, ASLA, ISA, Principal

# V. REFERENCES AND ACRONYMS

#### 1. **REFERENCES**

California Air Resources Board, Climate Change Scoping Plan a framework for change, December 2008.

- California Air Resources Board, Final Supplement to the AB 32 Scoping Plan Functional Equivalent Document (FED), Attachment D, August 19, 2011.
- California Air Resources Board, First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan, May 2014.
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Land Resource Protection – Home, Important Farmland Maps in PDF Format, Important Farmland in California, 2006, Map, website: http://www.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/Pages/Index.aspx, accessed April 2015.
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), 2006, Wildcat Map 117, Sacramento, California, website: *ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/oil/maps/dist1/117/Map117.pdf*, accessed March 2016.
- California Department of Transportation, Representative Environmental Noise Levels, 1998.
- California Department of Transportation, Transportation- and Construction –Induced Vibration Guidance Manual, June 2004.
- California Environmental Protection Agency, Climate Action Team, Climate Action Team Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the Legislature, March 2006.
- California Environmental Protection Agency, State Water Resources Control Board, Storm Water Program, website: *http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/water\_issues/programs/stormwater/construction. shtml*, accessed March 2016.
- City of Los Angeles, Air Quality Element of the General Plan, November 24, 1992.
- City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Engineering, Navigate LA, website: *http://navigatela.lacity.org*, accessed December 2015.
- City of Los Angeles, CEQA Thresholds Guide, 2006.
- City of Los Angeles Citywide General Plan Framework EIR, July 17, 1996.
- City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Environmental and Public Facilities Maps, September 1996.
- City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Environmental and Public Facilities Maps, Critical Facilities & Lifeline Systems in the City of Los Angeles, September 1996.
- City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: Prehistoric and Historic Archaeological Sites and Survey Areas in the City of Los Angeles, September 1996.

City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: Vertebrate Paleontological Resources in the City of Los Angeles, September 1996.

City of Los Angeles General Plan Elements, Mobility Plan 2035.

- City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Parcel Profile Reports, Zoning Information and Map Access System (ZIMAS), *http://www.zimas.lacity.org*, accessed December 2015.
- City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, The Citywide General Plan Framework, An Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan, adopted December 11, 1996 and re-adopted August 8, 2001.
- City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, West Los Angeles Community Plan Map, website: *http://cityplanning.lacity.org/complan/westla/PDF/wlaplanmap.pdf,*, accessed March 2016.
- City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, West Los Angeles Community Plan, website: *http://planning.lacity.org/complan/pdf/wlacptxt.pdf*, accessed March 2016.
- City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, West Los Angeles Transportation Improvement And Mitigation Specific Plan, Adopted March 8, 1997, website: *http://planning.lacity.org/complan/specplan/pdf/WLATIMP.PDF*, accessed March 2016.
- City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation, General Information, website: *www.lacitysan.org*, accessed March 2016.
- City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation, Hyperion Treatment Plant, website: http://san.lacity.org/lasewers/treatment\_plants/hyperion/index.htm, accessed April 2015.
- City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation, Wastewater, Facts & Figures, website: www.lacitysan.org/san/faces/wcnav\_externalId/s-lsh-wwd-cw-p-hwrp?\_adf.ctrlstate=1d75p3lzmc\_4&\_afrLoop=19805298971490380#!, accessed March 2016.
- City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Sanitation Department, <u>Sewer System Management</u> <u>Plan, May 2011</u>.
- City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, <u>2010 Urban Water Management Plan</u>, LADWP Board of Water and Power Commissioners Resolution No. 011268, adopted May 3, 2011.

City of Los Angeles, Green Building Code (Ordinance No. 181,480).

City of Los Angeles, Green LA, An Action Plan to Lead the Nation in Fighting Global Warming (LA Green Plan)

City of Los Angeles, Noise Element of the General Plan, November 24, 1992.

City of Los Angeles Municipal Code.

