

Environmental Checklist Form (Initial Study)

County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning



Project title: “New Sequoia Building at Hope Gardens” / Project No. 2020-000397-(5), Conditional Use Permit No. RPPL2020000694, Oak Tree Permit No. RPPL2020000706. Environmental Assessment No. RPPL2020003232

Lead agency name and address: Los Angeles County, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Contact Person and phone number: Michele Bush, Principal Regional Planner, (213) 974-6411

Project sponsor’s name and address: Union Rescue Mission, 545 S. San Pedro St., Los Angeles, CA 90013

Project location: 12249 Lopez Canyon Road, Sylmar, CA 91342
APN: 2846-001-017, 018, 019, & 020 USGS Quad: San Fernando

Gross Acreage: 77.4 acres

General plan designation: RL1- Rural Land 1

Community/Area wide Plan designation: N/A

Zoning: A-2-2 (Heavy Agricultural – Two Acre Minimum Required Lot Area) Zone – Mount Gleason Zoned District

Description of project: The project applicant, Union Rescue Mission (URM), is requesting a new Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to replace an existing housing building known as the Sequoia Building with a new housing building within Hope Gardens Family Center in the A-2-2 Zone pursuant to Los Angeles County (“County”) Code Section 22.16.030.C. The proposed building will be sited near the rear northeast corner of the Hope Gardens property where the existing one-story building currently exists. The new building will consist of three (3) stories with subterranean parking, totaling of approximately 106,410 square feet of building space for 117 housing units and supportive services. The facility was authorized by CUP No. 200600242 in 2007 for conversion of an existing convalescent hospital and senior citizen residential units into transitional housing for up to 225 formerly homeless women and children, including permanent supportive housing for senior citizen women. In 2019, CUP Modification No. RPPL2019000188 authorized an increased capacity up to 300. The project proposes to increase the housing capacity for up to total 525 formerly homeless women and children.

URM’s Hope Gardens facility provides social services transitional housing for women of various ages and children less than 18 years of age. The facility provides amenities for support services, such as kitchen, classrooms, congregation, recreation, maintenance, and staff housing. There is no male resident at this facility.

Other existing structures on the property include six residential buildings as well as other buildings for garage, office, utility, and administration. There are currently 128 livable units, 28 full-time staff or volunteers, three (3) staff members residing onsite full time, and one (1) staff member residing onsite part time. 25 livable units will be removed as part of the project.

The proposed new Sequoia Building and related infrastructure will occupy approximately one acre. The 106,410-square-foot new building will consist of three residential floors and a subterranean parking. The residential floors include 117 housing units, reception area, case manager and counseling offices, administration offices, security office, dental/medical examination rooms, day care center, computer lab, classroom, multi-purpose room, kitchen, communal dining room, and a courtyard. The new building will also provide a subterranean parking area for 22 spaces for staff and visitors, including four (4) ADA parking, and 11 long-term enclosed bicycle spaces. 74 existing parking spaces located elsewhere within the facility will continue to be provided for staff and general parking. Approximately 3,200 cubic yards of cut and 3,200 cubic yards of fill is proposed to be balance on site.

There are a total 57 protected coast live oak trees in the project area. The project proposes removal of five (5) oak trees located in northwest of the new building and encroach into eleven oak trees, including one (1) heritage tree. These oak trees are between eight (8) and forty feet tall. The eleven oak trees will be encroached between 6.1% and 34.5 % of the tree protected zone. An oak tree report documenting the encroachments has been prepared as required by the County Code.

The typical housing unit averages 371 square feet and can accommodate up to four people. Each unit includes a full bathroom. Numerous rooms will have a connecting door to accommodate female-single parent families with more than four members. Units will not contain kitchens. All food services for residents will be provided at the first-floor dining room.

The facility will be staffed of 60 full-time employees working in three shifts. The first shift will be staffed with up to 40 employees and the second and third shifts with eight to ten employees. The duration of stay for residents would be approximately two years. Individual counseling, various education and trainings, childcare, health care including dental service and general medical exams, and youth development will be available for these residents along with common dining facilities. All transportation needs for residents will be provided by the facility.

In addition, the project seeks the request for building height limit to increase up to 51 feet in order to maximize the available development area to provide the necessary accommodation and services for the growing homelessness problems in the County. Based on the existing topography, proposed project design height will be masked by existing mature trees and vegetation that currently surrounds the Hope Gardens facilities.

Surrounding land uses and setting: The Project Site is located at 12249 Lopez Canyon Road near Sylmar in the unincorporated County of Los Angeles. Surrounding land uses within a quarter mile mostly consists of vacant land, national forest, outdoor storage yards, and landfill.

Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

Three Native American Tribes were notified and one of them, Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians, requested consultation. Suggested mitigation measures by the tribe will be incorporated into the project's mitigation monitoring and reporting program.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse

impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission’s Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<i>Public Agency</i>	<i>Approval Required</i>
<u>County of Los Angeles</u>	<u>CUP and Oak Tree Permit</u>
_____	_____

Major projects in the area:

<i>Project/Case No.</i>	<i>Description and Status</i>
<u>PRJ2020-003076, CUP</u>	
<u>RPPL2020009397, Zone</u>	
<u>Change RPPL2021002637,</u>	<u>Change the zone from A-2-2 to M-1.5 and the land use category from</u>
<u>Plan Amendment</u>	<u>RL10 to IL to authorize an industrial contractor’s yard and retroactive</u>
<u>RPPL2021002658, Oak Tree</u>	<u>encroachment into the oak tree protected zones.</u>
<u>Permit RPPL2021002660,</u>	
<u>Environmental Review</u>	
<u>RPPL2021002662</u>	
_____	_____
_____	_____

Reviewing Agencies: [See [CEQA Appendix B](#) to help determine which agencies should review your project]

Responsible Agencies

- None
- Regional Water Quality Control Board:
 - Los Angeles Region
 - Lahontan Region
- Coastal Commission
- Army Corps of Engineers
- LAFCO

Trustee Agencies

- None
- State Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- State Dept. of Parks and Recreation
- State Lands Commission
- University of California (Natural Land and Water Reserves System)

Special Reviewing Agencies

- None
- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- National Parks
- National Forest
- Edwards Air Force Base
- Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mountains Area
-

County Reviewing Agencies

- DPW
- Fire Department
(delete those that don't apply)
 - Forestry, Environmental Division
 - Planning Division
 - Land Development Unit
 - Health Hazmat
- Sanitation District
- Public Health/Environmental Health Division: Land Use Program (OWTS), Drinking Water Program (Private Wells), Toxics Epidemiology Program (Noise)
- Sheriff Department
- Parks and Recreation
- Subdivision Committee
-

Regional Significance

- None
- SCAG Criteria
- Air Quality
- Water Resources
- Santa Monica Mtns. Area
-

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially significant impacts affected by this project.

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Department.)
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 in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature (Prepared by)

Date

Signature (Approved by)

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 the Lead Department 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 Department has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced.)
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA processes, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (State CEQA Guidelines § 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) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 7) The explanation of each issue should identify: the significance threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, and; mitigation measures identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant. Sources of thresholds include the County General Plan, other County planning documents, and County ordinances. Some thresholds are unique to geographical locations.

