

CITY OF LOS ANGELES CALIFORNIA



ERIC GARCETTI
MAYOR

EXECUTIVE OFFICES
200 N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801
(213) 978-1271

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
DIRECTOR

KEVIN J. KELLER, AICP
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

VACANT
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

DEPARTMENT OF
CITY PLANNING

COMMISSION OFFICE
(213) 978-1300

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

SAMANTHA MILLMAN
PRESIDENT

CAROLINE CHOE
VICE-PRESIDENT

HELEN LEUNG
KAREN MACK

DANA M. PERLMAN
YVETTE LOPEZ-LEDESMA
JENNA HORNSTOCK
RENEE DAKE WILSON
VACANT

West Court Apartments

Case Number: ENV-2019-5861-MND

Project Location: 1346, 1348, 1350, and 1354 West Court Street, Los Angeles, California
90026

Community Plan Area: Westlake

Council District: 1—Cedillo

Project Description: The project is the construction, use and maintenance of a six (6)-story, 69-unit apartment building up to 75 feet in height over a partially subterranean garage on one (1) lot with a total area of approximately 16,954.83 square feet. The project includes a minimum of 50 vehicle parking spaces, 61 bicycle parking spaces, 7,650 square feet of open space, and a minimum of 69 trees. The project proposes to cut 4,200 cubic yards of soil, and a haul route to export a total of 4,200 cubic yards of soil. The project will excavate approximately six (6) to eight (8) feet below the existing grade to accommodate the partially subterranean parking level. No fill or import of soil is proposed. There are no Protected Trees on-site.

PREPARED BY:

City of Los Angeles
Los Angeles City Planning

APPLICANT:

Lee Rubinoff
1350 Court Partners, LLP

July 2021

INITIAL STUDY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. Introduction	4
2. Executive Summary.....	6
3. Project Description	11
3.1. Project Summary.....	11
3.2. Environmental Setting	11
3.3. Description of project.....	13
3.4. Requested Permits and Approvals	14
4. Environmental Checklist.....	15
I. Aesthetics	15
II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources	19
III. Air Quality	21
IV. Biological Resources.....	24
V. Cultural Resources.....	27
VI. Energy	29
VII. Geology and Soils	30
VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	35
IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	37
X. Hydrology and Water Quality	43
XI. Land Use and Planning	48
XII. Mineral Resources	50
XIII. Noise	51
XIV. Population and Housing	53
XV. Public Services.....	54
XVI. Recreation	57
XVII. Transportation/Traffic.....	58
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources.....	61
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems.....	64
XX. Wildfire	66
XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	68
5. Preparers and Persons Consulted	70

List of Figures

A-1 Project Location.....	12
---------------------------	----

Appendices

A Soils Approval Letter, LADBS Grading, February 27, 2020 (Revised November 5, 2020).....A-1

B Soils Report, Leighton and Associates, Inc., August 31, 2016.....B-1

C Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Phase II Subsurface Investigation, Roux Associates, Inc. June 7, 2016. C-1

D Supplemental Phase II Investigation & Human Health Risk Screening Evaluation Report, Roux Associates, Inc. March 16, 2017..... D-1

E California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) Construction Site Well Review and Records, January 11, 2018.....E-1

F Anticipated Oil Well Abandonment Plan, Witten Engineering, Inc. July 22, 2021F-1

G Leak Test Report, Roux Associates, Inc. December 1, 2017..... G-1

H LADOT Transportation Assessment Letter, July 19, 2021 H-1

I Transportation Assessment, Overland Traffic Consultants, Inc. July 2021..... I-1

INITIAL STUDY

1 INTRODUCTION

This Initial Study (IS) document evaluates potential environmental effects resulting from construction and operation of the proposed West Court Apartments project (“project”). The proposed project is subject to the guidelines and regulations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Therefore, this document has been prepared in compliance with the relevant provisions of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines as implemented by the City of Los Angeles (City). Based on the analysis provided within this Initial Study, the City has concluded that the project will not result in significant impacts on the environment. This Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration are intended as informational documents and are ultimately required to be adopted by the decision maker prior to project approval by the City.

1.1 PURPOSE OF AN INITIAL STUDY

The California Environmental Quality Act was enacted in 1970 with several basic purposes: (1) to inform governmental decision makers and the public about the potential significant environmental effects of proposed projects; (2) to identify ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced; (3) to prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures; and (4) to disclose to the public the reasons behind a project’s approval even if significant environmental effects are anticipated.

An application for the proposed project has been submitted to the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning for discretionary review. The Department of City Planning, as Lead Agency, has determined that the project is subject to CEQA, and the preparation of an Initial Study is required.

An Initial Study is a preliminary analysis conducted by the Lead Agency, in consultation with other agencies (responsible or trustee agencies, as applicable), to determine whether there is substantial evidence that a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the Initial Study concludes that the project, with mitigation, may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report should be prepared; otherwise the Lead Agency may adopt a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code §21000 et seq.), the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, §15000 et seq.), and the City of Los Angeles CEQA Guidelines (1981, amended 2006).

1.2. ORGANIZATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study is organized into four sections as follows:

1 INTRODUCTION

Describes the purpose and content of the Initial Study and provides an overview of the CEQA process.

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Provides project information, identifies key areas of environmental concern, and includes a determination whether the project may have a significant effect on the environment.

3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Provides a description of the environmental setting and the project, including project characteristics and a list of discretionary actions.

4 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Contains the completed Initial Study Checklist and discussion of the environmental factors that would be potentially affected by the project.

INITIAL STUDY

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROJECT TITLE	WEST COURT APARTMENTS
ENVIRONMENTAL CASE NO.	ENV-2019-5861-MND
RELATED CASES	DIR-2019-5859-TOC-SPP

PROJECT LOCATION	1346, 1348, 1350, 1354 WEST COURT STREET
COMMUNITY PLAN AREA	WESTLAKE
GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION	MEDIUM RESIDENTIAL
ZONING	R4(CW)
COUNCIL DISTRICT	1 - CEDILLO

LEAD AGENCY	City of Los Angeles
STAFF CONTACT	DYLAN LAWRENCE
ADDRESS	200 N. SPRING ST., ROOM 621 LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
PHONE NUMBER	(213) 978-1182
EMAIL	DYLAN.LAWRENCE@LACITY.ORG

APPLICANT	LEE RUBINOFF, 1350 COURT PARTNERS, LLP
ADDRESS	1171 SOUTH ROBERTSON BOULEVARD, LOS ANGELES, CA 90035
PHONE NUMBER	(213) 437-3403

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project is the construction, use and maintenance of a six (6)-story, 69-unit apartment building up to 75 feet in height over a partially subterranean garage on one (1) lot with a total area of approximately 16,954.83 square feet. The project includes a minimum of 50 vehicle parking spaces, 61 bicycle parking spaces, 7,650 square feet of open space, and a minimum of 69 trees. The project proposes to cut 4,200 cubic yards and a haul route to export a total of 4,200 cubic yards of soil. The project will cut approximately six (6) to eight (8) feet below the existing grade to accommodate the partially subterranean parking level. No fill or import of soil is proposed and there are no Protected Trees on-site.

(For additional detail, see “Section 3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION”).

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site and vicinity are located in a residential area of the Westlake Community Plan within the Central City West Specific Plan area. The project site totals approximately 16,954.83 square feet. The site is zoned R4(CW)-75/3-O under the Central City West Specific Plan and designated for Medium Residential Land Use. R4(CW) is defined as a Multiple Residential Category. The surrounding area is zoned under the Central City West Specific Plan. To the west is the Echo Park Pool, which is designated as an Open Space land use and as OS(CW)-O under the Specific Plan. To the north is a 92-unit apartment building on a property designated for Medium Residential land use and designated as R4(CW)-75/3-O under the Specific Plan. To the east is a mixture of single-family homes and duplexes located on properties designated for Medium Residential land use and designated as R4(CW)-75/3-O under the Specific Plan. To the south is a 47-unit apartment building currently under construction on a site designated for Medium Residential land use and designated as R4(CW)-75/3-O under the Central City West Specific Plan. The project site is located at the southeast corner of the intersection at Court Street and Douglas Street within the Temple/Beaudry Neighborhood District of the Central City West Specific Plan.

Court Street is a Collector Street with a designated right-of-way width of 66 feet and a designated roadway width of 40 feet. West Court Street is improved with a paved roadway and sewer. There are no existing sidewalks adjacent to the project site. Douglas Street is a Local Street, Standard with a designated right-of-way width of 60 feet and a designated roadway width of 36 feet and is improved with a sewer and roadway. The Alley abutting the rear of the project site on the south is 20 feet wide.

No bodies of water are present on or adjacent to the project site. The project site is not located within a Very High Fire Severity Zone, landslide area, a flood zone, a tsunami inundation zone, or liquefaction area. The project site is located in a Methane Zone, a BOE Special Grading Area (Basic Grid Map A-13372), and an Urban Agriculture Incentive Zone; and is 1.15 kilometers away from the Upper Elysian Park fault. Per the California Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM), formerly the Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) records, the site contains four (4) oil wells. One was abandoned to current Division requirements, and three (3) will require abandonment to meet current Division standards as prescribed by law. The Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM) oversees the drilling, operation, maintenance, and plugging and abandonment of oil, natural gas, and geothermal energy wells.

