



CITY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

CITY HALL • 200 NORTH SPRING STREET • LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

Sylmar Self-Storage Building

Case Number: ENV-2021-9001-MND

Project Location: 12121 West Foothill Boulevard, Los Angeles, California, 91342

Community Plan Area: Sunland - Tujunga - Lakeview Terrace - Shadow Hills – East La Tuna Canyon

Council District: 7 – Monica Rodriguez

Project Description: The project would involve the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling and accessory structures including, a garage, carport, and barn, and the construction of a new three-story self-storage building having 130,094 square feet of floor area, equating to a floor area ratio (FAR) of 1.49:1. The proposed building would have a maximum height of 41 feet, 0 inches. The building will contain approximately 1,259 storage units, and 1,022 square feet of office space. The project proposes a surface parking lot that would contain 27 vehicular parking spaces, and would provide 28 bicycle parking stalls, including 14 short-term and 14 long-term parking stalls. The project proposes 18,036 square feet of landscaped area. The project would remove 14 on-site trees, two (2) of which are protected trees. All removed trees would be replaced in accordance with the City's tree replacement requirements. The planting of new street trees would be conducted in accordance with Bureau of Street Services, Urban Forestry Division. The project involves grading that will result in the export of approximately 11,100 cubic yards of soil from the site. It is anticipated that the soils will be exported to a landfill located at 14747 San Fernando Road in Sylmar, CA, which is approximately 8 miles away from the project site.

In order to facilitate the development of the proposed project, the applicant is requesting the following discretionary actions: a Vesting Zone Change from [T][Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU to (T)(Q)M1-1VL-CUGU; a Zone Variance to allow reduced vehicle parking of 27 parking stalls in lieu of 47 parking stalls otherwise required pursuant to LAMC Section 12.21 A.4; a Conditional Use Permit to allow a self-storage building in the proposed M1 Zone within 500 feet of an A or R Zone, and to allow a maximum building height of 41 feet, 0 inches, in lieu of 37 feet otherwise not permitted pursuant to LAMC Section 12.17.6 A.10; a Site Plan Review for a development project that results in an increase of 50,000 square feet of non-residential floor area; and any additional discretionary or ministerial actions from the Building and Safety Department (and other municipal agencies) for project construction actions including, but not limited to, demolition, removal and replacement of street trees, grading, foundation, temporary street closure permits, haul route building, and sign permits.

PREPARED FOR:

The City of Los Angeles
Department of City Planning

PREPARED BY:

Yorke Engineering, LLC.
31726 Rancho Viejo Road, Suite 218
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675

APPLICANT:

12121 Foothill Blvd, LLC.
570 Lake Cook Rd., Suite 325
Deerfield, IL 60015

INITIAL STUDY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction.....	5
1.1	Purpose of an Initial Study	5
1.2	Organization of the Initial Study	6
1.2.1	Initial Study	6
2	Executive Summary.....	7
2.1	Project Description.....	8
2.2	Environmental Setting.....	8
2.3	Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required	9
2.4	California Native American Consultation	9
2.5	Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	10
2.6	Determination	10
2.7	Evaluation of Environmental Impacts	11
3	Project Description.....	13
3.1	Project Summary	13
3.2	Environmental Setting.....	13
3.2.1	Project Location and Existing Conditions	13
3.2.2	Surrounding Land Uses	13
3.3	Description of Project.....	14
3.3.1	Project Overview.....	14
3.4	Requested Permits and Approvals.....	14
4	Environmental Impact Analysis	15
I.	Aesthetics	15
II.	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	18
III.	Air Quality	19
IV.	Biological Resources	23
V.	Cultural Resources	27
VI.	Energy	28
VII.	Geology and Soils.....	29
VIII.	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	33
IX.	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	34
X.	Hydrology and Water Quality	37
XI.	Land Use and Planning.....	41
XII.	Mineral Resources	42
XIII.	Noise	42
XIV.	Population and Housing.....	45
XV.	Public Services	46
XVI.	Recreation	48
XVII.	Transportation.....	49
XVIII.	Tribal Cultural Resources.....	51
XIX.	Utilities and Service Systems.....	54
XX.	Wildfire.....	56
XXI.	Mandatory Findings of Significance	58

Appendices

APPENDIX A – Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas, and Noise Impacts Study

APPENDIX B – Biological Resources Evaluation Report

APPENDIX C – Protected Tree Inventory Report

APPENDIX D – California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Report

APPENDIX E – Geotechnical Investigation Report

APPENDIX F – Trip Generation Memorandum and Transportation Study Assessment Form

APPENDIX G – Phase II Environmental Site Assessment

INITIAL STUDY

1 INTRODUCTION

This Initial Study (IS) evaluates potential environmental effects resulting from construction and operation of the proposed storage facility at 12121 West Foothill Boulevard ("Project"). The Proposed Project is subject to the guidelines and regulations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Therefore, this document has been prepared in compliance with the relevant provisions of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines as implemented by the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning (City). Based on the analysis provided within this IS, it has been concluded that the Project will not result in significant impacts on the environment. This IS and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) are intended as informational documents, and are ultimately required to be adopted by the City Council prior to project approval by the City.

1.1 PURPOSE OF AN INITIAL STUDY

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

An application for the Proposed Project has been submitted to the City for discretionary review. The Department of City Planning, as Lead Agency, has determined that the project is subject to CEQA, and the preparation of an IS is required.

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

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

1.2 ORGANIZATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY

This evaluation is organized into four sections as follows:

1 INTRODUCTION

Describes the purpose and content of the IS, and provides an overview of the CEQA process.

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

4 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Contains the completed IS Checklist and discussion of the environmental factors that would be potentially affected by the Project.

1.2.1 Initial Study

This IS has been prepared to determine if the Proposed Project may have a significant effect on the environment. The IS for the Project determined that the Proposed Project would not have significant environmental impacts that would require further study.

A Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) or Negative Declaration (ND) is provided to inform the general public, responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and the county clerk of the availability of the document and the locations where the document can be reviewed. A 20-day review period (or 30-day review period when the document is submitted to the State Clearinghouse for state agency review) is identified to allow the public and agencies to review the document. The notice is mailed to any interested parties and is noticed to the public through publication in a newspaper of general circulation.

The decision-making body then considers the Mitigated Negative Declaration or Negative Declaration, together with any comments received during the public review process, and may adopt the MND or ND and approve the project. In addition, when approving a project for which an MND or ND has been prepared, the decision-making body must find that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment, and that the ND or MND reflects the lead agency's independent judgement and analysis. When adopting an MND, the lead agency must also adopt a mitigation monitoring program to ensure that all proposed mitigation measures are implemented to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects.

INITIAL STUDY

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROJECT TITLE	Sylmar Self-Storage
ENVIRONMENTAL CASE NO.	ENV-2021-9001-MND
RELATED CASES	CPC-2021-9000-VZC-ZV-CU-SPR

PROJECT LOCATION	12121 West Foothill Boulevard
COMMUNITY PLAN AREA	Sunland - Tujunga - Lakeview Terrace - Shadow Hills – East La Tuna Canyon
EXISTING GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION	Limited Manufacturing
PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION	Limited Manufacturing
EXISTING ZONING	[T][Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU
PROPOSED ZONING	(T)(Q)M1-1VL-CUGU
COUNCIL DISTRICT	7

LEAD AGENCY	City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning
STAFF CONTACT	Trevor Martin
ADDRESS	200 North Spring Street, Room 763 Los Angeles, CA 90012
PHONE NUMBER	(213) 978-1341
EMAIL	Trevor.Martin@lacity.org

APPLICANT	12121 Foothill Blvd, LLC
ADDRESS	570 Lake Cook Rd., Suite 325, Deerfield, IL 60015
PHONE NUMBER	847-501-5450 (APPLICANT) 818-970-5710 (REPRESENTATIVE: Stacey Brenner, Brenner Consulting Group, Inc.)

2.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project would involve the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling and accessory structures including, a garage, carport, and barn, and the construction of a new three-story self-storage building having 130,094 square feet of floor area, equating to a floor area ratio (FAR) of 1.49:1. The proposed building would have a maximum height of 41 feet, 0 inches. The building will contain approximately 1,259 storage units, and 1,022 square feet of office space. The project proposes a surface parking lot that would contain 27 vehicular parking spaces, and would provide 28 bicycle parking stalls, including 14 short-term and 14 long-term parking stalls. The project proposes 18,036 square feet of landscaped area. The project would remove 14 on-site trees, two (2) of which are protected trees. All removed trees would be replaced in accordance with the City's tree replacement requirements. The planting of new street trees would be conducted in accordance with Bureau of Street Services, Urban Forestry Division. The project involves grading that will result in the export of approximately 11,100 cubic yards of soil from the site. It is anticipated that the soils will be exported to a landfill located at 14747 San Fernando Road in Sylmar, CA, which is approximately 8 miles away from the project site.