1. AESTHETICS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

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

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

The facility will not have any adverse impact on a scenic vista. The project site is not located near any County identified scenic vista resources or designated Scenic Highways. Most of the undeveloped areas within the Project Site is designated Hillside Management Area. However, the new Sequoia Building will be located within the previously developed area below the level of the adjacent street, Lopez Canyon Road and include a subterranean floor. The developed area is lowest elevation in the immediate vicinity and surrounded by hills and mountains. The new structure will also incorporate various design features such as materials and colors to make it more compatible with the surroundings. Therefore, less than significant impact will occur from the proposed project development.

- b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding, hiking, or multi-use trail?

The project site is not located near any County identified regional riding, hiking, or multi-use trails; therefore, no impact will occur.

- c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

There are no State designated scenic highways or historic buildings in the vicinity of the subject property. Although most of the Project Site is designated as Hillside Management Area, the proposed project is contained within the existing disturbed area of approximately 80,000 square feet in area. As such, the project would have less than significant impacts.

- d) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features and/or conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point)

The project will result in the replacement of a one-story building with a new four-story building, improved parking areas and driveways, as well as the installation of new landscaping. However, proposed project design will not degrade the existing visual character of the site or the quality of public view of the site. The project occurs on an existing developed housing facility that is surrounded by trees and slopes. The new 51-foot-high building is located at a grade lower than the adjacent street, Lopez Canyon Road, and will be mostly blocked from public view by existing, lush landscaping and trees between the building and the street. Design features of the new building such as color and building materials will be incorporated to be compatible with

other structures on site and surrounding vicinity. As such, the project development impact is considered to be less than significant.

e) **Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

The proposed new 3 story housing building will be developed and constructed on the same building pad location as the existing single-story building to be demolished. Any proposed building lighting will comply with County's Rural Outdoor Lighting District (ROLD) requirements, which are intended to reduce glare and light trespass. A lighting plan documenting compliance with ROLD requirements will be prepared and will be subject to review and approval by the County. The building site area is also surrounded by dense vegetations and existing mature pine and oak trees which will substantially shield the new structure and would minimize unwanted light or glare that would affect public views into the area. Thus, project development would result in less than significant impact.

2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST

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.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site does not contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or farmland of Statewide Importance; therefore, no impact would occur with the proposed project.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site is zoned A-2-2, but the existing site has been previously approved and developed as a temporary housing facility for formerly homeless women and children, including senior citizen women as an adult residential facility, which is a conditionally permitted use on the subject property's A-2 zone. There is no designated Agricultural Resources Area or Williamson Act contract on the project site or the adjacent areas; therefore, no impact will occur with the proposed project.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site is not zoned for forest land or timberland zoned Timberland Production; therefore, no impacts would occur with the proposed project.

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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site has been previously developed and approved as a women's housing facility. It is not located within designated forest land; therefore, no impacts will occur with the proposed project.

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?

There are no designated Farmland exist in the vicinity. The proposed project will not cause changes in the environment that will result in the conversion of any farmland; therefore, no impacts will occur from the proposed project.

3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project is a new housing building that will be constructed within an existing homeless shelter facility. The new building will replace an existing building that will be demolished. The project will require grading in the amount of approximately 3,200 cubic yards of cut and 3,200 cubic yards of fill to be balanced on site. The site is located in a non-urban setting that is surrounded by mostly natural open space and few non-residential equipment storage uses. Project construction and operation will comply with all SCAQMD rules and the project is not anticipated to generate any significant impacts associated with local air quality plan; therefore, impacts associated with the project is considered less than significant.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project is a new housing building that will be constructed within an existing homeless shelter facility. The new building will replace an existing building that will be demolished. Neither the required grading, nor vehicle emissions during construction or the facility operation should result in significant increase in pollutants as the residents at the facility will not operate personal vehicles while staying at the facility. Their transportation needs will be provided by the facility. .

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No sensitive uses or receptors exist in the vicinity of the project site; therefore, no impact will result from the project.

d) 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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Potential activities that may emit temporary odors during construction include the use of architectural coatings and solvents and the combustion of diesel fuel construction equipment. Mandatory compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1113 would limit the number of VOCs in architectural coatings and solvents. In addition, project will comply with the applicable provisions of the CARB Air Toxic Control Measures regarding idle limitation for diesel trucks. For project operation, this is a housing building that does not produce odors associated with non-residential uses such as agriculture, manufacturing plants, or commercial uses. Through

mandatory compliance with SCAQMD rules, the project is not expected to create objectionable odors affecting occupants in the vicinity; therefore, impact from the development is considered less than significant.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

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 (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The housing facility at the project site has been in operation since the late 1960s. The proposed project is for a demolition of one existing housing building at the northern end of the project site and construction of a new transitional housing building within the previously disturbed areas. The project requires improved driveways for vehicular circulation and fire access, and will not substantially expand the developed area. The project site is not within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA) or other sensitive habitat area as designated by the General Plan. Due to the new building location and the previously disturbed nature of the entire facility, the project would have a less than significant impact, either directly or through habitat modification, on species regulated by CDFW or USFWS.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFW or USFWS?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Part of the project site, specifically along Lopez Canyon Road and the existing driveways within the facility, is identified as Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest in California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). This portion of the site is where the existing buildings, driveways, and other infrastructure of the facility that has been in operation since the late 1960s. The project development request is for a demolition of one existing housing building at the northern end of the project site and construction of a new transitional housing building within the previously disturbed areas. The project requires improved driveways for vehicular circulation and fire access, and will result in removal of five oak trees and encroachment into the protected zone of eleven oak trees. An Oak Tree Report has been prepared by an arborist, and the project will incorporate mitigation measures recommended by the County Forester, including mitigation tree plantation on site. The project would have less than significant impact on the existing resources with the mitigations listed below.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project development will occur within a previously disturbed and developed 75- acre housing facility, and it is not in proximity to or does it contain wetlands and would not result in any removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means of disruption to a watercourse; therefore, project development impact is considered to be less than significant.

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?

The proposed new housing building project will occur within an existing 75-acre housing facilities that has been developed since 1960s. No wildlife corridors exist on the project site nor the project development interfere with movement of existing wildlife species; therefore, no impacts will result from the proposed project.

e) Convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or other unique native woodlands (juniper, Joshua, southern California black walnut, etc.)?

The proposed project development will occur within an existing developed housing facility that has been in existence since late 1960s. Development of the project would require both temporary and permanent impacts to protected oaks onsite. An oak tree impact report has been prepared for the project to evaluate and assess the existing oak trees and oak woodlands within the design envelope. Although the project would result in the permanent loss of five (5) oak trees and temporary encroachment of 11 oak trees, it would not result in conversion of oak woodlands. Compliance with the pending Oak Tree Permit conditions, inclusive of the planting of onsite replacement oak trees as mitigation would allow impacts to protect oaks to remain less than significant. There are no Juniper Woodlands or Joshua Trees on site.

f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.174), the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 102), Specific Plans (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.46), Community Standards Districts (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.300 et seq.), and/or Coastal Resource Areas (L.A. County General Plan, Figure 9.3)?