(For additional detail, see “Section 3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION”).

OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED

(e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement)

Including, but not limited to the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety for permits, Board of Public Works for removal of Protected Trees or parkway trees.

The California Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM), previous called California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources (“DOGGR”).

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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


DETERMINATION

(To be completed by the 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.

<u>Dylan Lawrence</u> PRINTED NAME	<u>Planning Assistant</u> TITLE
 SIGNATURE	<u>7/23/21</u> DATE

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

INITIAL STUDY

3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 PROJECT SUMMARY

The project is the construction, use and maintenance of six (6)-story, 69-unit apartment building up to 75 feet in height over a partially subterranean garage on one parcel with a total area of approximately 16,954.83 square feet within the Temple/Beaudry Neighborhood District of the Central City West Specific Plan. The project includes 51,137 square feet of floor area, a minimum of 50 vehicle parking spaces, 61 bicycle parking spaces, 7,650 square feet of open space, and a minimum of 69 trees. The project proposes to cut 4,200 cubic yards and a haul route to export a total of 4,200 cubic yards of soil. The project will cut approximately six (6) to eight (8) feet below the existing grade in order to accommodate the partially subterranean parking level. No fill or import of soil is proposed and there are no Protected Trees on-site. The proposed project includes 30 2-bedroom units, 20 1-bedroom units, and 19 studio units and would set aside six (6) units (8 percent of the total 69 units) as Extremely Low Income (ELI) units.

3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.2.1 Project Location

The project site is located at 1346, 1348, 1350, and 1354 West Court Street (APN 5160011018) in the Central City West Specific Plan area of the Westlake Community Plan. It is bounded by Court Street to the north and Douglas Street to the west. The project site is generally located south of Temple Street and east of Glendale Boulevard. The subject property consists of one (1) tied lot with approximately 120 feet of frontage along the southerly side of Court Street and approximately 135 feet of frontage along the westerly side of Douglas Street.

3.2.2 Existing Conditions

The project site, which is currently vacant, is slightly sloped and rectangular-shaped. It totals 16,954.83 square feet, is zoned under the Central City West Specific Plan as R4(CW)-75/3-O, and is designated in the Westlake Community Plan as Medium Residential. The zoning of R4(CW) is defined as a Multiple Residential Category. The project site and vicinity are located within a residential area of the Central City West Specific Plan, east of Glendale Boulevard and south of Temple Street.

The project site was previously developed with two (2) single-family dwellings that have since been demolished, and it is now vacant. No bodies of water are present on or adjacent to the project site. The project site is not located within a Very High Fire Severity Zone, hillside area, landslide area, a flood zone, an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone, an airport hazard area, a coastal zone, farmland, a tsunami inundation zone, or liquefaction area. The project site is located in a Methane Zone, a BOE Special Grading Area (Basic Grid Map A-13372), and an Urban Agriculture Incentive Zone; and is 1.15 kilometers away from

the Upper Elysian Park Fault Zone. There are four (4) oil wells on-site. One was abandoned to current Division requirements, and three (3) will require abandonment to meet current standards as prescribed by law.

Local access to the project site is provided from the following neighborhood streets:

- Douglas Street
- Colton Street
- Toluca Street
- Edgeware Road

3.2.3 Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is located within the Westlake Community Plan and the surrounding area is zoned for multi-family dwellings (R4(CW)-75/3-O Land Use Category within the Central City West Specific Plan). The zoning of R4(CW) is defined as a Multiple Residential Category. The Echo Park Pool, zoned OS(CW)-O under the Central City West Specific Plan, is located directly west of the project site, across Douglas Street. The project site is also located approximately 0.2 miles southwest of the 101 Freeway and 0.5 miles northwest of the 110 Freeway. Court Street is designated as a Collector with a designated right-of-way width of 66 feet and a designated roadway width of 40 feet. Douglas Street is designated as a Local Street – Standard with a designated right-of-way width of 60 feet and a designated roadway width of 36 feet. The alley abutting the rear of the property is approximately 20 feet in width.

The surrounding area is characterized by a mix of level and sloped topography and improved streets. Properties to the north, east, and south are zoned under the Central City West Specific Plan under the R4(CW)-75/3-O Land Use Category. The property to the west is zoned under the Central City West Specific Plan and under the OS(CW)-O Land Use Category. The project site is located within the Temple/Beaudry Neighborhood District of the Specific Plan.



Figure A-1: Project Location

3.3 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

3.3.1 Project Overview

The project is the construction, use and maintenance of a six (6)-story, 69-unit apartment building up to 75 feet in height over a partially subterranean garage on one (1) parcel with a total area of approximately 16,954.83 square feet. The project includes a minimum of 50 vehicle parking spaces, 61 bicycle parking spaces, 7,650 square feet of open space, and a minimum of 69 trees. As part of the project, a minimum of eight (8) percent (six (6) units) of the total dwelling units will be rent-restricted for Extremely Low Income Households, in accordance with a local land use covenant recorded with the Housing and Community Investment Department of Los Angeles (HCIDLA).

Of the 69 new dwelling units, the proposed project would include 30 two-bedroom apartments, 20 one-bedroom apartments, and 19 studio apartments. The proposed project would include at least 7,650 square feet of Open Space, consisting of a rec room, a podium deck, private open space balconies, a landscaped roof deck, and a separate rooftop deck. The proposed project will provide 50 residential parking spaces and 61 bicycle parking spaces on-site. The project proposes a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 4.2:1 and a total floor area of 51,137 square feet.

The project proposes a haul route to export a total of 4,200 cubic yards of soil. The project will excavate approximately six (6) to eight (8) feet below the existing grade in order to accommodate the partially subterranean parking level. No fill or import of soil is proposed and there are no Protected Trees on-site. The proposed project will be governed by the approved haul route that conforms to requirements of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, which regulate the travel route for hauling trucks and times at which they may leave the site.

The requested entitlements include a Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Affordable Housing Incentive Program and project Permit Compliance Review pursuant to Section 12.22 A.31 and Section 11.5.7 C of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) and the Central City West Specific Plan Ordinance No. 166,703 and all amendments, respectively.

3.4 REQUESTED PERMITS AND APPROVALS

The list below includes the anticipated requests for approval of the project. The Mitigated Negative Declaration will analyze impacts associated with the project and will provide environmental review sufficient for all necessary entitlements and public agency actions associated with the project. The discretionary entitlements, reviews, permits and approvals required to implement the project include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

- Pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 12.22 A.31, a Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Affordable Housing Incentive Program consisting of Base Incentives and three (3) additional incentives for 1) a 25 percent reduction of the western side yard to allow 6 feet, 9 inches in lieu of 9 feet otherwise required; 2) a 25 percent reduction of eastern side yard to allow 6 feet, 9 inches in lieu of 9 feet otherwise required; and 3) a 25 percent reduction of rear yard setback to allow 13 feet, 6 inches in lieu of 18 feet otherwise required for a property within Tier 1 of the TOC.

- Pursuant to LAMC Section 11.5.7 C, a Project Permit Compliance for the construction, use and maintenance of a new 6-story, 69 unit apartment building with, 50 vehicle parking spaces, 61 bicycle parking spaces on a 16,954.83 square foot parcel in the CW Zone within the Central City West Specific Plan.
- Other discretionary and ministerial permits and approvals that may be deemed necessary, including, but not limited to, temporary street closure permits, grading and hauling permits, tree removal permits, excavation permits, foundation permits, building permits, and sign permits.

INITIAL STUDY

4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

I. AESTHETICS

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

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Senate Bill (SB) 743 [Public Resources Code (PRC) §21099(d)] sets forth new guidelines for evaluating project transportation impacts under CEQA, as follows: “Aesthetic and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project on an infill site within a transit priority area (TPA) shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.” PRC Section 21099 defines a “transit priority area” as an area within 0.5 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.” PRC 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.” PRC Section 21099 defines an “employment center project” as “a project located on property zoned for commercial uses with a floor area ratio of no less than 0.75 and that is located within a transit priority area. PRC Section 21099 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 in the 2006 L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide, including those established for aesthetics, obstruction of views, shading, and nighttime illumination.

The related City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning Zoning Information (ZI) File ZI No. 2452 provides further instruction concerning the definition of transit priority projects and that “visual resources, aesthetic character, shade and shadow, light and glare, and scenic vistas or any other aesthetic impact as defined in the City’s CEQA Threshold Guide shall not be considered an impact for infill projects within TPAs pursuant to CEQA.”¹

PRC Section 21099 applies to the project. Therefore, the project is exempt from aesthetic impacts. The analysis in this initial study, is for informational purposes only and not for determining whether the project will result in significant impacts to the environment. Any aesthetic impact analysis in this initial study is included to discuss what aesthetic impacts would occur from the project if PRC Section 21099(d) was not in effect. As such, nothing in the aesthetic impact discussion in this initial study shall trigger the need for any CEQA findings, CEQA analysis, or CEQA mitigation measures.