City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance (LAMC Section 112.05)

- City of Los Angeles Ordinance 144331 and 161574.
- City of Los Angeles Ordinance 179681, adopted February 20, 2008.
- City of Los Angeles Ordinance 181142, April 9, 2010.
- City of Los Angeles, Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan, March 1996.
- City of Los Angeles Stormwater Program, Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plans (SUSMPs), website: *www.lastormwater.org/*, accessed March 2016.
- County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 2014 Annual Report, Los Angeles Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, December 2015.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Insurance Rate Maps, Search by Street Address, website: http://www.fema.gov/hazard/map/firm.shtm, accessed March 2016.
- FederalEmergencyManagementAgency,2008,website:https://hazards.fema.gov/femaportal/wps/portal/, accessed March 2016.
- Federal Transit Administration (Harris Miller Miller & Hanson), Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, May 2006.
- Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation Manual 9th Edition, 2012.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Second Assessment Report, 1996.
- Los Angeles County Department of Public Work, Disaster Route Maps by City, City of Los Angeles Central Area Map, website: *http://dpw.lacounty.gov/dsg/DisasterRoutes/city.cfm*, accessed March 2016.
- Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan (CMP), 2010.
- Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Urban Water Management Plan website: http://www.ladwp.com/ladwp/cms/ladwp007157.pdf, accessed March 2016.
- National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 117, Highway Noise: A Design Guide for Highway Engineers, 1971.
- Senate Bill 97 (SB 97), August 2007.

Senate Bill 375, September 2008.

South Coast Air Quality Management District, 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, June 1, 2007.

- South Coast Air Quality Management District, Air Quality Significance Thresholds, Revision March 2011, website: http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/signthres.pdf, accessed March 2015.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District, California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod Version 2011.1.1), 2012.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 1993, page 5-1
- South Coast Air Quality Management District, Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology, June 2003, Revised July 2008.
- Southern California Association of Governments, Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide.

Southern California Association of Governments, SCAG Forecast 2008.

State of California Assembly Bill (AB 32), the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, 2006

- State of California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Regional Geologic Hazards and Mapping Program, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Regulatory Maps, website: http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=regulatoryma ps, accessed March 2016.
- State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2006, Map. *ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2006/los06.pdf*, accessed March 2016.
- State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas & Geothermal Resources, OnlineMappingSystem,District1,http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dog/maps/Pages/d1\_index\_map1.aspx, accessed March 2016.
- State of California Integrated Waste Management Board, Solid Waste Information System, Facility Search, website: *http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/Search.aspx*, accessed March 2016.
- Sunshine Canyon Landfill, Update from Project Director, website: http://www.sunshinecanyonlandfill.com/update/\_index.htm, accessed March 2016.

Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations.

United States Environmental Protection Agency, Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment and Home Appliances, PB 206717, 1971.

- USEPA Report No. EPA530-98-010. *Characterization of Building Related Construction and Demolition* Debris in the United States, June 1998, page A-1
- White Paper on Regulatory Options for Addressing Cumulative Impacts from Air Pollution Emissions, SCAQMD Board Meeting, September 5, 2003, Agenda No. 29, Appendix D, p. D-3.
- U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory, Wetlands Mapper, website: http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/mapper.html, accessed March 2016.
- Williamson Act Program, California Division of Land Resource Protection, website: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/statewide/2006/fmmp2006\_wallsize.pdf, accessed March 2016.

#### 2. ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AAM	Annual Arithmetic Mean
AB	Assembly Bill
ACM	Asbestos-containing materials
AEP	Association of Environmental Professionals
AFY	Acre-feet per year
APN	Assessor Parcel Number
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
ASTM	American Society of Testing and Materials
ASTs	above-ground storage tanks
ATCS	Adaptive Traffic Control System
Basin	South Coast Air Basin
BMPs	Best Management Practices
C/D	construction/demolition
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAQS	California ambient air quality standards
Cal/EPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
CAPCOA	California Air Pollution Control Officers Association
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CAT	Climate Action Team
CBC	California Building Code (2007)
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CCAR	California Climate Action Registry
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CDMG	California Division of Mines and Geology
CEC	California Energy Commission
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act

CERCLIS	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability
	Information System
Cf	Cubic feet
CFC	Chlorofluorocarbons
CGS	California Geological Survey
CH <sub>4</sub>	Methane
CHMIRS	California Hazardous Material Incident Report System
CiSWMPP	City of Los Angeles Solid Waste Management Policy Plan
City Zoning Code	City of Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code
СМР	Congestion Management Plan
CNEL	Community Noise Exposure Level
СО	carbon monoxide
$CO_2$	carbon dioxide
CO2e	carbon dioxide equivalent
COHb	carboxyhemoglobin
COPC	Chemical of Potential Concern
CORRACTS	Corrective Action Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities
СРА	Community Plan Area
СРТ	cone penetrometer test
CPU	Crime Prevention Unit
CRA/LA	Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles
CWA	Clean Water Act
CWC	California Water Code
су	cubic yards
dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibel scale
d/D	flow level
DHS	California Department of Health and Services
DWP	Department of Water and Power
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
du	dwelling unit
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EMS	Emergency Medical Service
EOO	Emergency Operations Organization
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ERNS	Emergency Response Notification System
EZ	Los Angeles State Enterprise Zone
FAR	Floor Area Ratio
FCAA	Federal Clean Air Act
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
GBCI	Green Building Certification Institute