The proposed project development will occur within an existing developed housing facility that has been in existence since late 1960s. The project site does not include Wildflower Reserve Areas, Significant Ecological Areas, Community Standards District, Specific Plan, or Coastal Resource Areas. Development of the project would require both temporary and permanent impacts to protected oaks onsite. An oak tree impact report has been prepared in compliance with the County's Oak Tree Ordinance (Title 22, Ch 174) for the project to evaluate and assess the existing oak trees within the design envelope. As indicated in the attached project oak

tree survey report conducted by South Environmental, a total of 57 protected oak trees were identified in the survey area including 40 canyon live oak (*Quercus chrysolepis*) and 17 coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*). Of the 57 oaks surveyed, 13 are considered heritage oaks. The proposed redevelopment of the Sequoia building would result in the removal of five (5) oak trees (2 of which are heritage oaks) and encroachment into the tree protection zone of 11 oak trees (3 of which are heritage oaks). The County Oak Tree Ordinance has been followed with an oak tree report recommending care of the trees and replacement of the trees if lost due to project activities. Compliance with the pending Oak Tree Permit conditions, inclusive of the planting of onsite replacement oak trees as mitigation, would allow impacts to protect oaks to remain less than significant.

Mitigation Measures MM-Bio-1 through MM-Bio-5 shall be implemented to minimize impacts to oak trees:

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

The project site is not identified as an area within any approve state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan or a Natural Community Conservation Plan. The proposed new housing building project will occur within an approved and developed housing facility; therefore, no impacts will result from the proposed project

Mitigation Measures MM-Bio-1 through MM-Bio-4 shall be implemented to minimize impacts to oak trees:

MM- Bio-1: Prior to initiation of clearing, grading, or other construction activities, protective fencing should be installed around the outermost limits of the protected zones of the oaks within and adjacent to the construction area that may be disturbed during construction activities. Fencing shall remain in place and be maintained for the duration of all construction. No construction, grading, staging, or materials storage shall be allowed within the fenced exclusion areas, or within the protected zones of any on site protected trees. The limits of encroachment of trees should be clearly visible during construction to avoid unintentional damage.

MM- Bio-2: During construction, a qualified arborist shall monitor protected trees that are removed and those that are within or adjacent to the construction area.

MM- Bio-3: To the extent that is feasible, limbs of trees that overhang the roadways and parking areas will not be pruned or damaged during construction. Workers will be informed of the tree locations and instructed to avoid damaging limbs, trunks, and canopies of tree that overhang the staging areas or construction areas. Fending or high visible flagging will be used to mark areas where there is potential for damage from equipment.

MM- Bio-4: To minimize the compaction of soils beneath oaks that will be encroached, a temporary 10-12 - inch thick layer of mulch can be applied beneath the tree if construction equipment or materials are required to operate with the TPZ. Within 24 hours of finishing work beneath the tree, the mulch should be removed to a depth of no more than 4 inches. A monitoring arborist should be present during construction that is within proximity to this tree to advise on appropriate methods to retain the tree.

MM- Bio-5: Oak replacement tree at 2:1 for the removal of 6 oaks, totaling 12 new oaks, shall be planted onsite and monitored as required by approved Oak Tree conditions.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Section 15064.5 of the CEQA guidelines generally defines a historic resource as a resource that is listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), be included in a local register of historical resources of the public resources, and/or identified as significant in a historical resource survey. A significant impact may occur if a project would adversely affect the significance of any identified historic resources on or off site. A substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resources means demolition, destruction, relocation, and/or alternation of the resources of its immediate surrounding such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired.

A cultural resources analysis (January 2021) was conducted by South Environmental for the proposed project-the new Sequoia Building at the existing Hope Gardens Homeless shelter facility, which proposes the demolition of the existing Sequoia Lodge onsite and be replaced with the construction of a new housing building. The January 2021 analysis, as attached with this initial study, included the results of a California Historical Resources Information Center (CHRIS) records search of the project site and a 0.5-mile radius; and intensive pedestrian survey of the site, building development and archival research; and recordation and evaluation of the entire Hope Gardens property for historical significance and integrity in consideration of CRHR and Los Angeles County designation criteria.

CHRIS records search dated October 3, 2020, concluded that the age of the structure to be replaced is older than 45 years and should be recorded for significance even if it is to be demolished. Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands file search dated September 22, 2020 acknowledged an absence of specific site information in the Sacred Land File but it should not preclude that there might be other sources of cultural resources. The County of Los Angeles consulted with Gabrieleno Band of Mission (Kizh Nation), Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission (Tataviam), and San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians (Tongva) on October 16 and October 28 in 2020. Kizh Nation requested a consultation on October 19, and County staff responded with additional project information but was not informed of their availability. Tataviam tribe requested a consultation and a phone consultation meeting occurred on October 29, 2020 with County staff. During the phone consultation, the Tataviam representative requested that the tribe continues to be updated on the cultural resources report, draft mitigation measures, and draft initial study when available for review. The requested documents will be provided to Tataviam tribe upon completion.

As a result of the property significance evaluation, majority of the existing buildings within the Hope Gardens housing facility (formerly known as Forester Haven) including the existing Sequoia Lodge proposed for demolition is part of a larger campus of buildings that are eligible as contributing resources to the newly identified Forester Haven Historic District under CRHR and County Criteria 3 for embodying the distinctive character-defining features of the Contemporary style of architecture, which unite them aesthetically and create a cohesive campus of rustic, lodge-style buildings designed by an Independent Order of Foresters (IOF) member for an IOF retirement home. Therefore, the proposed project would result in significant impacts to

a building that appears eligible as a contributing resource to the Forester Haven District under CRHR and County Landmark designation Criterion 3 for its architectural merit and is considered an historical resource under CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(a)(3) and (4). The impacts would occur at two levels: (1) Demolition and (2) Construction:

(1) Sequoia Building- Demolition Impact:

Demolition of this building will demolish some of the physical characteristics that justify Forester Haven for its eligibility under CRHR and County Landmark designations. Due to the proposed project development goals, unfortunately, demolition of the Sequoia Building is an unavoidable impact that cannot be mitigated. Therefore mitigations MM-CUL-1 and MM CUL 2 should be incorporated in the context of the project development and overall feasibility:

(2) Sequoia Building- New construction impact:

The construction of a new building as proposed within the boundaries of a historic district has the potential to impact the significance of the district and its setting by introducing incompatible massing, scale, design, materials, or architectural styles that detract from the existing buildings and natural features of the site. Under CEQA, a project that conforms to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties “shall be considered as mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historical resources” (15064.5(b)(3)). Therefore, MM-CUL-3 will be incorporated in the project.

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

The proposed new building pad and the entire facility has been previously disturbed and developed with housing structures and related uses since 1960’s, and it is currently serving as a homeless transitional housing facility for women and children. The proposed project components will replace an existing housing structure that will be demolished in the same disturbed location. According to the Cultural Resources Report, No archaeological resources were identified in CHRIS records search or NAHC Sacred Lands File search. The Cultural Resources Report also concludes that no such resources were found with the project location and the entire facility area as a result of pedestrian survey. Therefore, the project site is unlikely to contain intact buried archaeological deposits. However, there is a possibility to encounter resources during ground disturbance. Standard unanticipated discovery measures, MM-CUL-4 and MM-CUL-5 are provided to mitigate any potential impacts.