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

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. A scenic vista refers to views of focal points or panoramic views of broader geographic areas that have visual interest. A focal point view would consist of a view of a notable object, building, or setting. An impact on a scenic vista would occur if the bulk or design of a building or development contrasts enough with a visually interesting view, so that the quality of the view is permanently affected.

The project site is located along the southerly side of Court Street and easterly side of Douglas Street. The project site is approximately 0.3 miles from the intersection of the Metro 10 bus line and the LADOT DASH Pico Union/Echo Park bus line. It is also approximately 0.4 miles away from the 1st and Beaudry stop of the Metro 14 bus line. The project site is identified as located within a Transit Priority Area (City of Los Angeles Transit Priority Area Map, 2016) per SB 743. Surrounding properties are developed with single-family dwellings, duplexes, multi-family residential buildings, and an indoor pool. The project proposes the construction, use, and maintenance of a new six (6)-story apartment building above a partially subterranean parking level that is 75 feet in height and contains 69 dwelling units within the Temple/Beaudry Neighborhood District of the Central City West Specific Plan. Due to existing topography and urban development, views from the vicinity of the project site are limited to short- and mid-range views of existing structures; no scenic vistas are present from and/or near the project site. Therefore, as an infill project within one-half mile from a major transit stop, the project will not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista.

¹ City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Zoning Information File ZA No. 2452, Transit Priority Areas (TPAs)/Exemptions to Aesthetics and Parking Within TPAs Pursuant to CEQA. Available at: <http://zimas.lacity.org/documents/zoneinfo/ZI2452.pdf>. Accessed Dec. 2, 2016.

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 state scenic highway?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially damage scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway. The City of Los Angeles' General Plan Mobility Element (Citywide General Plan Circulation System Maps) indicates that no State-designated scenic highways are located near the project site. Therefore, no impacts related to a State Scenic Highway would occur.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings. Significant impacts to the visual character of a site and its surroundings are generally based on the removal of features with aesthetic value, the introduction of contrasting urban features into a local area, and the degree to which the elements of the proposed project detract from the visual character of an area. The surrounding project area is developed with one- to three-story single-family dwellings and duplexes, along with a six-story multi-family residential building across West Court Street. Additionally, a six-story multi-family residential building is currently under construction across the alley abutting the rear of the project site. The area directly to the west is developed with an indoor public pool facility. The proposed project would construct a six-story, 69-unit, multi-family apartment building over one level of subterranean parking. The project site is zoned R4(CW)-75/3-O under the Central City West Specific Plan. The project site meets the requirements for Senate Bill SB 743, as described in Section I(a) and is exempt from aesthetic impacts. Therefore, through the implementation of SB 743 and due to complementary surrounding land uses and developments, impacts to the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings would be less than significant. Refer to Response to Checklist Question I (a) above.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if light and glare substantially altered the character of off-site areas surrounding the site or interfered with the performance of an off-site activity. Light impacts are typically associated with the use of artificial light during the evening and night-time hours. Glare may be a daytime occurrence caused by the reflection of sunlight or artificial light from highly polished surfaces, such as window glass and reflective cladding materials, and may interfere with the safe operation of a motor vehicle on adjacent streets. Daytime glare is common in urban areas and is typically associated with mid- to high-rise buildings with exterior façades largely or entirely comprised of highly reflective glass or mirror-like materials. Nighttime glare is primarily associated with bright point-source lighting that contrasts with existing low ambient light conditions. The project site meets the requirements for Senate Bill SB 743, as described in Section I(a) and is exempt from aesthetic impacts. Due to the urbanized

nature of the area, a moderate level of ambient nighttime light already exists. Nighttime lighting sources include street lights, vehicle headlights, and interior and exterior building illumination. The proposed project may include nighttime security lighting. However, the security lighting would be night-friendly LEDs and would not substantially change existing ambient nighttime lighting conditions. The proposed project does not include any elements or features that would create substantial new sources of glare. Therefore, light and glare impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Response to Checklist Question I (a) above.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would convert valued farmland to non-agricultural uses. The project site is vacant but located in an urbanized area and surrounded by single- and multi-family residences. No farmland, agricultural uses, or related operations are present within the project site or surrounding area. Due to its urban setting, the project site and surrounding area are not included in the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, the proposed project would not convert any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use, and no impact would occur.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project conflicted with existing agricultural zoning or agricultural parcels enrolled under the Williamson Act. The project site is not zoned for agricultural use or under a Williamson Contract. As the project site and surrounding area do not contain farmland of any type, the proposed project would not conflict with a Williamson Contract. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project conflicted with existing zoning or caused rezoning of forest land or timberland, or resulted in the loss of forest land or in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The project site and the surrounding area are not zoned for forest land or timberland. Accordingly, the proposed project would not conflict with forest land or timberland zoning or result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact would occur.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project conflicted with existing zoning or caused rezoning of forest land or timberland, or resulted in the loss of forest land or in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The project site and the surrounding area are not zoned for forest land or timberland. Accordingly, the proposed project would not conflict with forest land or timberland zoning or result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact would occur.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project caused the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. The project site does not contain farmland, forestland, or timberland. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

No Impact. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the agency primarily responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in the South Coast Air Basin and reducing emissions from area and point stationary, mobile, and indirect sources. SCAQMD prepared the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) to meet federal and state ambient air quality standards. A significant air quality impact may occur if a project is inconsistent with the AQMP or would in some way represent a substantial hindrance to employing the policies or obtaining the goals of that plan. The proposed project is not expected to conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the AQMP and SCAQMD rules. The proposed project is also subject to the City’s Green Building Program Ordinance (Ord. No. 179,890), which was adopted to reduce the use of natural resources, create healthier living environments, and minimize the negative impacts of development on local, regional and global ecosystems. Therefore, no impact would occur.

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the air basin is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project violates any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Based on published studies for similar projects, during the construction phase the proposed project would not likely exceed the regional SCAQMD significance thresholds for emissions of

Carbon Monoxide (CO), Reactive Organic Compounds (ROG), Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x), Particulate Matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), and Sulfur Dioxide (SO_x). Therefore, regional emission impacts for the proposed project would be less than significant for all construction phases. Motor vehicles that access the project site would be the predominant source of long-term project operations emissions. Additional emissions would be generated by area sources, such as energy use and landscape maintenance activities. The project would be subject to regulatory compliance measures, which reduce the impacts of operational and construction regional emissions. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project were to generate pollutant concentrations to a degree that would significantly affect sensitive receptors. The SCAQMD identifies the following as sensitive receptors: long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, and athletic facilities. The surrounding project area is developed with one- to three-story single-family dwellings and duplexes, along with a six-story multi-family residential building across West Court Street. Additionally, a six-story multi-family residential building is currently under construction across the alley abutting the rear of the project site. The area directly to the west is developed with an indoor public pool facility. The SCAQMD has developed localized significance thresholds (LSTs) that are based on the amount of maximum daily-localized construction emissions per day that can be generated by a project that would cause or contribute to adverse localized air quality impacts. These apply to projects that are less than or equal to five acres in size and are only applicable to Repairable Particulate Matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), Carbon Monoxide (CO), and Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x). The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has published guidance for locating new sensitive receptors (e.g., residences) away from nearby sources of air pollution. Relevant recommendations include avoiding siting new sensitive land uses within 500 feet of a freeway or 300 feet of a large gas station (defined as a facility with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater). The location of the proposed project would be consistent with the CARB recommendations for locating new sensitive receptors. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant Impact. Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include equipment exhaust and architectural coatings. Odors from these sources would be localized and generally confined to the immediate area surrounding the project site. The proposed project would utilize typical construction techniques, and the odors would be typical of most construction sites and temporary in nature. Construction of the proposed project would not cause an odor nuisance.

According to the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses and industrial operations that are associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies and fiberglass

molding. The proposed project does not include these land uses or industrial operations. Therefore, the proposed project will not create new objectionable odors during operation.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance (e.g., oak trees or California walnut woodlands)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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

No Impact. A project would have a significant biological impact through the loss or destruction of individuals of a species or through the degradation of sensitive habitat. The project site is located in a highly urbanized area, east of Glendale Boulevard and south of Temple Street, within the Westlake Community Plan. There are no trees onsite. Nesting birds are protected under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (Title 33, United States Code, Section 703 et seq., see also Title 50, Code of Federal Regulation, Part 10) and Section 3503 of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Code. Thus, the project applicant shall comply with the regulatory compliance measures to ensure that no significant impacts to nesting birds or sensitive biological species or habitat would occur. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if any riparian habitat or natural community would be lost or destroyed as a result of urban development. The project site does not contain any riparian habitat and does not contain any streams or water courses necessary to support riparian habitat. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or the United States Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS), and no impacts would occur.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if federally protected wetlands would be modified or removed by a project. The project site does not contain any federally protected wetlands, wetland resources, or other waters of the United States as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The project site is located in a highly urbanized area surrounded by land that is developed with residential uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any 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, and no impacts would occur.