In order to facilitate the development of the proposed project, the applicant is requesting the following discretionary actions: a Vesting Zone Change from [T][Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU to (T)(Q)M1-1VL-CUGU; a Zone Variance to allow reduced vehicle parking of 27 parking stalls in lieu of 47 parking stalls otherwise required pursuant to LAMC Section 12.21 A.4; a Conditional Use Permit to allow a self-storage building in the proposed M1 Zone within 500 feet of an A or R Zone, and to allow a maximum building height of 41 feet, 0 inches, in lieu of 37 feet otherwise not permitted pursuant to LAMC Section 12.17.6 A.10; a Site Plan Review for a development project that results in an increase of 50,000 square feet of non-residential floor area; and any additional discretionary or ministerial actions from the Building and Safety Department (and other municipal agencies) for project construction actions including, but not limited to, demolition, removal and replacement of street trees, grading, foundation, temporary street closure permits, haul route building, and sign permits.

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

2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The subject property is located at 12121 West Foothill Boulevard, southwest of Interstate 210 Freeway (Foothill Freeway) and east of Foothill Boulevard at the southeast corner of Foothill Boulevard and Carl Street. The project site is a gently sloping, rectangular-shaped lot encompassing a total lot area of approximately 87,337 square feet. The subject property has 343 feet of street frontage along the northeasterly side of Foothill Boulevard.

The project site is currently zoned [T][Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU and is located within the Sunland – Tujunga Lakeview Terrace – Shadow Hills – East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan Area which designates the subject property for Limited Manufacturing land uses corresponding to the CM, MR1, and M1 zones. The project site is located in and subject to the requirements of Clean Up Green Up (CUGU): Pacoima/Sun Valley (ZI-2458), a Los Angeles State Enterprise Zone (ZI-2374), a Freeway Adjacent Advisory Notice for Sensitive Uses (ZI-2427), and an Urban Agriculture Incentive Zone. The project site is not located within the boundaries of or subject to any specific plan, community design overlay, or interim control ordinance.

The subject property is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, Flood Zone, Hazardous Waste site, Hillside Area, Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone, Landslide Zone, Liquefaction Zone, Preliminary Fault Rupture Study Area, or Tsunami Inundation Zone. The project site is located in a BOE Special Grading Area and is located within the Verdugo Fault Zone.

Surrounding properties are within the [T][Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU, [Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU, [T][Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU, RD2-1-CUGU, and PF-1XL zones and contain a variety of residential, commercial, and light industrial uses. Adjoining the subject site to the northwest lots are lots zoned [T][Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU and [Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU and are improved with storage yards. Adjoining the subject property to the north is land that is zoned PF-1XL and improved with the I-210 Freeway. Adjoining the subject site to the southeast is a property zoned [T][Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU, improved with a storage yard. Abutting the project site to the southwest, across Foothill Boulevard are (Q)RD2-1-CUGU zoned parcels of land improved with single-family dwellings.

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

2.3 OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED

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

The Project may need additional discretionary and ministerial permits and approvals that may be deemed necessary, including, but not limited to, temporary street closure permits, haul route, demolition, grading, building permits, and sign permits.

2.4 CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

Yes.

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.

2.5 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

2.6 DETERMINATION

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Trevor Martin
PRINTED NAME

City Planning Associate
TITLE

Trevor Martin
SIGNATURE

7/7/2022
DATE

2.7 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whichever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

INITIAL STUDY

3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 PROJECT SUMMARY

“Section 2.1 Project Description” describes the proposed project and all the activities that it entails.

3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.2.1 Project Location and Existing Conditions

“Section 2.2 Environmental Setting” describes the project location. Figure 3-1 provides an overview of the project vicinity.

Figure 3-1. Project Vicinity



3.2.2 Surrounding Land Uses

Surrounding properties are within the [T][Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU, [Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU, [T][Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU, RD2-1-CUGU, and PF-1XL zones and contain a variety of residential, commercial, and light industrial uses. Adjoining the subject site to the northwest lots are lots zoned [T][Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU and [Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU and are improved with storage yards. Adjoining the subject

property to the north is land that is zoned PF-1XL and improved with the I-210 Freeway. Adjoining the subject site to the southeast is a property zoned [T][Q]MR1-1VL-CUG, improved with a storage yard. Abutting the project site to the southwest, across Foothill Boulevard are (Q)RD2-1-CUGU zoned parcels of land improved with single-family dwellings.

3.3 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

3.3.1 Project Overview

“Section 2.1 Project Description” describes the proposed project and all the activities that it entails.

3.4 REQUESTED PERMITS AND APPROVALS

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

- Pursuant to LAMC Sections 12.32 F and 12.32 Q, a Vesting Zone Change from [T][Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU to the (T)(Q)M1-1VL-CUGU Zone;
- Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.27, a Zone Variance to allow reduced vehicle parking of 27 parking stalls in lieu of 47 parking stalls otherwise required pursuant to LAMC Section 12.21 A.4;
- Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.24 W.50 and 12.24 F, a Conditional Use Permit to allow a self-storage building in the proposed M1 Zone within 500 feet of an A or R Zone, and to allow a maximum building height of 41 feet, 0 inches, in lieu of 37 feet otherwise not permitted pursuant to LAMC Section 12.17.6 A.10;
- Pursuant to LAMC Section 16.05, a Site Plan Review for a development project that results in an increase of 50,000 square feet of non-residential floor area;
- Other discretionary and ministerial permits and approvals that may be deemed necessary, including, but not limited to, temporary street closure permits, haul route, demolition, grading, removal and replacement of street trees, building permits, and sign permits.

INITIAL STUDY

4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

I. AESTHETICS

Senate Bill (SB) 743 [Public Resources Code (PRC) §21099(d)] sets forth new guidelines for evaluating project transportation impacts under CEQA, as follows: “Aesthetic and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project on an infill site within a transit priority area (TPA) shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.” PRC Section 21099 defines a “transit priority area” as an area within 0.5 mile of a major transit stop that is “existing or planned, if the planned stop is scheduled to be completed within the planning horizon included in a Transportation Improvement Program adopted pursuant to Section 450.216 or

450.322 of Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations.” PRC Section 21064.3 defines “major transit stop” as “a site containing an existing rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.” PRC Section 21099 defines an “employment center project” as “a project located on property zoned for commercial uses with a floor area ratio of no less than 0.75 and that is located within a transit priority area. PRC Section 21099 defines an “infill site” as a lot located within an urban area that has been previously developed, or on a vacant site where at least 75 percent of the perimeter of the site adjoins, or is separated only by an improved public right-of-way from, parcels that are developed with qualified urban uses. This state law supersedes the aesthetic impact thresholds in the 2006 L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide, including those established for aesthetics, obstruction of views, shading, and nighttime illumination.

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

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

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

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099 would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. A scenic vista refers to views of focal points or panoramic views of broader geographic areas that have visual interest. A focal point view would consist of a view of a notable object, building, or setting. Diminishment of a scenic vista would occur if the bulk or design of a building or development contrasts enough with a visually interesting view, so that the quality of the view is permanently affected. The Project involves the construction of a storage facility of household goods in a manufacturing zone on what appears to be a junk yard. The existing visual character of the surrounding locale is developed in an urban environment, and the Project Site is not located within or along a designated scenic highway, corridor, or parkway. No designated scenic vistas in the local area would be impeded, and the project will not substantially block any scenic vistas. Thus, there will be no impact on aesthetics and no impact on a scenic vista. No mitigation is required.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural feature within a state scenic highway?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project would substantially damage scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway. The proposed Project is not located along or near an officially designated California Scenic Highway or locally designated scenic highway. California State Route (SR) 2 also known as the Angeles Crest Highway Scenic Byway is the nearest officially designated scenic highway in the California Scenic Highway Mapping System. SR 2 is located approximately 12.7 miles southeast of the Project site in the San Gabriel Mountains. The City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035, An Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan (Map A2: Valley Subarea Citywide General Plan Circulation System) indicates that

no City-designated scenic highways are located near the Project Site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings. Significant impacts to the visual character of the site and its surroundings are generally based on the removal of features with aesthetic value, the introduction of contrasting urban features into a local area, and the degree to which the elements of the proposed project detract from the visual character of an area. The project site is in an urbanized neighborhood surrounded by residential, commercial, and light industrial development that range from one to two stories in height. The Project would involve the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling and accessory structures, and the construction of a new three-story, 130,094 square-foot self-storage building. The proposed building would have a maximum height of 41 feet, 0 inches. The proposed project is compatible with the Sunland - Tujunga - Lakeview Terrace - Shadow Hills – East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan and the Urban Design Guidelines. There are no additional regulations governing scenic quality that apply to the subject site. The Proposed Project will improve the visual character of its surroundings by replacing a vacant single-family dwelling and storage yard with a new self-storage building on a site that is designated for light industrial uses. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if light and glare substantially altered the character of off-site areas surrounding the site or interfered with the performance of an off-site activity. Light impacts are typically associated with the use of artificial light during the evening and night-time hours. Glare may be a daytime occurrence caused by the reflection of sunlight or artificial light from highly polished surfaces, such as window glass and reflective cladding materials, and may interfere with the safe operation of a motor vehicle on adjacent streets. Daytime glare is common in urban areas and is typically associated with mid- to high-rise buildings with exterior facades largely or entirely comprised of highly reflective glass or mirror-like materials. Nighttime glare is primarily associated with bright point-source lighting that contrasts with existing low ambient light conditions. The Proposed Project involves the construction, use, and maintenance of a new, mid-rise self-storage building for the storage of household goods. Due to the urbanized nature of the area, a moderate level of ambient nighttime light already exists. Nighttime lighting sources include street lights, vehicle headlights, and interior and exterior building illumination. The Proposed Project does not include any elements or features that would create substantial new sources of glare. The Proposed Project would include nighttime security lighting primarily along the perimeter of the project site. The proposed lighting, however, will be shielded from adjacent properties and would not substantially change existing ambient nighttime lighting conditions. Therefore, impacts related to light and glare would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