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

The proposed new building pad and the entire facility has been previously disturbed and developed with housing structures and related uses since 1960’s, and it is currently serving as a homeless transitional housing facility for women and children. The proposed project components will replace an existing housing structure that will be demolished in the same disturbed location. Therefore, the project site is unlikely to contain intact buried paleontological deposits. However, there is a possibility to encounter resources during ground disturbance. A standard measure, MM-CUL-4 is provided to mitigate any potential impacts.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

The proposed new building pad and the entire facility has been previously disturbed and developed with housing structures and related uses since 1960's, and it is currently serving as a homeless transitional housing facility for women and children. The proposed project components will replace an existing housing structure that will be demolished in the same disturbed location. Therefore, the project site is unlikely to contain intact buried human remains. However, there is a possibility to encounter resources during ground disturbance. A standard measure, MM-CUL-5, is provided to mitigate any potential impacts.

MM-CUL-1: Archival Documentation. Prior to demolition, it is recommended that the existing Sequoia Lodge be subject to archival documentation that includes photography of all exterior elevations, and views to and from the building, with detailed photographs of materials, doors, windows, rooflines, gardens, and other key components so that there is a record of the demolished building. It is also recommended that the original plans for the historic district (if available) be scanned and reproduced so that they are available for future study on the historic district. This documentation should be based on the National Park Service's Historic American Building Survey (HABS) guidelines for narrative and photographs should be filed with the SCCIC, the County of Los Angeles, and any other interested parties/stakeholders. It should be noted that this recommendation will not reduce impacts to historical resources below a level of significance, however, CEQA required consideration of all feasible mitigation measures.

MM-CUL-2: Protection Plan for Demolition and Construction. Prior to the start of project -related demolition and construction activities, protection measures should be developed in a formal plan for the adjacent building in particular, the Facility Operations Building location to the west. Protection should include: 1) clear denotation in the construction plans that the project is located within a historic district, marking the location of the adjacent Facility Operations Building; 2) all construction workers should be informed of the presence of a historic district and be aware of the protocol to avoid and protect all adjacent buildings; and 3) fencing and signage should be put in place to make sure that all construction worker and equipment are preventing from accessing the building. The protection plan should be prepared by a qualified architectural historian/historic preservation professional and should clearly identify all responsible parties with their contact information

MM-CUL-3: Protection Design Review for SOIS Conformance. Upon completion/near completion of the new building's design, a qualified architectural historian/historical preservation professional should review the final design for conformation with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, specifically, the Standards for Rehabilitation (Weeks and Grimmer 1995, revised 2017). Most importantly, the architectural historian should ensure that the new construction "will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment" (Standard 9). Further, the new construction should be "undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired" essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired" (Standard 10). The architectural historian should provide a letter summarizing the results of the review and describing how the design conforms to the Standards for Rehabilitation.

MM-CUL-4: If archaeological resources, such as sites, features, or artifacts, are exposed during construction activities for the proposed project, all construction work occurring within 100 feet of the find shall immediately stop until a qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, can evaluate the significance of the find and determine whether or not additional study is warranted. Depending upon the significance of the find, the archaeologist may simply record the

find and allow work to continue. If the discovery proves significant under CEQA, additional work such as preparation of an archaeological treatment plan, testing, or data recovery may be warranted.

MM-CUL-5: The applicant shall retain a professional Native American monitor, agreed upon by the Fernandeano Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (FTBMI) and Los Angeles County Planning, to observe all clearing, grubbing, and grading operations within the proposed impact areas. If cultural resources are encountered, the Native American monitor will have the authority to request that ground-disturbing activities cease within 60 feet of discovery to assess and document potential finds in real time. One monitor will be required on-site for all ground-disturbing activities in areas designated through additional consultation. However, if ground-disturbing activities occur in more than one of the designated monitoring areas at the same time, then the parties can mutually agree to an additional monitor, to ensure that simultaneously occurring ground-disturbing activities receive thorough levels of monitoring coverage.

6. ENERGY

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project will comply with the energy conservation standards established in Title 24 of the California Administrative Code during the duration of the project construction process and future building operation.

Project construction is considered a short-term duration, the extent of fuel consumption and energy demands during this time is inherent to construction projects of its size and nature; thus, the temporary demand would not necessitate additional energy facilities or cause wasteful inefficient/unnecessary consumption of energy. Daily operation of the project would generate demand of additional energy resources. The project would be designed to include applicable energy saving features such as energy efficient HVAC units, energy saving windows, low flow plumbing fixtures, and energy efficient light fixtures as well as waste reduction features that would allow the project to comply with the State regulations. Therefore, the project construction and operation would not result in an inefficient use of energy resources, thus, a less than significant impact would occur.

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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project development would be required to comply with all current State and County building standards that include provisions such as the use of recycled water for landscaping, long/short term bicycle parking, amongst other features; therefore, the project would not result in wasteful inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy that is inconsistent with the State and County plans for energy reduction measures.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

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

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known active fault trace? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

The subject property is within the Transverse Ranges Geomorphic Province of southern California that consists of series of west-trending mountains and intervening valleys. The southern California region is traversed by the San Andreas Fault, which is a transform boundary between the Pacific Plate and the North American Plate. The San Andreas fault is part of a system of northwest-striking, right lateral faults that are generally historically active. The San Andreas fault is located approximately 22 miles to the north-northwest. The southern California region is seismically active and commonly experiences strong ground shaking resulting from earthquakes along active faults. Earthquakes along these faults are part of continuous, naturally occurring process, which has contributed to the characteristic landscape of the region. Per the project geotechnical and soils study, the potential for ground rupture on site was evaluated utilizing published maps and references. Review of the Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation map for the San Fernando Quadrangle, provided digitally on the CGS EQZ web application, indicate that there are not any known active faults within the project site, per Alquist-Priolo criteria. Numerous blind (buried) thrust faults are present in the San Fernando Valley. These faults were not exposed at the ground surface and are not considered to be a potential fault-related ground rupture hazard to the project site; therefore, the possibility of fault-related impacts caused by the project site is considered less than significant over the design life of the proposed development.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

The southern California region is seismically active and commonly experiences strong ground shaking resulting from earthquakes along active faults. Earthquakes along these faults are part of continuous, naturally occurring process, which has contributed to the characteristic landscape of the region. Compliance with applicable building codes and adherence to design recommendations would provide safeguard against major failures and loss of life, although they are not intended to limit damage. By complying with the County Building Code and incorporating compacted fill as recommended in MM-GEO-1, the proposed improvements is not likely to induce significant level of seismic ground shaking.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading?

Ground failure such as liquefaction is a phenomenon in which pore water pressure generated by earthquake shaking causing sudden, temporary reduction or loss of shear strength in saturated soils with negligible to low plasticity. Structures founded on liquefied soils may experience subsidence and/or lateral movement. Since the existing development is within a Liquefaction Zone where existing, potential for seismic soil liquefaction and associated ground failure were evaluated and assessment of liquefaction potential and associated phenomena at the site was also performed in the Geotechnical Report. Based on site testing, the potential for liquefaction in soil layers beneath the proposed structure is less than significant provided that the recommended mitigation measure MM-GEO-1 is incorporated into the grading plan and implemented during construction. According to the assessment, potential for later spreading is believed to be negligible if all measures are incorporated since laterally continuous, potentially liquefiable soil layers meeting the relative density corresponding results were not present at the site.

iv) Landslides?