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

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would interfere with, or remove access to, a migratory wildlife corridor or impede use of native wildlife nursery sites. Due to the highly urbanized nature of the project site and surrounding area, the lack of a major water body, and the limited number of trees, the project site does not support habitat for native resident or

migratory species or contain native nurseries. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere with wildlife movement or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, and no impact would occur.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be inconsistent with local regulations pertaining to biological resources. The proposed project would not conflict with any policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Ordinance (No. 177,404). There are no trees on-site. The proposed project would be required to comply with the provisions of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the California Fish and Game Code (CFGF). Both the MBTA and CDFW protects migratory birds that may use trees on or adjacent to the project site for nesting, and may be disturbed during construction of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not 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), and no impacts would occur.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact. The 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. 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, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan, and no impacts would occur.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially alter the environmental context of, or remove identified historical resources. The site is currently vacant. In addition, the site has not been identified as a historic resource by local or state agencies, and the project site has not been determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, the Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments Register, and/or any local register. In addition, the site was not found to be a potential historic resource based on SurveyLA, the citywide survey of Los Angeles or the City's HistoricPlacesLA website. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if a known or unknown archaeological resource would be removed, altered, or destroyed as a result of the proposed development. Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines significant archaeological resources as resources that meet the criteria for historical resources or resources that constitute unique archaeological resources. A project-related significant impact could occur if a project would significantly affect archaeological resources that fall under either of these categories.

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 regulatory compliance measures, personnel of the proposed 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. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if previously interred human remains would be disturbed during excavation of the project site. Human remains could be encountered during excavation and grading activities associated with the proposed project. While no formal cemeteries, other places of human interment, or burial grounds or sites are known to occur within the project area, there is always a possibility that human remains can be encountered during construction. 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. If human remains of Native American origin are discovered during project construction, compliance with state laws, which fall within the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) (Public Resource Code Section 5097), relating to the disposition of Native American burials will be adhered to. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

VI. ENERGY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would be designed and operated in accordance with the applicable State Building Code Title 24 regulations and City of Los Angeles Green Building Code, which impose energy conservation measures. The majority of the energy usage in the proposed Project would consist of lighting, climate control, and appliance operation. Adherence to the aforementioned energy requirements will ensure conformance with the State's goal of promoting energy and lighting efficiency. As such, impacts of the proposed Project would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

No Impact. The project would be designed to comply with all applicable state and local codes, including the City's Green Building Ordinance and the California Green Building Standards Code. Design features that could be implemented would include, but not be limited to, use of efficient lighting technology; energy efficient heating, ventilation and cooling equipment; and Energy Star rated products and appliances.

Overall, the project would be designed and constructed in accordance with applicable state and local green building standards that would serve to reduce the energy demand of the project. In addition, based on the above, the project's energy demand would be within the existing and planned electricity and natural gas capacities of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) and SoCalGas, respectively. Use of petroleum-based fuels during construction and operation would also be minimized. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency and no impact would occur.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Directly or indirectly cause 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Be located on a geologic unit 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h. 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 waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Directly or indirectly cause 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 would occur if the proposed project would cause personal injury or death or result in property damage as a result of a fault rupture occurring on the project site and if the project site is located within a State-designated Alquist-Priolo Zone or other designated fault zone. The subject site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or other designated fault zone. The nearest fault zone, Upper Elysian Park, is located approximately 1.15 km from the project site. Thus, the potential for fault rupture at the project site would be considered low. The project would involve the construction of a residential structure to be utilized for residential purposes in accordance with allowed uses under existing zoning and no proposed uses would have the potential to directly or indirectly exacerbate existing potential for fault rupture. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would cause personal injury or death or resulted in property damage as a result of seismic ground shaking. The entire Southern California region is susceptible to strong ground shaking from severe earthquakes. Consequently, development of the proposed project could expose people and structures to strong seismic ground shaking. However, the proposed project would be designed and constructed in accordance with State and local Building Codes to reduce the potential for exposure of people or structures to seismic risks to the maximum extent possible. The proposed project would be required to comply with the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG), which provides guidance for the

evaluation and mitigation of earthquake-related hazards, and with the seismic safety requirements in the Uniform Building Code (UBC) and the LAMC. Compliance with such requirements would reduce seismic ground shaking impacts to the maximum extent practicable with current engineering practices. Therefore, impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

c) Directly or indirectly cause 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 proposed project site is located within a liquefaction zone. Liquefaction is the loss of soil strength or stiffness due to a buildup of pore-water pressure during severe ground shaking. While the subject site is not located within a Liquefaction Zone, specific Regulatory Compliance Measures (RCMs) in the City of Los Angeles regulate the grading and construction of projects in these particular types of locations and will reduce any potential impacts to less than significant. RCMs include the Uniform Building Code Chapter 18, Division 1, Section 1804.5: Liquefaction Potential and Soil Strength Loss. These RCMs have been historically proven to work to the satisfaction of the City Engineer to reduce any impacts from the specific environment the project is located. The LADBS, Grading Division issued a Soils Approval Letter dated February 27, 2020 (Log Reference No. 112259R) (Appendix A) with conditions that must be complied with during site development. This was based on the Geology and Soils Report (Appendix B) that the applicant submitted to the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety (LADBS) for review. Therefore, impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be less than significant.

d) Directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

Landslides?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project is implemented on a site that is located in a hillside area with unstable geological conditions or soil types that is be susceptible to failure when saturated. According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, the Seismic Hazard Zones Map for this area shows the project site is not located within a landslide hazard zone. The project site and surrounding area are characterized by a gentle downward slope from east to west along Court Street. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential effects resulting from landslides, and no impacts would occur.

e) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if construction activities or future uses result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Construction of the proposed project would result in ground surface disturbance during site clearance, excavation, and grading, which could create the potential for soil erosion to occur. The project includes 4,200 cubic yards of cut and 4,200 cubic yards of export. The project will cut six (6) to eight (8) feet below the existing grade in order to accommodate the partially subterranean parking level. Construction activities would

be performed in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles Building Code and the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) through the City's Stormwater Management Division. In addition, the proposed project would be required to develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would require implementation of an erosion control plan to reduce the potential for wind or waterborne erosion during the construction process. In addition, all onsite grading and site preparation would comply with applicable provisions of Chapter IX, Division 70 of the LAMC. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur with respect to erosion or loss of topsoil.

f) 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 significant impact would occur if any unstable geological conditions would result in any type of geological failure, including lateral spreading, off-site landslides, liquefaction, or collapse. Development of the proposed project would not have the potential to expose people and structures to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslide; see VII a-e for these issues. Subsidence and ground collapse generally occur in areas with active groundwater withdrawal or petroleum production. The extraction of groundwater or petroleum from sedimentary source rocks can cause the permanent collapse of the pore space previously occupied by the removed fluid. According to the Safety Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan, Critical Facilities and Lifeline Systems, Exhibit E and/or the Environmental and Public Facilities Map (1996), the project site is not identified as being located in an oil field or within an oil drilling area. The proposed project would be required to implement standard construction practices that would ensure that the integrity of the project site and the proposed structures is maintained. Construction will be required by the Department of Building and Safety to comply with the City of Los Angeles Uniform Building Code (UBC) which is designed to assure safe construction and includes building foundation requirements appropriate to site conditions. With the implementation of the Building Code requirements and the Department of Building and Safety's Soils Report Approval Letter dated February 27, 2020 (Log Reference #112259R)(Appendix A), the potential for landslide lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse would be less than significant.

g) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18 1 B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be built on expansive soils without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for project buildings, thus, posing a hazard to life and property. Expansive soils have relatively high clay mineral and expand with the addition of water and shrink when dried, which can cause damage to overlying structures. However, the proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements of the UBC, LAMC, and other applicable building codes. Compliance with such requirements would reduce impacts related to expansive soils, and impacts would be less than significant.

h) 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. A project would cause a significant impact if adequate wastewater disposal is not available. The project site is located in a highly urbanized area, where wastewater infrastructure is currently in place. The proposed project would connect to existing sewer lines that serve the project site and would not use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

i) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less Than Significant Impact. There is a potential for buried paleontological resources to be found within the project site. If paleontological resources are discovered during excavation, grading, or construction, the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety will be notified immediately, and all work will 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. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact. Greenhouse gases (GHG) are those gaseous constituents of the atmosphere, both natural and anthropogenic (human generated), that absorb and emit radiation at specific wavelengths within the spectrum of terrestrial radiation emitted by the earth's surface, the atmosphere itself, and by clouds. The greenhouse effect compares the Earth and the atmosphere surrounding it to a greenhouse with glass panes. The glass panes in a greenhouse let heat from sunlight in and reduce the amount of heat that escapes. GHGs, such as carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O), keep the average surface temperature of the Earth close to 60 degrees Fahrenheit (°F). Without the greenhouse effect, the Earth would be a frozen globe with an average surface temperature of about 5°F. The City has adopted the LA Green Plan to provide a citywide plan for achieving the City's GHG emissions targets, for both existing and future generation of GHG emissions. In order to implement the goal of improving energy conservation and efficiency, the Los Angeles City Council has adopted multiple ordinances and updates to establish the current Los Angeles Green Building Code (LAGBC) (Ordinance No. 179,890). The LAGBC requires projects to achieve a 20 percent reduction in potable water use and wastewater generation. As the LAGBC includes applicable provisions of the State's CALGreen Code, a new project that can demonstrate it complies with the LAGBC is considered consistent with statewide GHG reduction goals and policies including AB32 (California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006). Through required implementation of the LAGBC, the proposed project would be consistent with local and statewide goals and policies aimed at reducing the generation of GHGs. Therefore, the proposed project's generation of GHG emissions would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to emissions. Impacts will be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The California legislature passed Senate Bill (SB) 375 to connect regional transportation planning to land use decisions made at a local level. SB 375 requires the metropolitan planning organizations to prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in their regional transportation plans to achieve the per capita GHG reduction targets. For the SCAG region, the SCS is contained in the 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The 2020-2045 RTP/SCS focuses the majority of new housing and job growth in high-quality transit areas and other opportunity areas on existing main streets, in downtowns, and commercial corridors, resulting in more opportunity for transit-oriented development. In addition, SB 743, adopted September 27, 2013, encourages land use and transportation planning decisions that reduce vehicle miles traveled, which contribute to GHG emissions, as required by AB 32. The project would provide infill residential development [proximate to a major transportation corridor (i.e., Temple Street) and would not interfere with SCAG's ability to implement the regional strategies outlined in the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. The proposed project, therefore, would be consistent with statewide, regional and local goals and policies aimed at reducing GHG emissions and would result in a less than significant impact related to plans that target the reduction of GHG emissions.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Construction of the proposed project would involve the temporary use of potentially hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. Operation of the project would involve the limited use and storage of common hazardous substances typical of those used in residential developments, including lubricants, paints, solvents, custodial products (e.g., cleaning supplies), pesticides and other landscaping supplies, and vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. No uses or activities are proposed that would result in the use or discharge of unregulated hazardous materials and/or substances, or create a public hazard through transport, use, or disposal. As a residential development, the proposed project would not involve large quantities of hazardous materials that would require routine transport, use, or disposal. With compliance to applicable standards and regulations and adherence to manufacturer's instructions related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project created a significant hazard to the public or environment due to a reasonably foreseeable release of hazardous materials. The removal of asbestos is regulated by SCAQMD Rule 1403; therefore, any asbestos found on-site would be required to be removed in accordance with applicable regulations. The site is currently vacant, but was previously developed with two residential structures per building permit records.

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment ("ESA") and Phase II Subsurface Investigation was prepared by Roux Associates, Inc. dated June 7, 2016 (Appendix C). The purpose of the Phase I assessment was to review historic land uses on and near the site to identify potential environmental concerns involving known or potential releases of environmental contaminants, and to evaluate existing conditions to identify other potential sources of environmental contaminants that could represent a threat to construction workers, neighboring land uses and/or the environment. The Phase II was intended to help identify and define potential mitigation and/or remediation that may be needed to allow for Site redevelopment. Elevated concentrations of lead were detected in concentrations exceeding the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) risk levels of 80 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) in three locations. Sampling during grading activities associated with the future development of the Site is recommended to characterize the soil being transported off-Site during and confirm that no elevated concentrations remain on the Site.

In October 2016, Roux Associates conducted soil sampling at nine locations and analysis of three previously collected soil samples. A supplemental Phase II Investigation & Human Health Risk Screening Evaluation Report dated March 16, 2017 (Appendix D) was conducted to define the

extent of total lead impacts to soil to document the results of subsurface investigations at the Site and to evaluate environmental conditions for planned residential redevelopment. Based on the results of the investigations conducted, Roux Associates recommended the excavation of total lead impacted soils. Compliance with existing State laws regarding removal would be required, resulting in a less than significant impact.

Per the California Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM), (previously called California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources (“DOGGR”)) records and Construction Site Well Review letter dated January 11, 2018, (See Appendix E) the site contains four (4) oil wells. One (1) well was abandoned consistent with Division requirements as prescribed by law. The other three (3) wells will require re-abandonment to meet current standards in compliance with California law. According to the letter, the Division expects these wells to be re-abandoned in compliance with current California law, prior to development activities. A proposed abandonment plan for the three wells was prepared by Witten Engineering, Inc. dated July 22, 2021 (Appendix F). The applicant will be required to bring all oil wells into compliance and design, permit (plan check), inspect, and certify methane mitigation measures beneath the proposed building. With imposition of the following mitigation measure, the project will be designed to protect the health and safety of all future inhabitants. All re-abandonment work will be subject to a Site Remediation Program permitted by CalGEM to ensure safe and environmentally sound operations, which will avoid significant impacts. All oil re-abandonment work will be performed by licensed and experienced petroleum engineers. A Leak Test report was prepared (Leak Test Report, December 1, 2017. Roux Associates, Inc.) (Appendix G), which indicated that no leaks of hazardous gases were observed at Well No. 1, the reported plugged and abandoned oil well.

Based on the results of the investigations conducted, Roux Associates recommended the confirmation and, if necessary, the proper abandonment of reported historical oil wells; and, the design and installation of a methane barrier prior to Site development. As part of Site remediation and prior to Site development, the existence of all three previously unabandoned oil wells and all related piping associated with oil production will need to be confirmed and, if they exist on-Site, abandoned to current DOGGR guidelines, as necessary. Compliance with existing State laws regarding removal would be required, resulting in a less than significant impact.

As discussed previously, the proposed project operations would not involve activities that could result in reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials to the environment. The discussion of this threshold, therefore, focuses on potential impacts that could occur during oil well re-abandonment, and construction activities. Impacts could occur if there were an accidental release of hazardous materials from disturbance of existing site improvements and subsurface materials that are known to be contaminated or which could result in unexpected disturbances of unknown contamination that may exist. Groundwater is estimated beneath the site and since the proposed grading would not extend to depths greater than 6 - 8 feet, groundwater would not be encountered during development activities.

With the incorporation of the mitigation measures below and compliance with existing State laws, the project will result in a less-than-significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

MM-1 The Applicant is responsible for ensuring that all wells on the project site shall be abandoned and all construction in and around an abandoned well are consistent with current CalGEM regulations and recommendations (meeting the standards at the time of condition clearance). To ensure this requirement is met, all of the following shall be required. The applicant shall engage a Petroleum Engineer to monitor any and all grading or construction activities on, and in the vicinity of, the well. In addition, the Petroleum Administrator and/or his/her designee, in his or her reasonable discretion, shall monitor and inspect activities related to well abandonment, site preparation, zonal isolation, grading/shoring (CalOSHA), and other relevant activities on the project site to ensure public health and safety, regulatory consistency, and industry best practices. All well abandonment activities shall be consistent with CalGEM recommendations.

MM-2 A Soil Management Plan (SMP) be submitted, to the satisfaction of LACoFD-HHMD. The plan will include proper methods of excavation, handling, and storage of potentially contaminated soils onsite. Additionally, the plan should include onsite monitoring during any activities that lead to the movement of soil, and a confirmation soil sampling plan to be conducted upon the completion of any soil excavation.

MM-3 Prior to the issuance of Building Permits, the applicant shall submit to the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning and Building and Safety Department a written determination from the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Health Hazardous Materials Division (LACoFD-HHMD) confirming that the LACoFD-HHMD or a responsible agency designated by LACoFD-HHMD has conducted a site assessment for contaminated soil and determined adequate remedial action to address soil contamination has been taken and that no further action is required for the subject site.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activities have the potential to result in the release, emission, handling, and disposal of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing school. There are several schools within 500 feet of the project. These include: Betty Plasencia Elementary School and (STEAM Magnet), Edward R. Roybal Learning Center School, Rise Kohyang High School, Los Angeles Academy of Arts & Enterprise and Ednovate Brio College Prep.

The proposed project would provide for residential infill development. These types of uses would be expected to use and store very small amounts of hazardous materials, such as paints, solvents, cleaners, pesticides, etc. All hazardous materials within the project site would be acquired, handled, used, stored, transported, and disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, State, and local requirements. With this compliance, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact. The small quantities of common hazardous substances found in cleaning agents, office printers, paints, batteries that would be stored and used onsite would not require any permits and do not represent significant hazards. This Project would not result in

emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous substances within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school, and impacts would be less than significant. The proposed project is a residential development that would not emit hazardous emissions or hazardous materials, although it is located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Haul truck emissions are not expected to result in significant impacts to schools because the particulate matter from haul truck exhaust would not be substantial and construction would be short-term. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the project site is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) maintains a database (EnviroStor) that provides access to detailed information on hazardous waste permitted sites and corrective action facilities, as well as existing site cleanup information. EnviroStor also provides information on investigation, cleanup, permitting, and/or corrective actions that are planned, being conducted, or have been completed under DTSC's oversight. A review of EnviroStor did not identify any records of hazardous waste facilities on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites or create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, and no impact would occur.

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

No Impact. The project site is not located in an airport land use plan area, or within two (2) miles of any public or public use airports, or private air strips. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area, and no impacts would occur.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. The nearest emergency route is Glendale Boulevard, approximately 0.11 miles to the west of the project site (City of Los Angeles, Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan, Critical Facilities and Lifeline Systems, Exhibit H, November 1996.) The proposed project would not require the closure of any public or private streets and would not impede emergency vehicle access to the project site or surrounding area. Additionally, emergency access to and from the project site would be provided in accordance with requirements of the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD). Therefore, the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and no impact would occur.