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

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

No Impact. The Project Site is located within a developed and urbanized area of the City. No farmland or agricultural activity exists on or near the Project Site. No portion of the Project Site is designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local Importance. As such, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.

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

No Impact. The Project Site is located within the jurisdiction of the City of Los Angeles and is subject to the applicable land use and zoning requirements of the LAMC. The Project Site has a Land Use designation of Limited Manufacturing, and is zoned [T][Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU. The Project Site comprises a single interior lot that is currently developed with a single-family dwelling and accessory structures, and a storage yard. The Proposed Project involves the construction, use, and maintenance of a new, mid-rise self-storage building for the storage of household goods. To facilitate the development of the Project, the applicant is requesting a Vesting Zone Change from [T][Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU to (T)(Q)M1-1VL-CUGU. As such, the Project Site is not zoned for agricultural production, and there is no farmland at the Project Site. In addition, no Williamson Act Contracts are in effect for the Project Site. As such, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.

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

No Impact. As previously stated, the Project Site has a Land Use designation of Limited Manufacturing and is currently zoned [T][Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU. As such, the Project Site is not zoned as forest land or timberland, and there is no timberland production at the Project Site. As such, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.

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

No Impact. The Project Site is not designated or zoned for forest or timberland or used for foresting. Additionally, the Project Site is located in an urbanized area of the City and is not within any forestland area. As such, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.

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

No Impact. Neither the Project Site nor nearby properties are currently utilized for agricultural, or forestry uses. The Project Site is not classified in any “Farmland” category designated by the State of California. As such, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.

III. AIR QUALITY

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

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>

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

Less than Significant Impact. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the agency primarily responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in the South Coast Air Basin and reducing emissions from area and point stationary, mobile, and indirect sources. SCAQMD prepared the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) to meet federal and state ambient air quality standards. The 2016 AQMP contains a comprehensive list of pollution control strategies directed at reducing emissions and achieving ambient air quality standards. These strategies are developed, in part, based on regional population, housing, and employment projections prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). SCAG is the regional planning agency for Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Imperial Counties and addresses regional issues relating to transportation, the economy, community development and the environment.⁸ With regard to future growth, SCAG has prepared the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016-2040 RTP/SCS) which provides population, housing, and employment projections for cities under its jurisdiction. The growth projections in the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS are based in part on projections originating under County and City General Plans. These growth projections were utilized in the preparation of the air quality forecasts and consistency analysis included in the 2016 AQMP. The 2020-2045 RTP/SCS was approved in September 2020. Consistency with the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS is therefore analyzed in Land Use, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy sections of this Initial Study/MND. However, the 2016 AQMP relies on the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and is therefore addressed for consistency with the 2016 AQMP.

The 2016 AQMP was adopted by the SCAQMD as a program to lead the Air Basin into compliance with several criteria pollutant standards and other federal requirements. It relies on emissions forecasts based on demographic and economic growth projections provided by SCAG's 2016-2040 RTP/SCS. SCAG is charged by California law to prepare and approve "the portions of each AQMP relating to demographic projections and integrated regional land use, housing, employment, and transportation programs, measures and strategies." Projects whose growth is included in the projections used in the formulation of the AQMP are considered to be consistent with the plan and not to interfere with its attainment. The SCAQMD recommends that, when determining whether a project is consistent with the current AQMP, a lead agency must assess whether the project would directly obstruct implementation of the plan and whether it is consistent with the demographic and economic assumptions (typically land use related, such as resultant employment or residential units) upon which the plan is based.

A significant air quality impact may occur if a project is inconsistent with the AQMP or would in some way represent a substantial hindrance to employing the policies or obtaining the goals of that plan. The Project involves the construction of a storage facility of household goods in a manufacturing zone on what appears to be a junk yard. The project will not substantially increase in regional employment or population growth. Furthermore, while the Project would generate part-time and full-time jobs associated with construction of the Project between the start of construction and Project buildout, these would be short-term opportunities and are employment positions that circulate throughout the region based on the construction site. As such, the Project would not result in additional permanent employment. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the demographic projections set forth in SCAG's 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and which were used in the 2016 AQMP because the Project would result in no increase in population or permanent employment. Thus, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2016 AQMP.

The City's General Plan Air Quality Element identifies policies and strategies for advancing the City's clean air goals. To achieve the goals of the Air Quality Element, performance-based standards have been adopted by the City of Los Angeles to provide flexibility in implementation of its policies and objectives. The goal, objectives, and policies provided in the City's Air Quality Element applicable to the Project include the following:

- Goal 1: Good air quality and mobility in an environment of continued population growth and healthy economic structure.
- Objective 1.1: It is the objective of the City of Los Angeles to reduce air pollutants consistent with the AQMP, increase traffic mobility, and sustain economic growth citywide.
- Objective 1.3: It is the objective of the City of Los Angeles to reduce particulate air pollutants emanating from unpaved areas, parking lots, and construction sites.
- Policy 1.3.2: Minimize particulate emissions from unpaved roads and parking lots which are associated with vehicular traffic.
- Policy 4.2.3: Ensure that new development is compatible with pedestrians, bicycles, transit, and alternative fuel vehicles.

The Project would increase the number of daily trips for the site by 241 trips per day. The net increase of 241 daily vehicle trips does not exceed the Department of Transportation's (LADOT) threshold of 250 daily vehicle trips. Additionally, according to the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Study prepared by Yorke Engineering dated July 16, 2021, provided in Appendix A, and utilizing the California Emissions Estimator Model® (CalEEMod), the project does not reach the established thresholds of potential significance for air quality per the SCAQMD. Thus, the Proposed Project is not expected to conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the AQMP and SCAQMD rules. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. For the detailed description of the Air Quality analysis and results, refer to Appendix A.

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

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project would violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Project construction and operation emissions are estimated using CalEEMod, the statewide land use emissions computer model designed to quantify potential criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with both construction and operations from land

use projects. According to the CalEEMod model results as summarized in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Study conducted by Yorke Engineering, LLC. dated July 16, 2021, provided in Appendix A, overall construction (maximum daily emission) for the Proposed Project would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds for the criteria pollutants Reactive Organic Compounds (ROG), Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x), Carbon Monoxide (CO), Sulfur Oxides (SO_x), and Respirable and Fine Particulate Matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, respectively). The project is estimated to generate less than the SCAQMD threshold of 75 pounds per day (lbs/day) for ROG, 100 lbs/day for NO_x, 550 lbs/day for CO, 150 lbs per day for SO_x, 150 lbs/day for PM₁₀, and 55 lbs/day for PM_{2.5} during the construction phase. Additionally, the project is estimated to generate less than the SCAQMD threshold of 55 pounds per day (lbs/day) for ROG, 55 lbs/day for NO_x, 550 lbs/day for CO, 150 lbs per day for SO_x, 150 lbs/day for PM₁₀, and 55 lbs/day for PM_{2.5} during the operational phase. The primary source of operation phase emissions office and storage uses are on-road vehicles traveling to and from the Site and standard commercial building operational activities such as landscape equipment, energy use, and water use. The project operational emissions output is also below the significance thresholds for the above referenced criteria pollutants with regard to overall operational emissions.

The proposed Project site is 2.00 acres in source-receptor area Zone 7 – East San Fernando Valley. The 2-acre screening lookup tables were used to evaluate NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} impacts on nearby receptors. The nearest receptor is approximately 50 meters away, across Foothill Boulevard, from the site. Therefore, the impact evaluation was performed using the closest distance within SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold (LST) tables of 50 meters for construction. (SCAQMD 2008a).