Landslides are mass movements of the ground that include rock falls, relatively shallow slumping and sliding of soil. The Project Site contains areas designated as Landslide Zone throughout, although they are outside the existing development. Based on the findings in the Geotechnical Report prepared for the project, that the project will be safe against hazard from landslide, settlement, and slippage for the intended use and will not affect adjacent properties by complying with Section 111 and incorporating all recommendations in the Grading and Building Plans during construction (MM-GEO-1, 2, 3, and 4).

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

Temporary earthmoving activities associated demolition and grading have the potential that will result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Short term effects during construction phase would be prevented through compliance with previously identified NPDES and SWPPP programs and incorporation of construction BMPs to reduce soil erosion as well as project LID facilities to insure onsite drainage, water quality and soil loss. Therefore, impacts to loss of topsoil and erosion is less than significant.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

The project site is located within a Liquefaction Zone, and the onsite soil consists of recent alluvial sedimentary deposits (Qal) within Lopez Canyon that are underlain by Saugus Formation (TQs) bedrock. Saugus Formation bedrock is also exposed in the adjacent ridgelines at a depth ranging from 23 feet to 30 feet. Quaternary Alluvium formed unconsolidated deposits. Artificial fill (af) associated with past site development was encountered at one subsurface location to a depth of 6 feet. In general, the artificial fill is considered to be thin (< 3 feet) and is undifferentiated from the alluvium. Based on the assessment of potential for liquefaction and associated ground failure in soil layers beneath the proposed structure is less than significant, with inclusion of the recommended removal and re-compaction of site soils. No significant seismically-induced ground surface settlement is anticipated. Potential for lateral spreading is believed to be negligible since laterally continuous, potentially liquefiable soil layers with a relative density are not present at the site. Therefore, it is determined that the project requires incorporation of MM-GEO-1 in order to potentially result in less than significant impact in terms of causing soil instability and seismic-related ground failure.

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

As indicated in the project geological and soils analysis, the expansion potential of in-situ soils when removed, mixed, and replaces as compacted fill per preliminary design is considered very low. Conventional shallow column footings and continuous footings are considered adequate for the support to the proposed structure at the site provided the footings are supported entirely on competent compacted fill soils. All project footing design shall be required to comply with the minimum foundation requirements of the 2020 County of Los Angeles Building Code. Per existing condition and analysis, the project impact is considered less than significant.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

Currently, the Hope Gardens facility is serviced by its own onsite wastewater treatment plant, which is located approximately 1,700 feet near the southerly end of the site. The existing system may need an expansion to accommodate the proposed development pending County's review and comments. However, the existing treatment system has been in operation since 1975 with modification performed in 2006 and less than significant impact is anticipated for minor modifications that may be required for the existing system based on the soil analysis

f) Conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch.22.104)?

Hillside Management Areas (HMA) are defined as areas with 25% or greater natural slopes. The project site contains HMA but the proposed project development will demolish an existing housing building and to be replaced with a new building within an already developed facility. As such, the project would not be considered to be in Hillside Management Area and no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures

MM-GEO-1: Refer to Section 8, General Conclusions and Grading Recommendations, in the Geotechnical Report for mitigation measures regarding earthwork and grading, natural slopes, low impact development, oil wells and water wells, sewage disposal, drainage, landscaping, and planters. Earthwork and Grading shall be observed and tested by the Project Geotechnical Engineer, Engineering Geologist, and/or their authorized representatives. These tasks should be performed in accordance with the County Building Code requirements and with the Recommended Earthwork Specifications in Geological Report.

MM-GEO-2: Refer to Section 9, Foundation Recommendations, in the Geotechnical Report for mitigation measures regarding conventional shallow footing foundations, concrete slabs-on-grade, expansive soils considerations, and soil corrosivity considerations.

MM-GEO-3: Refer to Section 10, Retaining Walls; Section 12, Construction Considerations; and Section 13, Tentative Pavement Design and Associated Grading, in the Geotechnical Report.

MM-GEO-4: Refer to Appendix E, Drainage and Erosion Control Recommendations, in the Geotechnical Report, subject to approval of County Department of Public Works.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) **Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) 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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project development request is for a demolition of one existing housing building and construction of a new transitional housing building for homeless women and children within an established housing facility. Construction related sources are considered temporary and it is negligible by compliance with local SCAQMD and County regulations. The project design will incorporate measures that will comply with California Air Resource Board Scoping Plan policies and measures. No significant traffic is generated by the project development as the anticipated homeless occupants will not generate vehicle use since they do not own personal vehicles. Any daily operation and activities associated with the project is also considered not significant since the new building would contribute to overall facility operation. Therefore, the project is considered to result in less than significant impact in regard to greenhouse gas emission.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The project development is a housing facility for homeless women and children within an existing homeless shelter facility. Furthermore, the project would also comply with applicable Green Building Standards and County policies regarding sustainability. Therefore, project impacts are considered less than significant.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The Project may contain some storage of hazardous materials such as paint, cleaners and solvents during demolition and construction of the buildings. However, applicable best practices and any applicable requirements in County Code will be implemented and will result in a less than significant impact.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The Project may contain some storage of hazardous materials such as paint, cleaners and solvents during demolition and construction of the buildings. However, applicable best practices and any applicable requirements in County Code will be implemented and will result in a less than significant impact.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No emissions of any hazardous materials, substances, or waste are associated with the project development; therefore, no impacts to sensitive land uses within one-quarter mile will occur.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site is not located on a parcel of land that has been included on a list of hazardous materials site compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Thus, there would be no impact.

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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport. The project would not result in an airport related safety hazard concern. Thus, no impacts would occur.

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

The proposed project development consists of replacing an existing housing building with a new building within a developed homeless shelter facility. The Project Site is approximately 1 mile north of Foothill Freeway and is served by two-lane street. Development design and requirements will comply with all County Fire access and fire prevention requirements and existing facility Emergency Evacuation and Management Plan. An Emergency Action and Evacuation Plan has been prepared to address specific conditions of the site and existing facility, and it will be implemented to address any potential adverse impacts on implementing an adopted, existing emergency response plan. Result in less than significant impacts.

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, because the project is located:

i) within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?

The proposed new building is adjacent to and direct site access off two-lane Lopez Canyon Road. Access around the new building will be designed to accommodate and comply with the Los Angeles County Fire Access code. An Emergency Action and Evacuation Plan has been prepared to address specific conditions of the site and existing facility, and it will be implemented to address any potential adverse impacts on implementing an adopted, existing emergency response plan. Therefore, project development is considered less than significant.

ii) within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?

The project is located within an existing developed housing facility that has been in operation for more than 40 years. No new utility improvements are required as part of the project development. All existing water service is more than adequate to meet the water pressure fire flow standards; therefore, no impact will result from the project.

iii) within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard?

While the Hope Gardens facility is surrounded by natural open space, including Angeles National Forest to the north and east. To the south, there are mobile home parks, outside storage of industrial containers or trucks, and landfill. There may be potential for wildfires but all fire prevention equipment and requirements by County of Los Angeles Fire Codes shall be designed as part of the project development. In addition, Hope Gardens facility has an emergency response plan in place to account for such emergency events; therefore, project impact is considered less than significant.

h) Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?