GHG	greenhouse gas
gpd	gallons per day
gpm	gallons per minute
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HFC	hydrofluorocarbons
HSA	Hyperion Service Area
HTP	Hyperion Treatment Plant
HVAC	Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning
I-10	Santa Monica Freeway
I-101	Hollywood Freeway
ISO	Interim Control Ordinance
ITE	Institute of Transportation Engineers
km	kilometers
kV	kilovolt
kWh	kilowatt-hours
LAA	Los Angeles Aqueduct
LABS	Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Sanitation
LADBS	Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety
LADOT	Los Angeles Department of Transportation
LADRP	Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks
LADWP	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
LAFD	Los Angeles Fire Department
LAMC	Los Angeles Municipal Code
LAPD	Los Angeles Police Department
LAPL	Los Angeles Public Library
LARWQCB	Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board
LAUSD	Los Angeles Unified School District
LBP	Lead-based paint
lbs/day	pounds per day
LCFS	Low Carbon Fuel Standard
L <sub>dn</sub>	day-night average noise level
LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
L <sub>eq</sub>	equivalent energy noise level/ambient noise level
LOS	Level of Service
LST	localized significance thresholds
LUST	leaking underground storage tank
LUTP	Land Use/Transportation Policy
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MCE	Maximum Considered Earthquake
MEP	maximum extent practicable
Metro	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority
mgd	million gallons per day

mi	miles
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MS4	medium and large municipal separate storm sewer systems
msl	mean sea level
mm	millimeters
M <sub>max</sub>	maximum moment magnitude
MTA	Metropolitan Transportation Authority
MWD	Metropolitan Water District
MWh	Mega-Watt hours
N <sub>2</sub> O	nitrous oxide
NAAQS	National ambient air quality standards
NFRAP	No Further Remedial Action Planned Sites
$NO_2$	nitrogen dioxide
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NOx	nitrogen oxides
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPL	National Priorities List
O <sub>3</sub>	Ozone
OAL	California Office of Administrative Law
OPR	Office of Planning and Research
Pb	lead
PEC	Potential environmental concern
PFC	perfluorocarbons
PGA	peak horizontal ground acceleration
PM	particulate matter
$PM_{10}$	respirable particulate matter
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	fine particulate matter
ppd	pounds per day
ppm	parts per million
PRC	Public Resources Code
PSI	pounds per square inch
PUC	Public Utilities Commission (also see CPUC)
PWS	Public water suppliers
RCP	Regional Comprehensive Plan
RCPG	Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide
RCRA	Resource Conservation Recovery Act
RD	Reporting District
REC	Recognized Environmental Condition
ROG	Reactive Organic Gases
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SB	Senate Bill

SCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCG	Southern California Gas Company
SCH	State Clearinghouse
sf	square feet
SF <sub>6</sub>	sulfur hexafluoride
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SLIC	Spills, Leaks, Investigation and Cleanup
$SO_2$	sulfur dioxide
$SO_4$	sulfates
SOx	sulfur oxides
SOPA	Society of Professional Archeologist
SPT	Standard Penetration Test
SR-110	Harbor Freeway
SRA	source receptor area
SRRE	Source Reduction and Recycling Element
SWAT	Solid Waste Assessment Test
SWF/LF	Solid Waste Information System
SWFP	Solid Waste Facility Permit
SWMP	stormwater management plan
SWP	State Water Project
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resource Control Board
TAC	Toxic Air Contaminants
TOD	Transit Oriented District
ТРН	total petroleum hydrocarbons
TSD	Treatment, Storage, and Disposal
TSP	Transportation Specific Plan
ULSD	Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel
US-101	Hollywood Freeway
USEPA/ U.S. EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USGBC	United States Green Building Council
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
UST	underground storage tank
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
V/C	Volume-to-Capacity
VCP	Voluntary Cleanup Plan
VdB	Vibration decibels
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound

WMA	Watershed Management Area
WMUDS	Waste Management Unit Database System
WSA	Water Supply Assessment
µg/m3	micrograms per cubic meter
ZIMAS	Zoning Information and Map Access System