The LST results provided in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Study conducted by Yorke Engineering, LLC. dated July 16, 2021 show that on-site emissions from construction and operations would meet the LST passing criteria at the nearest receptors (50 meters).

Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact related to regional operational emissions and no mitigation is required. For the detailed description of the Air Quality analysis and results, refer to Appendix A.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project were to expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations. The SCAQMD identifies the following as sensitive receptors: long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, and athletic facilities. The Project Site is surrounded by residential, commercial, and light industrial uses. The project is subject to grading and construction standards to mitigate air pollution and dust impacts. Additionally, the project is not expected to contribute to pollutant concentrations or expose surrounding residences and other sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The Project is required to meet SCAQMD District Rule 403 as well as the City's requirements for demolition, grading, and construction related to air pollution. Therefore, construction and operation of the project would result in a less than significant impact for both localized and regional air pollution emissions and no mitigation is required. For the detailed description of the Air Quality analysis and results, refer to Appendix A.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include equipment exhaust and architectural coatings. Odors from these sources would

be localized and generally confined to the immediate area surrounding the Project Site. The Proposed Project would utilize typical construction techniques, and the odors would be typical of most construction sites and temporary in nature. Construction of the proposed project would not cause an odor nuisance. According to the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses and industrial operations that are associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies and fiberglass molding. The proposed self-storage building for the primary use of storage of household goods would not result in activities that create objectionable odors. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact related to objectionable odors and no mitigation is required. For the detailed description of the Air Quality analysis and results, refer to Appendix A.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

policy or ordinance?

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. Per the Biological Resources Evaluation Report prepared by Helix Environmental Planning dated April 8, 2022, the project area and adjacent sites provide marginal habitat for nesting migratory birds and raptors. A copy of this report is provided in Appendix B. Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-1 will be implemented for the Proposed Project activities. Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures for nesting bird surveys would reduce the potential for project impacts to common migratory birds and raptors. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated and no further analysis is needed.

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

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if any riparian habitat or natural community would be lost or destroyed as a result of urban development. Per the Biological Resources Evaluation Report prepared by Helix Environmental Planning dated April 8, 2022, provided in Appendix B, there is currently no suitable habitat for special-status plant species on the project site and there have been no reported occurrences of special-status plant species on or adjacent to the project site in the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). The site is vegetated with ruderal vegetation and has been disturbed to the point where no native or naturalized vegetation communities are present.. Additionally, due to the disturbed nature of the project study area and the general lack in abundance of native plant species, there are no terrestrial or aquatic sensitive natural communities on the subject property. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have any effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the United States Fish and Wildlife Services, and no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.

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

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if federally protect wetlands would be modified or removed by a project. The Project Site does not contain any federally protected wetlands, wetland resources, or other waters of the United States as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Per the Biological Resources Evaluation Report prepared by Helix Environmental Planning dated April 8, 2022, provided in Appendix B, the Project Site is located within the Tujunga Wash-Los Angeles River hydrologic unit (HUC12: 180701050208). Waterways in the region of the project

study area drain into Tujunga Wash and eventually the Los Angeles River. National Wetland Inventory (NWI) mapping based on 1984 aerial imagery shows no aquatic features on the project site and no aquatic features were noted in the project study area during the biological reconnaissance survey.. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have any effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means, and no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project would interfere with, or remove access to, a migratory wildlife corridor or impede use of native wildlife nursery sites. Per the Biological Resources Evaluation Report prepared by Helix Environmental Planning dated April 8, 2022, provided in Appendix B, there have been no reported occurrences of special-status wildlife species on or adjacent to the project site in the CNDDDB. The site is vegetated with ruderal vegetation and has been heavily disturbed. There is currently no suitable habitat for any special-status wildlife species in the project study area. Additionally, due to the disturbed nature of the project study area and the general lack in abundance of native plant species, there are no terrestrial or aquatic sensitive natural communities on the subject property. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not interfere with wildlife movement or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Furthermore, no water bodies that could serve as habitat for fish exist on the Project Site or in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site. The abovementioned Biological Report states that the project area and adjacent sites provide marginal habitat for nesting migratory birds and raptors. Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-1 will be implemented for the Proposed Project activities. Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures for nesting bird surveys would reduce the potential for project impacts to common migratory birds and raptors.

Per the Protected Tree Inventory Report prepared by Seven Elk Ranch Design Inc. dated April 7, 2022, provided in Appendix C, the Project site and immediate vicinity contains a total of 14 protected species: 8 coast live oak trees and 6 Mexican elderberry shrubs). It is anticipated that two (2) of the protected trees will require removal to construct the project as proposed.

Notwithstanding, although unlikely, the existing trees that would be removed during construction of the Proposed Project could potentially provide nesting sites for migratory birds. However, the Project would comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MM-BIO-1), which regulates vegetation removal during the nesting season to ensure that significant impacts to migratory birds would not occur. In accordance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, tree removal activities would take place outside of the nesting season (February 15-September 15), if and to the extent feasible. To the extent that vegetation removal activities must occur during the nesting season, a biological monitor would be present during the removal activities to ensure that no active nests would be impacted. If active nests are found, a 300-foot buffer (500 feet for raptors) would be established until the fledglings have left the nest. With compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Ordinance (Chapter IV, Article, 6 of the LAMC) regulates the relocation or removal of all Southern California native oak trees (excluding scrub oak), Southern California black walnut trees, western sycamore, California

bay trees, Mexican Elderberry shrubs, and Toyon shrubs. These tree species are defined as “protected” by the City of Los Angeles. Trees that have been planted as part of a tree planting program are exempt from this Ordinance and are not considered protected. Per the Protected Tree Inventory Report prepared by Seven Elk Ranch Design Inc. dated April 7, 2022, provided in Appendix C, the Project site and immediate vicinity contains a total of 14 protected species: 8 coast live oak trees and 6 Mexican elderberry shrubs). It is anticipated that two (2) of the protected trees will require removal to construct the project as proposed. Each protected tree to be removed is expected to be replaced within the property, on-site, by trees of a protected variety at a ratio determined by the City or at least four specimens of a protected variety included within the definition set forth in Section 17.02 of the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Ordinance, unless otherwise directed by the Urban Forestry Division.

Additionally, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the provisions of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the California Fish and Game Code (CFGF). Both the MBTA and CFGF protects migratory birds that may use trees on or adjacent to the Project Site for nesting, and may be disturbed during construction of the Proposed Project. The Project Site is currently developed and located in an urbanized area. No wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites are present on the Project Site or in the surrounding area. Further, due to the urbanized nature of the Project area, the potential for native resident or migratory wildlife species movement through the Project Site is negligible. Foothill Boulevard is a highly utilized street and I-210 is a freeway with high levels of ambient noise and human disturbance associated with vehicular traffic.

Nonetheless, since the Proposed Project will result in the removal of vegetation and disturbances to the ground, it may result in take of nesting native bird species. As the Project would include disturbances to the ground and the removal of existing trees on the Project Site, the removal of vegetation with nesting birds during the breeding season is considered a potentially significant impact. Accordingly, Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-1 as recommended by the California Department of Fish and Game would be implemented to reduce potential impacts to protected nesting birds consistent with the Federal MBTA. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated and this issue does not need to be further analyzed in an EIR.

Mitigation Measures

MM-BIO-1

- Proposed project activities (including disturbances to native and non-native vegetation, structures and substrates) should take place outside of the breeding bird season which generally runs from March 1- August 31 (as early as February 1 for raptors) to avoid take (including disturbances which would cause abandonment of active nests containing eggs and/or young). *Take* means to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture or kill (Fish and Game Code Section 86).
- If project activities cannot feasibly avoid the breeding bird season, beginning thirty days prior to the disturbance of suitable nesting habitat, the applicant shall:
 - a. Arrange for weekly bird surveys to detect any protected native birds in the habitat to be removed and any other such habitat within 300 feet of the construction work area (within 500 feet for raptors) as access to adjacent areas allows. The surveys shall be conducted by a Qualified Biologist with experience in conducting breeding bird surveys. The surveys shall continue on a weekly basis with the last survey being conducted no more than 3 days prior to the initiation of clearance/construction work.

- b. If a protected native bird is found, the applicant shall delay all clearance/construction disturbance activities within 300 feet of suitable nesting habitat for the observed protected bird species (within 500 feet for suitable raptor nesting habitat) until August 31.
- c. Alternatively, the Qualified Biologist could continue the surveys in order to locate any nests. If an active nest is located, clearing and construction within 300 feet of the nest (within 500 feet for raptor nests) or as determined by a qualified biological monitor, shall be postponed until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged and when there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. The buffer zone from the nest shall be established in the field with flagging and stakes. Construction personnel shall be instructed on the sensitivity of the area.
- d. The applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures described above to document compliance with applicable State and Federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds. Such record shall be submitted and received into the case file for the associated discretionary action permitting the project.