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project exposed people and structures to high risk of wildfire. The project site is not located in a Very High Fire Severity Zone, which means it would be subject to wildland fires. The proposed project would be designed and constructed in accordance with State and local Building and Fire Codes, including installing sprinklers and planting fire resistant landscaping as appropriate. Therefore, there would be no impact of the project in exposing people or structures to a risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;				
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;				
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or;				
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?				
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project discharges water that does not meet the quality standards of agencies which regulate surface water quality and water discharge into storm water drainage systems, or does not comply with all applicable regulations as governed by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB). As is typical of most nonindustrial urban development, stormwater runoff from the proposed project has the potential to introduce small amounts of pollutants into the stormwater system. Pollutants would be associated with runoff from landscaped areas (pesticides and fertilizers) and paved surfaces (ordinary household cleaners). Thus, the proposed project would be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) standards and the City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control regulations (Ordinance No. 172,176 and No. 173,494) to ensure pollutant loads from the project site are minimized for downstream receiving waters. The Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control Ordinances contain requirements for construction activities and operation of development and redevelopment projects to integrate low impact development practices and standards for stormwater pollution mitigation, and maximize open, green and pervious space on all developments and redevelopments consistent with the City's landscape ordinance and other related requirements in the City's Development BMPs Handbook. Conformance would be ensured during the permitting process with the Department of Building & Safety. Therefore, the project would not violate water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, or stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise substantially degrade water quality, and project impacts would be less than significant.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially deplete groundwater or interferes with groundwater recharge. The proposed project would not require the use of groundwater at the project site. Potable water would be supplied by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), which draws its water supplies from distant sources for which it conducts its own assessment and mitigation of potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the project would not require direct additions or withdrawals of groundwater. Excavation to accommodate subterranean levels is not proposed at a depth that would result in the interception of existing aquifers or penetration of the existing water table. In addition, the City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control regulations (Ordinance No. 172,176 and No. 173,494) contain requirements for construction activities and operation of development and redevelopment projects to integrate low impact development practices and standards for stormwater and to maximize open, green and pervious space on all developments and redevelopments consistent with the City's landscape ordinance and other related requirements in the City's Development BMPs Handbook. Conformance would be ensured during the permitting process with the Department of Building & Safety. Therefore, the project would not impact groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge, and project impacts would be less than significant. c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would?

i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially alter the drainage pattern of an existing stream or river such that flooding would result. There are no streams or rivers located in the project vicinity. During project operation, storm water or any runoff irrigation waters would be directed into existing storm drains that are currently receiving surface water runoff under existing conditions. Impermeable surfaces resulting from the development of the project would not substantially change the volume of stormwater runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. Accordingly, significant alterations to existing drainage patterns within the site and surrounding area would not occur. The proposed project will include pervious area. Furthermore, compliance with construction-related BMP and/or the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would control and minimize erosion and siltation. During project operation, storm water or any runoff irrigation waters would be directed into existing storm drains that are currently receiving surface water runoff under existing conditions. Additionally, the potential to alter an existing drainage pattern would be further reduced with the following applicable RCMs, which requires the applicant to submit LID Plans and/or Standard Urban Storm water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) to the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation (BOS) Watershed Protection Division for review and approval. As such, the new development would not substantially change existing drainage patterns. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to the alteration of drainage patterns and on- or off-site flooding.

ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially alter the drainage pattern of an existing stream or river such that flooding would result. There are no streams or rivers located in the project vicinity. During project operation, storm water or any runoff irrigation waters would be directed into existing storm drains that are currently receiving surface water runoff under existing conditions. Impermeable surfaces resulting from the development of the project would not substantially change the volume of stormwater runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. Accordingly, significant alterations to existing drainage patterns within the site and surrounding area would not occur. The proposed project will include pervious area. Furthermore, compliance with construction-related BMP and/or the SWPPP control and minimize erosion and siltation. During project operation, storm water or any runoff irrigation waters would be directed into existing storm drains that are currently receiving surface water runoff under existing conditions. Additionally, the potential to alter an existing drainage pattern would be further reduced with the following applicable RCMs, which requires the applicant to submit LID Plans and/or SUSMP to the BOS Watershed Protection Division for review and approval. As such, the new development would not

substantially change existing drainage patterns. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to the alteration of drainage patterns and on- or off-site flooding.

iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if runoff water would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm drain systems serving the project site, or if the proposed project would substantially increase the probability that polluted runoff would reach the storm drain system. Site-generated surface water runoff would continue to flow to the City's storm drain system. Any project that creates, adds, or replaces 500 square feet of impervious surface must comply with the Low impact Development (LID) Ordinance or alternatively, the City's SUSMP, as an LAMC requirement to address water runoff and storm water pollution. As such, the new development would not substantially change existing drainage patterns. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to existing storm drain capacities or water quality.

iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project included housing and would be located within a 100-year or 500-year floodplain or would impede or redirect flood flows. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map, the subject property is not located within a Flood Zone; and according to the Safety Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan, *100-Year & 500-Year Flood Plains, Exhibit F*, the subject property is not located within a 100-year or 500-year flood plain. Therefore, while the project does include housing, it is not located within a 100-year or 500-year flood plain, and no impact would occur.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be located within an area susceptible to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. A seiche is an oscillation of a body of water in an enclosed or semi-enclosed basin, such as a reservoir, harbor, or lake. A tsunami is a great sea wave produced by a significant undersea disturbance. Mudflows result from the down slope movement of soil and/or rock under the influence of gravity. The project site and the surrounding areas are not located near a water body to be inundated by seiche. Similarly, the project site and the surrounding areas are located approximately 14 miles east of the Pacific Ocean. Therefore, the project would have no impact related to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. Potential pollutants generated by the project would be typical of residential land uses and may include sediment, nutrients, pesticides, pathogens, trash and debris, oil and grease, and metals. The implementation of BMPs required by the City's LID Ordinance would target these pollutants that could potentially be carried in stormwater runoff. Implementation of the LID measures on the project site would result in an improvement in surface water quality runoff as compared to existing conditions. As such, the project would not conflict with or obstruct any water quality control plans. In addition, with implementation of the project's proposed landscaping, impervious surfaces would marginally decrease. The decrease in impervious areas would improve the groundwater recharge capacity of the project site over existing conditions. With compliance with existing regulatory requirements and implementation of LID BMPs, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or a sustainable groundwater management plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

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

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

a) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be sufficiently large or configured in such a way so as to create a physical barrier within an established community. A physical division of an established community is caused by an impediment to through travel or a physical barrier, such as a new freeway with limited access between neighborhoods on either side of the freeway, or major street closures. The proposed project would not involve any street vacation or closure or result in development of new thoroughfares or highways. The proposed project is for the construction of a 69-unit infill development on an existing lot in an urbanized area of Los Angeles, and would not divide an established community. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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

No 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. The site is located within the Westlake Community Plan Area. The site is zoned under the Central City West Specific Plan as R4(CW)-75/3-O, with a General Plan land use designation of Medium Residential. The proposed project is 75 feet in height, is composed of 69 multi-family dwellings, and includes a partially subterranean parking level.

The project proposes a multi-family apartment building containing 69 dwelling units in an area zoned and designated for such development, through the use of the TOC Affordable Housing Incentive Program. Surrounding lots are developed with single- and multi-family buildings and an indoor recreational pool. The project proposes a maximum FAR of 4.2:1 in conjunction with the TOC Affordable Housing Incentive program, which allows a maximum FAR increase of up to 40 percent, allowing a maximum FAR of 4.2:1 in lieu of the 3:1 FAR otherwise permitted by the Central City West R4(CW)-75/3-O land use category, in exchange for setting aside six (6) units for Extremely Low Income Households. The proposed building will be six (6) stories above a

subterranean parking level, in an area that is developed with apartment buildings and single-family dwellings that range in height from one (1) to six (6) stories. In conjunction with the TOC Affordable Housing Incentive Program, the proposed building will not be unusual for the vicinity of the subject site and will be similar in scope to other residential buildings in the area that use the TOC Affordable Housing Incentive Program in exchange for affordable housing. Thus, there are no unusual circumstances which may lead to a significant effect on the environment. The proposed project would conform to the allowable land uses pursuant to the Los Angeles Municipal Code, Central City West Specific Plan, and TOC Affordable Housing Incentive Program. Impacts related to land use are addressed through compliance with existing regulations. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

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

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources of regional value or locally-important mineral resource recovery site. The project site is not classified by the City as containing significant mineral deposits nor is it designated for mineral extraction land use. In addition, the project site is not identified by the City as being located in an oil field or within an oil drilling area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any known, regionally- or locally-valuable mineral resource, and no impact would occur.

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

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources of regional value or locally-important mineral resource recovery site. The project site is not classified by the City as containing significant mineral deposits nor is it designated for mineral extraction land use. In addition, the project site is not identified by the City as being located in an oil field or within an oil drilling area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any known, regionally- or locally-valuable mineral resource, and no impact would occur.