The project development will consist of demolishing the existing housing building and replacing it with a new building that is located within an existing 75-acre Hope Gardens facility for the purpose of housing

homeless women and children. The proposed use does not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard. The project will shall comply with all applicable fire and safety codes and standards of the Los Angeles County Fire Department. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	<i>Less Than Significant</i>			
	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>

Would the project:

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

During project construction, discharge that could affect stormwater such as soil and sediment entering stormwater would be regulated by the Statewide General Construction Permit issued by State Water Resources Control Board. Demolition of the exiting building, construction grading and disturbance would require compliance with erosion control measures. Since the total disturbance area is over 1 acre in size, the project would be required to comply with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and requirement with State Water Resources Control Board. A SWPPP with project specific BMPs will be prepared to reduce or eliminate soil erosion and siltation from the construction site. The construction contractor would be required to operate and maintain these controls throughout the duration of the onsite activities. Thus, compliance with the SWPPP and BMP measures will minimize wastewater discharge and reduce impacts to potential water quality; therefore, impacts to water quality is less than significant. During facility operation, a Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan for municipal storm water and Urban Runoff Management Programs in Los Angeles County (SUSMP) would be required. In accordance with SUSMP requirements, new development is required to meet or exceed pre-project conditions form storm water discharge. The project would be required retain any additional runoff onsite and discharge it into the storm drain system at rates that do not exceed pre-project conditions. To address this requirement, the project design includes low impact development (LID) implementation and structural treatment control approved by County of Los Angeles Dept. of Public Works. Thus, project compliance with required NPDES, SWPPP, and SUSMP implementation, the project would ensure impacts related to surface or groundwater quality or discharge would remain 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?

The construction of the project is not expected to encounter groundwater and would prevent the potential surface runoff through adherence to applicable regulations and BMPs requirements of the NPDES permits, SWPPP, and County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works. In addition, operation of the project will not require direct groundwater extraction either through dewatering for water supply use; therefore, project development impacts is considered less than significant.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of a Federal 100-year flood hazard area or County Capital Flood floodplain; 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?

The project development will not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site as the newly proposed building will occur on the previously developed building pad with mostly impervious area such as parking and existing driveways. Project construction would temporarily affect the disturb pervious and impervious areas, potentially affecting onsite soils to erosion and siltation. However, pursuant to previously discussion on meeting the State and County stormwater and water quality control best management practice measures during the entire construction phases of the project would ensure that the project impacts related to erosion and siltation would be less than significant.

- (ii) Substantially increase the rate, amount, or depth of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?

The project development will not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site as the newly proposed building will occur on the previously developed building pad with mostly impervious area such as parking and existing driveways. The project would be required retain any additional runoff onsite and discharge it into the storm drain system at rates that do not exceed pre-project conditions. To address this requirement, the project design includes low impact development (LID) implementation and structural treatment control approved by County of Los Angeles Dept. of Public Works. Thus, project compliance with required NPDES, SWPPP, and SUSMP implementation, the project would ensure impacts related to surface or groundwater quality or discharge would remain less than significant.

- (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?

The project development will not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site as the newly proposed building will occur on the previously developed building pad with mostly impervious area such as parking and existing driveways. The project would be required to comply with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and requirement with State Water Resources Control Board. A SWPPP with project specific BMPs will be prepared to reduce or eliminate soil erosion and siltation from the construction site. The construction contractor would be required to operate and maintain these controls throughout the duration of the onsite activities. The project would be required retain any additional runoff onsite and discharge it into the storm drain system at rates that do not exceed pre-project conditions. To address this requirement, the project design includes low impact development (LID) implementation and structural treatment control approved by County of Los Angeles Dept. of Public Works. Thus, project compliance with required NPDES, SWPPP, and SUSMP implementation, the project would ensure impacts related to surface or groundwater quality or discharge would remain less than significant.

- (iv) Impede or redirect flood flows which would expose existing housing or other insurable structures in a Federal 100-year flood hazard area or County Capital Flood floodplain to a significant risk of loss or damage involving flooding?

The project site is not within a Federal 100-year flood hazard or County Capital Flood floodplain area or floodway, therefore less than significant impacts would result from the project.

d) Otherwise place structures in Federal 100-year flood hazard or County Capital Flood floodplain areas which would require additional flood proofing and flood insurance requirements?

The project site is not within a Federal 100-year flood hazard or County Capital Flood floodplain area, therefore no impacts would result from the project.

e) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84)?

The project development is required to comply with the County's LID requirements. As discussed above, the project design includes improvements and LID devices within the driveways onsite to address the potential impacts associated with the new building. Thus, project impacts is considered less than significant.

f) Use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course)?

Currently, the Hope Gardens facility is serviced by its own onsite wastewater treatment plant, which is located approximately 1,700 feet near the southerly end of the site. The existing treatment system has been in operation since 1975 with modification performed in 2006. No improvements to the existing treatment system will occur from the project development and it is not within high groundwater or near surface water in the area. Based on the project development location, no disturbance will occur on the remaining areas of the entire facility; therefore, no impacts will occur.

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

The proposed project is not located within a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones; therefore, no impact will occur.

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

The construction and operation of the project would involve activities that have the potential to be in conflict with the local groundwater quality control and management plan. However, project implementation will occur on a previous development property with existing control measures preventing the spread of contaminants. In addition, the construction of the project is not expected to encounter groundwater and would prevent the potential surface runoff through adherence to applicable regulations and BMPs requirements of the NPDES permits, SWPPP, and County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works. In

addition, operation of the project will not require direct groundwater extraction either through dewatering for water supply use; therefore, project development impact is considered less than significant.

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

The project development request is for the demolition of one existing housing building and construction of a new transitional housing building for homeless women and children within an established housing facility. The project site is surrounded by mostly natural, vacant land to north, east and west, with only commercial trailer and auto related storage site located to the south of the property along Lopez Canyon Road. Therefore, the project would not physically divide an established community. No impacts would occur.

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

The project development request is for the demolition of one existing housing building and construction of a new transitional housing building for homeless women and children within a previously established housing facility previously approved under the County designation of Rural Land (RL-1) and zoning of A-2-2 (Heavy Agricultural). Thus, the existing development and use is not in conflict with any County land use plan, policies, or regulations. Therefore, no impact would occur with the proposed project.

c) Conflict with the goals and policies of the General Plan related to Hillside Management Areas or Significant Ecological Areas?

The project development request is for the demolition of one existing housing building and construction of a new transitional housing building for homeless women and children within an established housing facility. The site is not located in a County designated Significant Ecological Area. The site contains a Hillside Management Area but the proposed development will occur within a developed, gentle-sloping area only; therefore, no impacts would occur.

12. MINERAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project area is within a fully developed and established homeless housing facility, and it is not located within a known mineral resource area. Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources 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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site and the adjacent land are not identified as any locally important mineral resource zone or recovery sites that are delineated on County's General Plan or any other land use plans; therefore, no impacts area associated with the project.