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

No Impact. The Project Site and its vicinity are not part of any draft or adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan, and no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project substantially altered the environmental context of, or removed, identified historical resources. The project includes demolition of existing structures and grading of the site. None of the structures on site have been identified as a historic resource by local or state agencies, and the Project Site has not been determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, or the Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments Register. In addition, the site was not found to be a potential historic resource according to the data available on the City's Historic Places LA website (the City's new online information and management system created to inventory Los Angeles' significant historic resources). Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. A significant impact would occur if a known or unknown archaeological resource was removed, altered, or destroyed as a result of the Proposed Project. Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA guidelines defines significant archaeological resources as resources that meet the criteria for historical resources, or resources that constitute unique archaeological resources. Per the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) report dated March 29, 2022, provided in Appendix D, the archaeological sensitivity of the project location is unknown because there are no previous studies for the subject property. Additionally, most of the natural ground-surface appears to be obscured by urban development; consequently, not all surface artifacts would not be visible during a survey. While there are currently no recorded archaeological sites within the project area, buried resources could potentially be unearthed during project activities. Therefore, customary caution and a halt-work condition will in place for all ground-disturbing activities. In the event that any evidence of cultural resources is discovered, all work within the vicinity of the find will stop until a qualified archaeological consultant can assess the find and make recommendations. Excavation of potential cultural resources will not be attempted by project personnel.

Thus, impacts will be less than significant with mitigation incorporated and no further analysis is needed..

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

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if previously interred human remains would be disturbed during excavation activities associated with project construction. No human remains are expected to be located on the Project Site; however, the applicant shall abide by current law if human remains are discovered during grading or construction. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

construction or operation?

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

☐☐☒☐

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would be designed and operated in accordance with the applicable State Building Code Title 24 regulations and 2020 City of Los Angeles Green Building Code, which impose energy conservation measures. The majority of the energy usage in the project consists of lighting and climate control. Adherence to the aforementioned energy requirements will ensure conformance with the State's goal of promoting energy and lighting efficiency. As such, impacts of the project would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project involves the demolition and removal of an existing single-family dwelling and accessory structures, and the construction of a new three-story self-storage building and surface parking lot. As stated above, the project's improvements and operations would be in accordance with applicable State Building Code Title 24 regulations and City of Los Angeles Green Building Code, which impose energy conservation measures. As such, impacts of the project would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| iv. Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Be located on a geologic unit that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project would cause personal injury or death or result in property damage as a result of a fault rupture occurring on the Project Site and if the Project Site is located within a State-designated Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone or other designated fault zone. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act is intended to mitigate the hazard of surface fault rupture on structures for human occupancy. Per the Geotechnical Investigation Report dated April 8, 2021 prepared by Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc. the site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (APEFZ) based on a review of the CGS Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation map. A copy of this report is provided in Appendix E. The Project Site is 9.75 miles south from the epicenter of the 1971 Sylmar Earthquake and is not on the San Fernando Fault. Earthquake hazard zones define areas subject to three distinct types of geologic ground failures: 1) fault rupture, where the surface of the earth breaks along a fault; 2) liquefaction, in which the soil temporarily turns to quicksand and cannot support structures; and 3) earthquake-induced landslides. The project site is located within the Verdugo Fault Zone. However, as stated in the abovementioned Geotechnical Report, the site is generally free from geologic or seismic hazards that would preclude the proposed development. Furthermore, the seismic design

requirements of the 2020 Los Angeles Building Code will be followed therefore the proposed development is considered feasible from a geotechnical perspective. Thus, impacts related to fault rupture would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project would cause personal injury or death or resulted in property damage as a result of seismic ground shaking. The entire Southern California region is susceptible to strong ground shaking from severe earthquakes. Consequently, the Proposed Project could expose people and structures to strong seismic ground shaking. The design of the Project would be in accordance with the provisions of the latest California Building Code and Los Angeles Building Code (implemented at the time of building permits) will mitigate the potential effects of strong ground shaking. The design and construction of the Project is required to comply with the most current codes regulating seismic risk, including the California Building Code and the LAMC., which incorporates the IBC. Compliance with current California Building Code and LAMC. requirements will minimize the potential to expose people or structures to substantial risk of loss, injury or death. In addition, a Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared by Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc., dated April 8, 2021, and attached to the environmental case file, concluded that the site can be developed as proposed, provided the recommendations of the report are followed and implemented during design and construction. See Appendix E for a copy the report. Therefore, impacts related to seismic ground shaking will be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No Impact. A significant impact may occur if a Proposed Project Site is located within a liquefaction zone. Liquefaction is the loss of soil strength or stiffness due to a buildup of pore- water pressure during severe ground shaking. Per the Geotechnical Investigation Report dated April 8, 2021 prepared by Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc. the site is not located in the California Department of Conservation's Seismic Hazard Zones Map, and the Project Site is not located within a liquefaction zone. A copy of this report can be found in Appendix E. Therefore, no impact related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would occur and no mitigation is required.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project would be implemented on a site that would be located in a hillside area with unstable geological conditions or soil types that would be susceptible to failure when saturated. According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, the Seismic Hazard Zones Map for this area shows the Project Site is not located within a landslide hazard zone. The Project Site and surrounding area are relatively flat. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not expose people or structures to potential effects resulting from landslides, and no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of Proposed Project would result in ground surface disturbance during site clearance, excavation, and grading, which could create the potential for soil erosion to occur. Proposed grading and excavation would result in approximately 11,100 cubic yards of soil being exported from the Project Site. Construction activities would be performed in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles Building Code and the Los

Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQBC) through the City's Stormwater Management Division. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. As such, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if any unstable geological conditions would result in any type of geological failure, including lateral spreading, off-site landslides, liquefaction, or collapse. The Proposed Project would not have the potential to expose people and structures to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslide. Subsidence and ground collapse generally occur in areas with active groundwater withdrawal or petroleum production. The extraction of groundwater or petroleum from sedimentary source rocks can cause the permanent collapse of the pore space previously occupied by the removed fluid. The Project Site is not identified as being located in an oil field or within an oil drilling area. The Proposed Project would be required to implement standard construction practices that would ensure that the integrity of the Project Site and the proposed structures are maintained. A Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared by Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc., dated April 8, 2021, and attached to the environmental case file, concluded that the site can be developed as proposed, provided the recommendations of the report are followed and implemented during design and construction. A copy of this report is provided in Appendix E. Subsequently, a Los Angeles Building & Safety Soils Report Approval Letter (Log #116979) dated May 10, 2021, concluded that project's Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared by Geocon West, Inc. is acceptable. The proposed self-storage building will be required by the Department of Building and Safety to comply with the City of Los Angeles Uniform Building Code (UBC) which is designed to assure safe construction and includes building foundation requirements appropriate to site conditions. With the implementation of the Building Code requirements, the potential for landslide lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project would be built on expansive soils without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for project buildings, thus, posing a hazard to life and property. Expansive soils have relatively high clay mineral and expand with the addition of water and shrink when dried, which can cause damage to overlying structures. Soils on the Project Site may have the potential to shrink and swell resulting from changes in the moisture content. The Project Site is not located in an area known to have expansive soils. Therefore, no impact will result, and no mitigation is required.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No Impact. A project would cause a significant impact if adequate wastewater disposal is not available. The Project Site is located in an urbanized area, where wastewater infrastructure is currently in place. The Proposed Project would connect to existing sewer lines that serve the Project Site and would not use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact could occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the Project were to disturb unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features that presently exist within the Project Site. The Project Site is located within an urbanized area that has been subject to grading and development in the past and is not known to contain any unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Potential paleontological or geologic impacts of the Project would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Greenhouse gases (GHGs) include any gas that absorbs infrared radiation in the atmosphere. GHG include, but are not limited to, water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), and fluorocarbons. The warming potential of different types of GHG varies. The global warming potential is the potential of a gas or aerosol to trap heat in the atmosphere. Since GHG absorb different amounts of heat, a common reference gas, CO₂, is used to relate the amount of heat absorbed by a GHG relative to CO₂, referred to as CO₂ equivalent, or CO₂e. The increase of GHG emissions has led to the trapping and buildup of heat in the atmosphere near the earth's surface, commonly known as the greenhouse effect.

The City has adopted the Green New Deal to provide a citywide plan for achieving the City's GHG emissions targets, for both existing and future generation of GHG emissions. In order to implement the goal of improving energy conservation and efficiency, the Los Angeles City Council has adopted multiple ordinances and updates to establish the current Los Angeles Green Building Code (LAGBC) (Ordinance No. 179,890). As the LAGBC includes applicable provisions of the State's CALGreen Code, a new project that can demonstrate it complies with the LAGBC is considered consistent with statewide GHG reduction goals and policies including AB32 (California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006). Through required implementation of the LAGBC, the Proposed Project would be consistent with local and statewide goals and policies aimed at reducing the generation of GHGs. Therefore, the Proposed Project's generation of GHG emissions would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to emissions. Impacts will be

less than significant, and no mitigation is required. For the detailed description of the Greenhouse Gas analysis and results, refer to Appendix A.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. In addition to implementing measures to align with the Green New Deal, discussed in the previous Section VIII.a, the Proposed Project is in alignment with transportation plans designed to reduce the emissions of GHGs.