XIII. NOISE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels are in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. The City of Los Angeles has established policies and regulations concerning the generation and control of noise that could adversely affect its citizens and noise-sensitive land uses. Construction activity would result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the project area on an intermittent basis. Noise levels would fluctuate depending on the construction phase, equipment type and duration of use, distance between the noise source and receptor, and presence or absence of noise attenuation barriers. Construction noise for the project will cause a temporary increase in the ambient noise levels, but will be subject to the LAMC Sections 112.05 (Maximum Noise Level of Powered Equipment or Powered Hand Tools) and 41.40 (Noise Due to Construction, Excavation Work – When Prohibited) regarding construction hours and construction equipment noise thresholds. The potential for excessive noise would be further reduced with compliance with the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance No. 161,574, and any subsequent ordinances which prohibits the emission of creation of noise beyond certain levels at adjacent uses unless technically infeasible. Therefore, project impacts would be less than significant.

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activities can generate varying degrees of vibration, depending on the construction procedures and the type of construction equipment used. The operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish with distance from the source. Unless heavy construction activities are conducted extremely close (within a few feet) to the neighboring structures, vibrations from construction activities rarely reach the levels that damage structures. By complying with regulations, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to construction vibration.

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

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from a public airport or public use airport. The proposed project is not located within two (2) miles of a public airport or public use airport. The project site is outside of the Los Angeles International Airport Land Use Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project would not expose people working or residing in the project area to excessive noise levels from a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A potentially significant impact would occur if the proposed project would induce substantial population growth that would not have otherwise occurred as rapidly or in as great a magnitude. The proposed project would result in the development of 69 residential units. The increase in residential population resulting from the proposed project would not be considered substantial in consideration of anticipated growth for the Westlake Community Plan, and is within the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) 2020 population projections for the City in their 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan. The project would meet a growing demand for housing near jobs and transportation centers, consistent with State, regional and local regulations designed to reduce trips and greenhouse gas emissions. Operation of the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in the project area, either directly or indirectly. The physical secondary or indirect impacts of population growth such as increased traffic or noise have been adequately mitigated in other portions of this document. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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

No Impact. The proposed project would construct 69 new multi-family residential units, including six (6) set aside for Extremely Low Income Households on a vacant lot. The project site is currently vacant and does not contain existing housing, and as such, no housing would be demolished. No impact would occur.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) could not adequately serve the proposed project, necessitating a new or physically altered station. The project site is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The project site and the surrounding area are currently served by Los Angeles Fire Department Station 3 located at 108 North Fremont Avenue, approximately 0.5 miles southeast of the project site. As part of the project planning process, the applicant has coordinated with the Fire Department to incorporate emergency service vehicle and infrastructure requirements.

The proposed project would result in a net increase of 69 units, which could increase the number of emergency calls and demand for LAFD fire and emergency services. To maintain the level of fire protection and emergency services, the LAFD may require additional fire personnel and equipment. However, given that there are existing fire stations are in close proximity to the project site, it is not anticipated that there would be a need to build a new or expand an existing fire station to serve the proposed project and maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection. By analyzing data from previous years and continuously monitoring current data regarding response times, types of incidents, and call frequencies, LAFD can shift resources to meet local demands for fire protection and emergency services. The proposed project would neither create capacity or service level problems nor result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other

performance objectives for fire protection. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact.

b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) could not adequately serve the proposed project, necessitating a new or physically altered station. The proposed project would result in a net increase of 69 units and could increase demand for police service. The project site and the surrounding area are currently served by LAPD's the Rampart Community Police Station located at 1401 West 6th Street, approximately 0.7 miles southwest of the project site. Given that there is a police station in close proximity to the project site, it is not anticipated that there would be a need to build a new or expand an existing police station to serve the proposed project and maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection. In the event a situation should arise requiring increased staffing or patrol units, additional resources can be called in. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to police protection services.

c) Schools?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would include substantial employment or population growth, which could generate a demand for school facilities that would exceed the capacity of the school district. The proposed project would add 69 residential units, which could increase enrollment at schools that serve the area. However, development of the proposed project would be subject to California Government Code Section 65995, which would allow LAUSD to collect impact fees from developers of new residential and commercial space. Conformance to California Government Code Section 65995 is deemed to provide full and complete mitigation of impacts to school facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact to public schools.

d) Parks?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would exceed the capacity or capability of the local park system to serve the proposed project. The City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) is responsible for the provision, maintenance, and operation of public recreational and park facilities and services in the City. The proposed project would result in a net increase of 69 units, which could result in increased demand for parks and recreation facilities. While the proposed use can have the potential to increase demand for parks and recreation facilities, the increase will not be substantial. Moreover, the project is required to provide at least 7,650 square feet of open space. This usable open space on the subject site would help alleviate the City's existing park system. In addition, the payment of required impact fees by the proposed residential development within the City of Los Angeles per LAMC Sections 12.33 (and 17.12 and the City's Dwelling Unit Construction Tax) could offset some of the increased demand by helping fund new facilities, as well as the expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, the project would not create capacity or service level problems, or result in

substantial physical impacts associated with the provision of new or altered parks facilities, and project impacts would be less than significant.

e) Other public facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would add 69 multi-family units in a residential area, which could result in increased demand for library services and resources of the LAPL System. The Echo Park Branch Library is located approximately 0.2 miles north of the project site. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would result in substantial employment or population growth that could generate a demand for other public facilities, including libraries, which exceed the capacity available to serve the project site, necessitating new or physically altered public facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts. The proposed project would result in a net increase of 69 units, which could result in increased demand for library services and resources of the Los Angeles Public Library System. While the increase in population as a result of the proposed project may create a demand for other public facilities, the project would not create substantial capacity or service level problems that would require the provision of new or physically altered public facilities in order to maintain an acceptable level of other government services. Therefore, project impacts would be less than significant.

XVI. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Response to Checklist Question XV (d) above.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Response to Checklist Question XV (d) above.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project will result in a net increase of 284 daily vehicle trips and a net increase of 1,878 daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for the site. The net increase of 284 daily vehicle trips exceeds the Department of Transportation’s (LADOT) threshold of 250 daily vehicle trips and thus requires further VMT analysis. The LADOT VMT Calculator measures Household VMT per Capita, and Work VMT per Employee. LADOT has identified thresholds for significant VMT impacts by sub-area of the City. For this area of the City (the Central Area Planning Commission area) the following thresholds have been identified: Household VMT per Capita: 6.0 and Work VMT per Employee: 7.6. The project is the construction of a multi-family apartment building with 69 units (including 6 affordable units). Based on similar projects in this area, it is anticipated that implementation of the project would not result in a significant Household VMT impact. Additionally, LADOT issued a letter dated July 19, 2021 (Appendix H) stating that the Transportation Assessment prepared by Overland Traffic Consultants, Inc. (Appendix I) found the proposed project would not have a significant impact and would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system. This assessment also found that the proposed project would not result in a Household or Work VMT that exceeds the aforementioned thresholds. Therefore, no mitigation measures are necessary.

b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Less Than Significant Impact. The referenced section of the CEQA Guidelines was added when the California Legislature passed Senate Bill 743, to change the primary metric to assess traffic impacts from vehicle delay and congestion, measured in terms of levels of service at intersections and freeway ramps, to vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for various types of trips. This change was enacted to help implement the State's objectives to reduce the level of greenhouse gas emissions generated by exhausts from vehicular travel. Transportation sources represent approximately 40 percent of all GHG's emitted in California (CARB 2019). It was recognized that a focus on reducing congestion mainly leads to expansion of the roadway system capacity through physical expansions, thus facilitating higher traffic volumes and smoother traffic flows, which discourage alternative forms of travel and contribute to high rates of GHG emissions from vehicular travel. The shift to a focus on reducing vehicle miles traveled recognizes that to the extent vehicle trips are avoided or shortened, the level of GHG emissions associated with vehicle travel will also decline. The project will result in a net increase of 284 daily vehicle trips and a net increase of 1,878 daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for the site. The net increase of 284 daily vehicle trips exceeds the Department of Transportation's (LADOT) screening threshold of 250 daily vehicle trips. A Transportation Assessment prepared by Overland Traffic Consultants, Inc. (Appendix I) found that the proposed project is projected to have a Household VMT per Capita of 4.9 and no Work VMT, which are lower than the thresholds of 6.0 and 7.6 VMT, respectively, for significant VMT impacts within the Central Area Planning Commission area. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially increase an existing hazardous design feature or introduce incompatible uses to the existing traffic pattern. The proposed project would not include unusual or hazardous design features and the proposed project is compatible with existing uses. The project proposes a land use that complements the surrounding urban development and utilizes the existing roadway network. The project would have a vehicular access point along Douglas Street, which would lead into the partially subterranean parking area for the residential uses, and along Court Street, which would lead into the ground floor parking area. The project's driveways would conform to the City's design standards and would provide adequate sight distance, sidewalks, and pedestrian movement controls meeting the City's requirements to protect pedestrian safety. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the project design threatened the ability of emergency vehicles to access and serve the project site or adjacent uses. The nearest emergency/disaster routes to the project site are Glendale Boulevard to the west, Temple Street to the north, the 101 Freeway to the east, and Third Street to the south (City of Los Angeles, General Plan Safety Element Exhibit H, Critical Facilities & Lifeline Systems, 1996). The proposed project would not require the closure of any public or private streets and would not impede

emergency vehicle access to the project site or surrounding area. Additionally, emergency access to and from the project site would be provided in accordance with requirements of the LAFD. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access, and no impact would occur.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k)?