13. NOISE

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

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 County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies?**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Temporary noise impacts from construction activities are generally a function of the noise generated by construction equipment, the sensitivity of nearby land uses, and the timing and duration of the activities. The proposed project would require the typical construction techniques and equipment. The project will comply with all County noise ordinance and applicable standards during construction activities. The project site is also not located within any noise sensitive uses in the proximity; therefore, noise impacts associated with the project is considered less than significant.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Temporary project construction activities could generate varying degrees of ground vibration depending on the construction procedures and equipment uses. The project operation would typically consist of noise source from mechanical equipment such HAVC units and electrical equipment. The project facility is not located near any noise sensitive uses, the site is located adjacent to mostly open space with nonresidential and commercial uses. The project will comply with all County noise ordinance and applicable standards during construction activities. Thus, impacts to ground borne vibration and noise level is considered less than significant.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport; therefore, no impact will occur.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project proposes to develop a new housing building with 117 units that will replace 25 units within an older building within the existing Hope Gardens homeless shelter facility for women and children. The new building will house approximately 450 residents, each up to two-year of stay. The existing facility is currently entitled for up to 300 women and children and the Project requests an increase of capacity to allow the new livable units through a Conditional Use Permit. However, due to the nature of the transitional housing that serves people who formerly experienced homelessness, the project is not expected to induce un-planned population growth. No roads or other infrastructure will be constructed except for possibly on-site expansion of wastewater that will serve the subject property only. Lastly, no zone change or plan amendments are being requested or required for this project, as the use is conditionally permissible in the A-2-Zone.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project proposes to develop a new housing building to replace an existing older building within the existing Hope Gardens homeless shelter facility for women and children. The intent of the project is to address the ongoing homeless issues occurring in the regional by providing needed housing facility for homeless women and children. No impacts will result from the project.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

	<i>Less Than Significant</i>		
<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>

a) **Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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:**

Fire protection?

Fire protection and emergency medical services are provided by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department. The nearest fire station to the facility is the County Fire Department Station #74, which is approximately 3 miles in distance near the adjacent Kagel Canyon Community to the east. The project involves the construction and operation of a new housing building within an existing housing facility for the homeless. The new project building would be equipped with automatic fire sprinkler system and the new building will also be supported by multiple fire hydrants that are located adjacent to the new structure. Fire Lane access will be provided to loop through the new building and would allow direct access from Lopez Canyon Road. Per current project review with County Fire Department, no new demand for physical or staff resources associated with fire protection will be required; therefore, less than significant impact would occur.

Sheriff protection?

The project facility is located with the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, which provides law enforcement and protection services to the area. The nearest Sheriff's office is located at 900 3rd St. in San Fernando, which is approximately 3.6 miles to the south of the Hope Gardens facility. The facility is also protected and monitored by 24-hour onsite security. The Project may create an additional demand for Sheriff's services. However, Hope Gardens Homeless Shelter facility only provide transitional housing for homeless women and small children only. All activities associated with the operation occurs onsite that are supervised by the staff and onsite security. The development is not expected to require a significant impact to sheriff's facility or resources.

Schools?

The proposed project development involves the construction of a new transitional housing building within an existing homeless shelter facility for women and mothers with children. Currently, Hope Gardens provides children residing in the facility with education services through the local schools within the Los Angeles Unified School District near Sylmar area. Project development will not require expansion existing facilities or resources for the service. The anticipated project development is considered negligible, resulting in impacts that is less than significant.

Parks?

The existing Hope Gardens site maintains its own private recreational facility onsite for the homeless occupants; therefore, the project would not require new or expanded County parks or recreational facilities in the area; therefore, no impacts would occur.

Libraries?

Although the proposed new building and the facility is within the County of Los Angeles Public Library service jurisdiction, the project will not increase the demand for library services. Hope Gardens is a non-profit organization offering transitional housing for homeless women and their young children; therefore, the facility receives, maintains, and provides books and educational materials onsite serving those residents. In impacts will occur with the project.

Other public facilities?

The project development and its operation will not result in any increase in requirement for any local public facilities or resources impacting the surrounding area; therefore, no impacts would occur.

16. RECREATION

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The proposed project will not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. The County Department of Parks and Recreation has indicated that the project will not impact any park facilities.

b) **Does the project include neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No new park facilities are proposed or required for the proposed project. The County Department of Parks and Recreation has indicated that no impact will occur with the proposed project.

c) **Would the project interfere with regional trail connectivity?**

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

There are no identified regional trails within the vicinity of the project site. The County Department of Parks and Recreation has indicated no impacts will occur from the proposed project.

17. TRANSPORTATION

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable 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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project will demolish an existing housing building and replace it with a new building that is located within an existing homeless shelter facility. The existing property is conveniently accessible by existing Lopez Canyon Road and it will not change, be in conflict with any existing local circulation plan in the vicinity or the region. The project is to provide accommodation in addressing the local homeless issue with the County. It is not considered to overburden any existing circulation system. Therefore, the project impact is considered less than significant.

b) 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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project development is a homeless shelter housing building that will replace an existing building on a existing developed homeless shelter facility. No significant traffic is generated by the project development as the anticipated homeless occupants will not generate vehicle use due to the fact that they do not own personal vehicles. Therefore, the project development is not considered to be in conflict with the section 15064.3 guidelines; thus, resulting in less than significant impact.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project development is a homeless shelter housing building that will replace an existing building on an existing developed homeless shelter facility. No improvements to existing roadway access will occur, pending an approval of traffic access management study by Department of Public Work. The proposed use is consistent with the current use of the site, therefore, no impact will occur.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed development occurs within an existing housing facility that has been developed for more than 40 years and has served as a homeless shelter use since 2007. Main access to the site is provided by existing paved Lopez Canyon Road with multiple access to the property. No offsite improvements will occur with the project and the project would not result in inadequate emergency access to the property, pending an approval of traffic access management study by Department of Public Work. Therefore, project development impact is considered less than significant.

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	--	---	----------------------

a) **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code §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:**

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>i) 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 § 5020.1(k), or</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Scared Lands file search dated September 22, 2020 acknowledged an absence of specific site information in the Sacred Land File but it should not preclude that there might be other sources of cultural resources. The County of Los Angeles consulted with Gabrieleno Band of Mission (Kizh Nation), Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission (Tataviam), and San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians (Tongva) on October 16 and October 28 in 2020. Kizh Nation requested a consultation on October 19, and County staff responded with additional project information but was not informed of their availability. Tataviam tribe requested a consultation and a phone consultation meeting occurred on October 29, 2020 with County staff. During the phone consultation, the Tataviam representative requested that the tribe continues to be updated on the cultural resources report, draft mitigation measures, and draft initial study when available for review. The requested documents will be provided to Tataviam tribe upon completion. In the event of discovery of such resources, the applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist to assess the nature and significance of the find as described in mitigation measures below.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>ii) 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 § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Scared Lands file search dated September 22, 2020 acknowledged an absence of specific site information in the Scred Land File but it should not preclude that there might be other sources of cultural resources. The County of Los Angeles consulted with Gabrieleno

Band of Mission (Kizh Nation), Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission (Tataviam), and San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians (Tongva) on October 16 and October 28 in 2020. Kizh Nation requested a consultation on October 19, and County staff responded with additional project information but was not informed of their availability. Tataviam tribe requested a consultation and a phone consultation meeting occurred on October 29, 2020 with County staff. During the phone consultation, the Tataviam representative requested that the tribe continues to be updated on the cultural resources report, draft mitigation measures, and draft initial study when available for review. The requested documents will be provided to Tataviam tribe upon completion. In the event of discovery of such resources, the applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist to assess the nature and significance of the find as described in mitigation measures below.