The California legislature passed Senate Bill (SB) 375 to connect regional transportation planning to land use decisions made at a local level. SB 375 requires the metropolitan planning organizations to prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in their regional transportation plans to achieve the per capita GHG reduction targets. For the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region, the SCS is contained in the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS focuses the majority of new housing and job growth in high-quality transit areas and other opportunity areas on existing main streets, in downtowns, and commercial corridors, resulting in an improved jobs-housing balance and more opportunity for transit-oriented development. In addition, SB 743, adopted September 27, 2013, encourages land use and transportation planning decisions and investments that reduce vehicle miles traveled that contribute to GHG emissions, as required by AB 32. The Proposed Project consists of demolition of existing structures, construction, use, and maintenance of a new self-storage building on a site that is designated for limited industrial uses. It would not interfere with SCAG's ability to implement the regional strategies outlined in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. As such, impacts will be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. For the detailed description of the Greenhouse Gas analysis and results, refer to Appendix A.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The project involves the construction of a new mid-rise self-storage building intended for the storage of common household goods. The Project would involve the limited use and storage of common hazardous substances typical of those used in commercial and light industrial developments, including lubricants, paints, solvents, custodial products (e.g., cleaning supplies), pesticides and other landscaping supplies. No industrial uses or activities are proposed that would result in the use or discharge of unregulated hazardous materials and/or substances, or create a public hazard through transport, use, or disposal. With regard to airborne hazards, the project will comply with all applicable rules of the SCAQMD that regulate air contaminants. With compliance to applicable standards and regulations and adherence to manufacturer's instructions related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, the Proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project created a significant hazard to the public or environment due to a reasonably foreseeable release of hazardous materials. The removal of asbestos is regulated by SCAQMD Rule 1403; therefore, any asbestos found on-site would be required to be removed in accordance with applicable

regulations prior to demolition. Similarly, it is likely that lead-based paint is present in the existing on-site structures constructed prior to 1979. Compliance with existing State laws regarding removal would be required. As such, impacts related to asbestos and lead-based paint will be less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A project would normally have a significant impact to hazards and hazardous materials if: (a) the project involved a risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation); or (b) the project involved the creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (i.e., such as exposure to lead based paint, polychlorinated biphenyls, or asbestos). The site is approximately 0.25 miles northeast of the Fenton Primary Center located at 11351 Dronfield Avenue.

The Proposed Project would be expected to use and store very small amounts of hazardous materials, such as paints, solvents, cleaners, pesticides, etc. All hazardous materials within the Project Site would be acquired, handled, used, stored, transported, and disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, State, and local requirements. Given the Project's proposed scope of work and required compliance with existing State laws regarding removal (if needed), impacts related to hazardous emissions, materials, substances, or waste, will be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project Site is located within one mile of Whiteman Airport. However, the project site is located outside of the airport's noise sensitive areas, therefore, impacts resulting from airport noise levels to people in the project area are expected to be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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

No Impact. The nearest emergency route is Foothill Boulevard, which is approximately 50 feet to the west of the project site (City of Los Angeles, Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General

Plan, Critical Facilities and Lifeline Systems, Exhibit H, November 1996.) The Proposed Project would not require the closure of any public or private streets and would not impede emergency vehicle access to the Project Site or surrounding area. Additionally, emergency access to and from the Project Site would be provided in accordance with requirements of the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD). Therefore, the Proposed Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and no impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

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

No Impact. The Project Site is located within an urbanized area and does not include wildlands or high-fire-hazard terrain or vegetation. In addition, the Project Site is not identified by the City as being located within an area susceptible to fire hazards. The nearest area susceptible to wildfire hazards is approximately 0.5 miles northeast of the Project Site, separated by other urban land uses and the Foothill Freeway (I-210). Additionally, the proposed industrial building would not create a fire hazard that has the potential to exacerbate the current environmental condition relative to wildfires. Therefore, the project would not subject people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury, or death as a result of exposure to wildland fires. No impacts related to this issue would occur, and no mitigation is required.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;				
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;				

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

iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Based on the criteria established in the State's CEQA Guidelines and Appendix G, a project could have a significant impact on surface water quality if discharges associated with the project were to create pollution, contamination, or nuisance as defined in Section 13050 of the California Water Code (CWC) or that cause regulatory standards to be violated, as defined in the applicable National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permit or Water Quality Control Plan for the receiving water body. For the purpose of this specific issue, a significant impact may occur if the project would discharge water that does not meet the quality standards of local agencies that regulate surface water quality and water discharge into stormwater drainage systems.

The Project Site will add more than 500 square feet of impervious space, which will meet the City thresholds for Low Impact Development (LID) review. The Project is expected to comply with all applicable regulations with regard to surface water quality as governed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). These regulations include the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements to reduce potential water quality impacts and the City's LID Ordinance. The purpose of the LID standards is to reduce the peak discharge rate, volume, and duration of flow through the use of site design and stormwater quality control measures. The LID Ordinance requires that the project retain or treat the first three-quarters of an inch of rainfall in a 24-hour period. LID practices can effectively remove nutrients, bacteria, and metals while reducing the volume and intensity of stormwater flows.

As such, potential water quality impacts from the project would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Based on the criteria established in the State's CEQA Guidelines and Appendix G, a project could have a significant impact on groundwater level if the project were to change potable water levels sufficiently to (a) reduce the ability of a water utility to use the groundwater basin for public water supplies, conjunctive use purposes, storage of imported water, summer/winter peaking, or respond to emergencies and drought; (b) reduce yields of adjacent wells or well fields (public or private); (c) adversely change the rate or direction of flow of

groundwater; or (d) result in demonstrable and sustained reduction in groundwater recharge capacity. The project is not adjacent to a well field nor part of a groundwater recharge area. The Proposed Project would not require the use of groundwater at the Project Site. Potable water would be supplied by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), which draws its water supplies from distant sources for which it conducts its own assessment and mitigation of potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the project would not require direct additions or withdrawals of groundwater. Excavation to accommodate subterranean levels is not being proposed and the scope of the work thus would not result in the interception of existing aquifers or penetration of the existing water table. Additionally, any project that creates, adds, or replaces 500 square feet of impervious surface must comply with the Low impact Development (LID) Ordinance. The LID Ordinance requires that the project retain or treat the first three-quarters of an inch of rainfall in a 24-hour period. As such, through project design features and through regulatory compliance, impacts on groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project would substantially alter the drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, such that erosion or siltation would result. The Project Site does not contain, nor is adjacent to, any stream or river. Project construction would temporarily expose on-site soils to surface water runoff. However, compliance with construction-related BMPs and/or the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would control and minimize erosion and siltation. During project operation, storm water or any runoff irrigation waters would be directed into existing storm drains that are currently receiving surface water runoff under existing conditions. Significant alterations to existing drainage patterns within the Project Site and surrounding area would not occur. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in less than significant impact related to the alteration of drainage patterns and on- or off-site erosion or siltation and no mitigation is required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Site-generated surface water runoff would continue to flow to the City's storm drain system. Impermeable surfaces resulting from the development of the project would not significantly change the volume of stormwater runoff. The site is already partially developed with impermeable uses including commercial/light industrial uses. Accordingly, since the volume of runoff from the site would not measurably increase over existing conditions, water runoff after development would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned drainage systems. Any project that creates, adds, or replaces 500 square feet of impervious surface must comply with the Low impact Development (LID) Ordinance or alternatively, the City's Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), as an LAMC requirement to address water runoff and storm water pollution. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts related to flooding on- or off-site, and no mitigation is required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if runoff water would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm drain systems serving the Project Site, or if the Proposed Project would substantially increase the probability that polluted runoff would reach the storm drain system. Site-generated surface water runoff would continue to flow to the City's storm drain system. Pursuant to local practice and City regulations, stormwater retention would be required as part of City's Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) implementation features and the requirements of the Low Impact Development (LID) ordinance requirements. The primary purpose of the LID ordinance is to ensure that development and redevelopment projects mitigate runoff in a manner that captures rainwater and removes pollutants while reducing the volume and intensity of stormwater flows. Accordingly, with compliance to the LID ordinance, the project would not create or contribute to surface runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts related to existing storm drain capacities or water quality and no mitigation is required.

iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

No Impact. The Project Site is located in an urbanized area that is currently served by storm drain infrastructure. The site is currently developed with an existing single-family dwelling, accessory structures, and a storage yard and contains both permeable and impermeable surfaces. The Project involves the construction of a new three-story self-storage building and surface parking lot. The Project would not change the local drainage pattern; therefore, the project would not have the potential to impede or redirect floodwater flows. No impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

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

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Project Site were sufficiently close to the ocean or other water body to potentially be at risk of seismically induced tidal phenomena (e.g., seiche and tsunami), or was within a flood zone, and if the Project Site utilized, stored or otherwise contained pollutants that would be at risk of release if inundated. The Project Site is not located within a Tsunami Inundation Zone or Flood Zone. Furthermore, the proposed use does not involve the storage or use of substantial quantities of potential pollutants. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact could occur if the project includes potential sources of water pollutants that would have the potential to interfere with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. The project involves the construction, use, and maintenance of a new self-storage building for the storage of household goods. The project would comply with the City's Low Impact Development (LID) ordinance, the primary purpose of which is to ensure that development and redevelopment projects mitigate runoff in a manner that captures rainwater and removes pollutants while reducing the volume and intensity of storm water flows. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project would be sufficiently large or configured in such a way so as to create a physical barrier within an established community. A physical division of an established community is caused by an impediment to through travel or a physical barrier, such as a new freeway with limited access between neighborhoods on either side of the freeway, or major street closures. The Proposed Project would not involve any street vacation or closure or result in development of new thoroughfares or highways. The Proposed Project, which involves construction, use, and maintenance of a new self-storage building is in an urbanized area of Los Angeles, would not divide an established community. Therefore, no impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project is inconsistent with a General Plan policy or zoning regulation was designed expressly to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect at the Project Site. The site is located in the Sunland - Tujunga - Lakeview Terrace - Shadow Hills – East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan Area. The Community Plan designates the Project Site for Limited Manufacturing land uses and is zoned [T][Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU. The project site is not located within the boundaries of or subject to any specific plan, community design overlay, or interim control ordinance. The Proposed Project involves the construction, use, and maintenance of a new three-story self-storage building. In order to facilitate the development of the Proposed Project, the applicant is requesting a Vesting Zone Change from [T][Q]MR1-1VL-CUGU to (T)(Q)M1-1VL-CUGU, which is consistent with the General Plan's Limited Manufacturing land use designation for the subject site. The decision maker will determine whether the discretionary requests, including the Vesting Zone Change, Zone Variance, Conditional Use Permit, and Site Plan Review, will conflict with applicable plans/policies. Impacts related to land use have been mitigated elsewhere or are addressed through compliance with existing regulations. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally- important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project would result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources of regional value or locally-important mineral recovery site. The Project Site is not classified by the City as containing significant mineral deposits. The Project Site is currently designated for Limited Manufacturing land uses and not as a mineral extraction land use. In addition, the Project Site is not identified by the City as being located in an oil field or within an oil drilling area. In addition, the project site is not identified by the City as being located in an oil field or within an oil drilling area. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of any known, regionally- or locally valuable mineral resource, and no impact would occur.

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

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project would result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources of regional value or locally important mineral resource recovery site. The Project Site is not classified by the City as containing significant mineral deposits. The Project Site is currently designated for Restricted Industrial land uses and not as a mineral extraction land use. In addition, the Project Site is not identified by the City as being located in an oil field or within an oil drilling area. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of any known, regionally- or locally- valuable mineral resource, and no impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

XIII. NOISE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. A noise impact is considered potentially significant if project construction activities extended beyond ordinance time limits for construction or construction-related noise levels exceed the ordinance noise level standards unless technically infeasible to do so, subject to confirmation under the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Noise Regulation. The Proposed Project involves the demolition and removal of an existing single-family dwelling, accessory structures, and storage yard, and the construction of a new three-story self-storage building.

Construction noise levels will vary at any given receptor and are dependent on the construction phase, equipment type, duration of use, distance between the noise source and receptor, and the presence or absence of barriers between the noise source and receptor. The project does not propose to deviate from any requirements of the Noise Element of the General Plan, Section 111 of the LAMC, or any other applicable noise standard. The project is required to comply with the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance No. 144,331 and 161,574, and any subsequent ordinances, which prohibit the emission or creation of noise beyond certain levels at adjacent uses unless technically infeasible. The City of Los Angeles limits construction activities to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. on weekdays and 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on any Saturday. Construction is not permitted on any national holiday or on any Sunday.

A Noise Study dated July 16, 2021 was prepared by Yorke Engineering, LLC to analyze construction and operational noise from the Proposed Project (See Appendix A). Although the estimated construction-related exterior noise levels associated with the Proposed Project would normally be below the 75 dBA threshold, there may be times when the construction activities could intermittently and marginally exceed the 75 dBA threshold at 50 feet from the noise source. To minimize impacts, the Project will implement technically feasible BMPs in compliance with the standards set forth in LAMC Section 112.05. Specifically, the use of deflectors/barriers such as plywood construction fencing, flexible sound-absorbing curtains, or existing intervening buildings, can reduce line-of-sight exterior noise levels by approximately 5 to 15 dBA, depending on the applied physical configuration. With the application of construction noise BMPs, exterior noise

levels would be reduced by approximately 10 dBA, possibly up to 15 dBA. Therefore, based on the provisions set forth in LAMC 112.05, implementation of the LAMC-required noise control measures, impacts would be less than significant.

The construction noise control BMPs required by LAMC Section 112.05 would include the following:

1. The Project shall comply with the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance No. 161,574 (see LAMC Section 112.05) and any subsequent ordinances (et seq) which prohibit the emission or creation of noise beyond certain levels.
2. Construction shall be restricted to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays or national holidays. No construction work shall be performed at any time on Sundays.
3. Construction activities shall be scheduled to avoid operating several pieces of large equipment simultaneously, which can cumulatively cause higher noise levels.
4. Noise-generating equipment operated at the Project site shall be equipped with the most effective and technologically feasible noise control devices, such as mufflers, lagging (enclosures for exhaust pipes), and/or motor enclosures. All equipment shall be properly maintained to assure that no additional noise due to worn or improperly maintained parts would be generated.
5. Where its location on the site may be flexible (e.g., air compressors, generators, cement and mortar mixers, and materials deliveries), noise-generating equipment shall be placed as far as practical from the nearest noise-sensitive land uses. Natural and/or man-made barriers (e.g., trees, fencing, curtains) shall be used to screen propagation of noise from such activities toward these land uses to the maximum extent possible.
6. The Project shall implement noise barriers comprising plywood construction fencing and/or flexible sound-absorbing curtains. The noise barriers shall be erected between the receptor and the construction site to minimize the transmission of construction noise toward nearby noise-sensitive land uses. The noise barriers shall be at least 8 feet in height and constructed of materials achieving an Insertion Loss (IL) coefficient of at least 5 dBA for flexible curtains, 8 dBA for rigid plywood fencing, or 10 dBA in combination (FHWA 2006).
7. The Project shall comply with the City of Los Angeles Building Regulations Ordinance No. 178,048 (see LAMC Section 91.106.4.8), which requires a construction site notice to be provided that includes the following information: job site address, permit number, name and phone number of the contractor and owner or owner's agent, hours of construction allowed by code or any discretionary approval for the site, and City telephone numbers where violations can be reported. The notice shall be posted and maintained at the construction site prior to the start of construction and displayed in a location that is readily visible to the public, i.e., in plain sight.

Upon completion of construction and occupancy of the proposed Project, on-site operational noise would be generated mainly by heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment installed on the roof of the new building. However, the overall noise levels generated by the new HVAC equipment are not expected to be substantially greater than generated by older HVAC equipment installed on existing buildings near the Project site. As such, the new HVAC equipment associated with the proposed Project would not represent a substantially new type or source of noise in the general vicinity. In addition, the operation of this and any other on-site stationary sources of mechanical noise would be required to comply with the LAMC Section 112.02, which

prohibits noise from air conditioning, refrigeration, heating, pumping, and filtering equipment from exceeding the ambient noise level on the premises of other occupied properties, e.g., nearby residential buildings, by more than 5 dBA. Such equipment is designed to meet this standard. No adverse impacts are expected from, and no noise reduction measures would be required for, the operation of the proposed project. Therefore, the operational noise impacts of the proposed Project would be less than significant. For the detailed description of the Noise analysis and results, refer to Appendix A.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The City of Los Angeles does not address vibration in the LAMC or in the Noise Element of the General Plan. According to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), ground vibrations from construction activities very rarely reach the level capable of damaging structures. The construction activities that typically generate the most severe vibrations are blasting and impact pile driving. The project would be constructed using standard construction techniques and no blasting or impact pile driving is anticipated. Heavy construction equipment (e.g., bulldozers, scrapers, excavators, compactors, and motor graders) would generate a limited amount of ground-borne vibration during construction activities at a short distance away from the source. Post-construction on-site activities would be limited to typical self-storage uses that would not generate excessive ground-borne noise or vibration. As such, ground-borne vibration and noise levels associated with the project would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required. For the detailed description of the Noise analysis and results, refer to Appendix A.