Less than Significant Impact. Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) established a formal consultation process for California Native American Tribes to identify potential significant impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources, as defined in Public Resources Code §21074, as part of CEQA. As specified in AB 52, lead agencies must provide notice inviting consultation to California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project if the Tribe has submitted a request in writing to be notified of proposed projects. The Tribe must respond in writing within 30 days of the City's AB 52 notice. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) provided a list of Native American groups and individuals who might have knowledge of the religious and/or cultural significance of resources that may be in and near the project site. An informational letter was mailed to a total of 10 Tribes known to have resources in this area, on March 10, 2021, describing the project and requesting any information regarding resources that may exist on or near the project site. On March 17, 2021, one (1) tribal response was received from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation who made a formal

request for tribal consultation under the provisions of CEQA for the mitigation of potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. On March 24, 2021, the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning reached out to the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation to schedule a consultation. On May 6, 2021, the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning (Lead Agency) and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation began consultation through the telephone. The Tribal representatives notified City Planning staff that they did not wish to conduct the consultation at this time, provided no evidence of the presence of tribal cultural resources near or the project site and requested that the consultation remain open. To date, no follow up consultations have been scheduled and no documents have been provided.

Based on the geotechnical analysis conducted by Leighton and Associates, Inc. dated August 31, 2016, the site is underlain by undocumented artificial fill soils.

No evidence was provided showing that there will be a substantial adverse change in the significant of a tribal cultural resource. While there are no known recorded archaeological sites within the project site or surrounding area, buried resources could potentially be unearthed during project activities. As such, the proposed project would be subject to the Department of City Planning's standard conditions of approval for addressing inadvertent finds. In the unlikely event any suspected archaeological or tribal cultural resources are discovered during surface grading or construction activities, standard operating procedures dictate that 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. Impacts will be less than significant.

b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

Less than Significant Impact. Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) established a formal consultation process for California Native American Tribes to identify potential significant impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources, as defined in Public Resources Code §21074, as part of CEQA. As specified in AB 52, lead agencies must provide notice inviting consultation to California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project if the Tribe has submitted a request in writing to be notified of proposed projects. The Tribe must respond in writing within 30 days of the City's AB 52 notice. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) provided a list of Native American groups and individuals who might have knowledge of the religious and/or cultural significance of resources that may be in and near the project site. An informational letter was mailed to a total of 10 Tribes known to have resources in this area, on March 10, 2021, describing the project and requesting any information regarding

resources that may exist on or near the project site. On March 17, 2021, one (1) tribal response was received from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation who made a formal request for tribal consultation under the provisions of CEQA for the mitigation of potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. On March 24, 2021, the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning reached out to the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation to schedule a formal consultation. On May 6, 2021, the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning (Lead Agency) and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation began consultation through the telephone. However, the Tribal representatives notified City Planning staff that they did not wish to conduct the consultation at this time, provided no evidence of the presence of tribal cultural resources near or the project site and requested that the consultation remain open. To date, no follow up consultations have been scheduled and no documents have been provided.

Based on the geotechnical analysis conducted by Leighton and Associates, Inc. dated August 31, 2016, the site is underlain by undocumented artificial fill soils.

No evidence was provided showing that there will be a substantial adverse change in the significant of a tribal cultural resource. While there are no known recorded archaeological sites within the project site or surrounding area, buried resources could potentially be unearthed during project activities. As such, the proposed project would be subject to the Department of City Planning's standard conditions of approval for addressing inadvertent finds. In the unlikely event any suspected archaeological or tribal cultural resources are discovered during surface grading or construction activities, standard operating procedures dictate that 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. Impacts will be less than significant.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed 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 LADWP conducts water planning based on forecast population growth. The addition of 69 residential units as a result of the proposed project would be consistent with Citywide growth, and, therefore, the project demand for water is not anticipated to require new water supply entitlements and/or require the expansion of existing or construction of new water treatment facilities beyond those already considered in the LADWP 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). Prior to any construction activities, the project applicant would be required to coordinate with the City of Los Angeles BOS to determine the exact wastewater conveyance requirements of the proposed

project, and any upgrades to the wastewater lines in the vicinity of the project site that are needed to adequately serve the proposed project would be undertaken as part of the project. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact related to water or wastewater infrastructure.

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Response to Checklist Question XIX (a).

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Response to Checklist Question XIX (a).

d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project's solid waste generation exceeded the capacity of permitted landfills. The Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation (BOS) and private waste management companies are responsible for the collection, disposal, and recycling of solid waste within the City, including the project site. Solid waste during the operation of the proposed project is anticipated to be collected by the BOS and private waste haulers, respectively. As the City's own landfills have all been closed and are non-operational, the destinations are private landfills. In compliance with Assembly Bill (AB) 939, the project applicant would be required to implement a Solid Waste Diversion Program and divert at least 50 percent of the solid waste generated by the project from the applicable landfill site. The proposed project would also comply with all federal, State, and local regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact related to solid waste.

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Refer to Response to Checklist Question XIX (d).

XX. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

No Impact. (Response to Checklist Questions XX.a through XX.d). As discussed above, in Response to Checklist Question IX.f, the project would not cause an impediment along the City's designated disaster routes or impair the implementation of the City's emergency response plan. Impacts related to the implementation of the City's emergency response plan would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required. In addition, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.01(a), analysis of the impacts related to wildfire are related to the development of projects located on a site which is classified as state responsibility areas, as

defined in Section 4102, and on very high fire hazard severity zones, as defined in subdivision (i) of Section 51177 of the Government Code. The project site is located within an urbanized area of the Westlake Community Plan area and is not designated as state responsibility area as defined in Section 4102. The project is also not located within a City-designated fire buffer zone or high fire severity zone. Furthermore, as discussed in Response to Checklist Question VII.a.iv, the project site is not located in a landslide area as mapped by the state or the City of Los Angeles. As such, the project would not substantially impair an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, would not expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or uncontrolled spread of a wildfire, would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk, or expose people or structure to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Based on the analysis in this Initial Study, the proposed project would not 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, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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 the related projects, would result in impacts that are less than significant when viewed separately but significant when viewed together. Although the project may be constructed in the project vicinity, the cumulative impacts to which the proposed project would contribute would be less than significant.

There were 12 other projects filed, nine (9) of which include construction of a multi-family apartment building in the past 10 years in proximity to the project site. Each project is subject to specific RCMs that, when considered cumulatively, reduce any potential impacts to less than significant. Additionally, all nearby active projects were proposed at different times over an eight (8)-year period, resulting in staggered construction staging times and timelines. According to Navigate LA, there are seven (7) issued haul route permits within 500 feet of the project site; three (3) of these haul route permits have expired and four (4) remain active.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the proposed project has the potential to result in significant impacts, as discussed in the preceding sections. All potential impacts of the proposed project have been identified, and RCMs have been identified, where applicable, to reduce all potential impacts to less than significant levels. Upon implementation of the RCMs identified and compliance with existing regulations, the proposed project would not have the potential to result in substantial adverse impacts on human beings either directly or indirectly. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

5 PREPARERS AND PERSONS CONSULTED

Lead Agency

City of Los Angeles
Department of City Planning
200 North Spring Street, Room 621
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Dylan Lawrence, Planning Assistant

Project Applicant

Lee Rubinoff
1350 Court Partners, LLP
1171 South Robertson Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90035

Project Representative

Aaron Belliston
BMR Enterprises
5250 Lankershim Boulevard
Suite 500
North Hollywood, CA 91601

APPENDIX A

**SOILS APPROVAL LETTER, LADBS GRADING, FEBRUARY 27, 2020
(REVISED NOVEMBER 5, 2020)**

APPENDIX B

**SOILS REPORT, LEIGHTON AND ASSOCIATES, INC. AUGUST 31,
2016**

APPENDIX C

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT AND PHASE II SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION, ROUX ASSOCIATES, INC. JUNE 7, 2016

APPENDIX D

**SUPPLEMENTAL PHASE II INVESTIGATION & HUMAN HEALTH RISK
SCREENING EVALUATION REPORT, ROUX ASSOCIATES, INC.
MARCH 16, 2017**

APPENDIX E

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION, DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES (DOGGR) CONSTRUCTION SITE WELL REVIEW AND RECORDS, JANUARY 11, 2018

APPENDIX F

**ANTICIPATED OIL WELL ABANDONMENT PLAN, WITTEN
ENGINEERING, INC. JULY 22, 2021**

APPENDIX G

LEAK TEST REPORT, ROUX ASSOCIATES, INC. DECEMBER 1, 2017

APPENDIX H

LADOT TRANSPORTATION ASSESSMENT LETTER, JULY 19, 2021

APPENDIX I

**TRANSPORTATION ASSESSMENT, OVERLAND TRAFFIC
CONSULTANTS, INC. JULY 2021**