MM-TCR-1: Discovery of Tribal Cultural Resources. If tribal cultural resources are encountered during construction, all ground disturbance activities within 25 feet of the find shall stop until the Tribal Monitor can evaluate the significance of the find. Construction activities may continue in other areas of the project site. The applicant or Project manager shall contact the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians and any other consulting tribes to consult if any such find occurs. If the discovery proves significant, the Tribal Monitor shall recommend appropriate measures, subject to County approval, to mitigate potential impacts to tribal cultural resources to less than significant. Such measures may include but are not limited to resource avoidance, reburial, and preservation for educational purposes. The Tribal Monitor shall coordinate with the project Applicant to ensure that all measures approved by the County are implemented. Within 90 days after monitoring has ended, the Tribal Monitor shall prepare and submit a final monitoring report documenting all encountered tribal cultural resources, the significance of the resources, and the treatment of the resources to the County and the California Native American Heritage Commission.

MM-TCR-2: Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains. If human remains are encountered during construction, all ground disturbance activities within 150 feet of the discovery shall be suspended and the construction manager shall immediately notify the County coroner. If the human remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians, and any other consulting tribes within 24 hours of identification. The NAHC shall identify and immediately notify the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) of the deceased Native American. Within 48 hours of being granted access to the site, the MLD shall complete the inspection of the site of the discovery and make recommendations to the Applicant/landowner for the treatment or disposition of the human remains and any associated funerary objects. All measures, as required by the County, shall be implemented under the supervision of the MLD and/or Tribal Monitor.

MM-TRC-3: When human remains are found, the County Coroner shall be notified within 24 hours of the discovery pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. No further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the County Coroner has determined, within two working days of notification of the discovery, the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner shall notify the NAHC in Sacramento within 24 hours. In accordance with California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons it believes to be the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) from the deceased Native American. The MLD shall complete their inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The MLD would then determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains.

MM-TRC-4: The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with the FTBMI on the disposition and treatment of any Tribal Cultural Resource encountered during all ground disturbing activities.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication 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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

No new expansion of existing utility facilities and services would be required for the proposed project. The project development will demolish an existing housing facility that will be replaced with a newer building. Although the newer building is anticipated to provide additional homeless housing needs, all existing onsite utility service facilities are more than adequate to meet the gradual demand without resulting in significant environmental effects; therefore, no impacts to existing utility system will occur.

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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The existing facility is currently served by City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (DWP) and it has been the sole service provider to the subject property. The project development will demolish an existing housing facility that will be replaced with a newer building to accommodate the growing homeless needs. The project development would be required to continue satisfy all terms and conditions set forth by DWP and provide adequate services. The project design features would also include drought-tolerant landscaping and low flow plumbing fixtures. Therefore, sufficient water supply would be available to serve the facility without resulting in new or expansion of existing infrastructure. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The facility is currently being served by an existing onsite wastewater treatment plant onsite. Current analysis of the exiting wastewater treatment plant indicates that the proposed future addition will be adequately served by the existing system and no future expansion will required to meet the project demand; therefore, no impacts will result from the project.

d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

The waste Management Act (AB 939) requires each California City and County to demonstrate how the local jurisdiction would meet the diversion goals of 50 percent. The project site is located within the service area of the Sunshine Canyon landfill with a maximum permitted throughput of 8300 tons per day and an estimated closure date in the year 2037. Project construction and operation would result in negligible solid waste that would need to be disposed of in off-site facilities. As required by state and local agency mandated required recycling and reuse programs, the project would incorporate the collection of recyclable materials into the project design, the facility would provide recycling containers and appropriate storage areas for onsite use, and require all contractors to reuse construction supplies where practicable to the extent feasible. Therefore, solid waste generated during construction and future project operation would result in a less than significant impact.

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

In complying with goals set by the State AB 939 and County of Los Angeles SRRE, the project would incorporate the collection of recyclable materials into the project design and to require contractors to reuse construction materials where practicable and applicable to the extent feasible. The project would comply with the County Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling and Reuse Code.

The proposed project is located within an existing housing facility that has been developed for more than 40 years. No additional new infrastructure improvements will be required since all existing utility connection and access are in place. A fuel modification plan will be adopted to ensure proper vegetation maintenance to mitigate fire risks. Therefore, impacts associated with project development would be less than significant.

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?

The project site is located within an already developed property for more than 40 years with existing improvements that are in place to prevent significant risks from downslope flooding, landslides, stormwater runoff, and drainage changes. Therefore, impacts associated with project development would be less than significant.

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

The proposed project is located within an existing housing facility that has been developed for more than 40 years. Design and construction of the project would be built in accordance with the current California Building Code that include design features such as ignition-resistant materials and incorporate fire sprinklers that would minimize any risk of exposure of persons or property to potential fire related risk. A fuel modification plan will be adopted to ensure proper vegetation maintenance to mitigate fire risks. Therefore, impacts associated with project development would be less than significant.

MM-WF-1: Implement a Emergency Evacuation Plan as approved by the County.

MM-WF-2: Implement a fuel modification plan as approved by Fire Department.

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	<i>Less Than Significant</i>			
<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

As indicated in the biological resources section, the project development area consists of ordinance protected oak trees. Removal and encroachment of oak trees is considered a potential impact associated with the project development. However, to mitigate the loss of protected oaks, the project would implement mitigation measures during construction activities, plant replacement trees with monitoring, and compliance with project conditions will mitigate the potential impacts to be less than significant.

As indicated in the cultural resources section, the existing Sequoia Lodge building is eligible as contributing resources to the newly identified Forester Haven Historic District under CRHR and County Criteria 3 for embodying the distinctive character-defining features of the Contemporary style of architecture, which unit them aesthetically and create a cohesive campus of rustic, lodge-style buildings designed by an Independent Order of Foresters (IOF) member for an IOF retirement home. Therefore, the proposed project would result in impact to a building that appears eligible as a contributing resource to the Forester Haven District under CRHR and County Landmark designation Criterion 3 for its architectural merit and is considered an historical resource under CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(3) and (4). Demolition of this building will demolish some of the physical characteristics that justify Forester Haven for its eligibility under CRHR and County Landmark designations. Due to the proposed project development goals; unfortunately, demolition of the Sequoia Building is an unavoidable impact that cannot be mitigated significant historical resource.

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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

This project review did not reveal any cumulatively considerable impacts. The project development is a replacement of an existing housing building that is largely in support of an existing developed 75- acre homeless shelter facility. There is a current project at a property immediately adjacent at the southeast corner

of the Project Site to legalize an existing contractor's storage yard by changing the zone from A-1-1 to M-1.5 and the land use category from RL10 to IL. An oak tree permit is also concurrently filed to address retroactive encroachments into multiple oak tree protected zones. However, since the contractor's storage yard has existed at this location and no other physical changes are requested, there would be no cumulatively considerable impacts. Therefore, the project would not be expected to meet this mandatory finding of significance.

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

As indicated, the project development is a replacement of an existing housing building that is largely in support of an existing developed 75- acre homeless shelter facility. Project impacts are considered negligible and can be reduced to less than significant level with incorporation of project features and mitigation measures as required. Mitigation measures would be implemented to ensure less than significant impacts related to biological resources- Oak Trees. Based on the evaluation contained herein, there is no substantial evidence the project development itself would lead to adverse effects on human beings. Therefore, the project would not be expected to meet this mandatory finding of significance.