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

No Impact. Although the Project Site is located within a mile of an airport (Whiteman Airport), the Project Site is located outside of the airport's noise sensitive areas. Per Exhibit F of the Noise Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan, the Project Site is located outside of 65 CNEL contour of the airport and is in compliance with the City of Los Angeles noise ordinance and consistent with the "Land Use Compatibility Table" of the comprehensive airport land use plans (CLUPs). Therefore, no impact will occur. For the detailed description of the Noise analysis and results, refer to Appendix A.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

elsewhere?

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

Less than Significant Impact. A potentially significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project would induce substantial population growth that would not have otherwise occurred as rapidly or in as great a magnitude. The Project would involve the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling and accessory structures, and the construction of a new three-story, 130,094 square-foot self-storage building. The proposed self-storage building would not substantially induce population growth in the project area, either directly or indirectly. The physical secondary or indirect impacts of population growth such as increased traffic or noise have been adequately studied in other portions of this document. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project would result in the displacement of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The Project Site is developed with a single-family dwelling that is currently vacant. The Project involves the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling and accessory structures, and the construction of a new three-story self-storage building on a site that is designated by the Sunland - Tujunga - Lakeview Terrace - Shadow Hills – East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan for Light Manufacturing land uses. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

a) Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) could not adequately serve the Proposed Project, necessitating a new or physically altered station. The Project Site and the surrounding area are currently served by LAFD Fire Station 98, located at 13035 Van Nuys Boulevard, located approximately 1.2 miles west of the Project Site. The Project involves the construction of a new three-story, 130,094 square-foot self-storage building, which could increase the number of emergency calls and demand for LAFD fire and emergency services. To maintain the level of fire protection and emergency services, the LAFD may require additional fire personnel and equipment. However, it is not anticipated that there would be a need to build a new or expand an existing fire station to serve the Proposed Project and maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection. By analyzing data from previous years and continuously monitoring current data regarding response times, types of incidents, and call frequencies, LAFD can shift resources to meet local demands for fire protection and emergency services. The Proposed Project would neither create capacity or service level problems nor result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed self-storage building has the potential to increase the demand for police services in the area. However, the Project Site and the surrounding area are currently served by the LAPD Foothill Community Police Station at 12760 West Osborne Street, is approximately 1.9 miles southwest of the Project Site. Given that there is a police station in close proximity to the Project Site, it is not anticipated that there would be a need to build a new or expand an existing police station to serve the Proposed Project and maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection. As such, impacts will be less than significant.

c) Schools?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would include substantial employment or population growth, which could generate a demand for school facilities that would exceed the capacity of the school district. The Project involves the construction of a new three-story, 130,094 square-foot self-storage building. Although the project does not include a residential component, the addition of a new self-storage building could potentially draw in new residents to the area as a result of new employment opportunities, which could increase enrollment at schools that service the area. However, development of the proposed project would be subject to California Government Code Section 65995, which would allow LAUSD to collect impact fees from developers of new commercial development. Conformance to California Government Code Section 65995 is deemed to provide full and complete mitigation of impacts to school facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact to public schools.

d) Parks?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would exceed the capacity or capability of the local park system to serve the proposed project. The City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) is responsible for the provision, maintenance, and operation of public recreational and park facilities and services in the City. The proposed project

involves the construction of a new three-story self-storage building, which is unlikely to result in increased demand for parks and recreation facilities. Furthermore, non-residential development is exempt from park fees per LAMC Section 12.33. Therefore, the project would not create capacity or service level problems or result in substantial physical impacts associated with the provision of new or altered parks facilities. Therefore, no impact will occur.

e) Other public facilities?

No Impact. The Project would remove and replace an existing single-family dwelling, accessory structures, and storage yard with a new three-story self-storage building for the storage of household goods. The Project would introduce a non-residential use to a site that is underutilized and designated for Light Manufacturing land uses. The proposed self-storage use at the site would not require a significant number of employees as compared to other commercial and light industrial uses. The project will not substantially increase in regional employment or population growth. Therefore, the Project would not result in increased demand for public facilities, such as library services and resources of the Los Angeles Public Library (LAPL) System. As such, no impacts would occur.

XVI. RECREATION

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project would include substantial employment or population growth which could generate an increased demand for public park facilities that exceeds the capacities of existing parks and causes premature deterioration of the park facilities. The project will not result in the addition of any new residential units that would potentially lead to increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. The proposed self-storage use at the site would not require a significant number of employees as compared to other commercial and light industrial uses. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

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

No Impact. The Proposed Project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond the limits of the project site. The project involves the construction of a new three-story self-storage building. The project would not result in the addition of any residential units would otherwise potentially include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. As such, no impact will occur.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact to the Circulation System may occur if the Proposed Project causes a net increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) that surpasses Los Angeles Department of Transportation's (DOT) established traffic impact criteria². A technical memorandum of trip generation associated with the Proposed Project dated July 21, 2021 was prepared by Chen Ryan Associates. A copy of this report can be found in Appendix F. The technical memo concluded that the Proposed Project would increase the number of daily trips for the site by 241 trips per day. The net increase of 241 daily vehicle trips does not exceed the Department of Transportation's (LADOT) threshold of 250 daily vehicle trips that requires further

² Per the DOT Traffic Study Assessment form, VMT analysis is required if the project would generate a net increase of 250 or more daily vehicle trips.

VMT analysis. The Transportation Study Assessment Form signed by DOT Staff on January 19, 2022, determined that no VMT analysis is required (Appendix F). As such, the Project is not expected to contribute significantly to any traffic congestion. The Project will provide the required right-of-way dedications and street improvements pursuant to the Mobility Plan 2035. The Project provides the minimum bicycle parking as required per LAMC, and would not impede construction of future bicycle facilities within the public right of ways adjacent to the Project. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the vehicular circulation system. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)? (Would vehicle miles traveled exceed an applicable threshold of significance?)

Less than Significant Impact. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b), a significant impact to the transportation system may occur if the project causes an increase Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) that surpasses Los Angeles Department of Transportation's (DOT) established traffic impact criteria.³ A technical memorandum of trip generation associated with the Proposed Project dated July 21, 2021 was prepared by Chen Ryan Associates. A copy of this report is provided in Appendix F. The technical memo concluded that the Proposed Project would increase the number of daily trips for the site by 241 trips per day. The technical memo concluded that the Proposed Project would increase the number of daily trips for the site by 241 trips per day. The net increase of 241 daily vehicle trips does not exceed the Department of Transportation's (LADOT) threshold of 250 daily vehicle trips that requires further VMT analysis. Therefore, the project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

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

No Impact. A significant impact could occur if a project were to include new roadway design or introduces a new land use or features into an area with specific transportation requirements and characteristics that have not been previously experienced in that area, or if access or other features were designed in such a way as to create hazard conditions. The Project Site currently consists of a single-family dwelling, accessory structures, and storage yard. The Project involves the removal and replacement of all existing on-site structures with a new three-story self-storage building. The Project would establish one (1) new curb cut on Foothill Boulevard for egress/ingress into the parking area and building access and would not include unusual design features. Adherence to all emergency response plan requirements set forth by the City and LAFD would be required through the duration of the project's construction and operation phases. There would be no impacts regarding hazards due to a design feature.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would result in inadequate emergency access. The project does not propose any changes to emergency access, and will require approval of plans by the Fire Department. Further, the project must comply with all applicable City fire safety regulations. Therefore, no impact will occur.

³ Per the DOT Traffic Study Assessment form, VMT analysis is required if the project would generate a net increase of 250 or more daily vehicle trips.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. A significant impact would occur if the project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, which is Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k). Per the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) report dated March 29, 2022, provided in Appendix D, the archaeological sensitivity of the project location is unknown because there are no previous studies for the subject property. Additionally, most of the natural ground-surface appears to be obscured by urban development; consequently, not all surface artifacts would not be visible during a survey. While there are currently no recorded archaeological sites within the project area, buried resources could potentially be unearthed during project activities. Therefore, customary caution and a halt-work condition will in place

for all ground-disturbing activities. In the event that any evidence of cultural resources is discovered, all work within the vicinity of the find will stop until a qualified archaeological consultant can assess the find and make recommendations. Excavation of potential cultural resources will not be attempted by project personnel.

On January 25, 2022, Jairo Avila, Tribal Historic and Cultural Preservation Officer of the Cultural Resources Management (CRM) Division of the Tribal Historic and Cultural Preservation Department, was requested to engage in tribal consultation. The consultation was scheduled for February 17, 2022. On March 25, 2022 the CRM Division requested that prior to the initiation of ground-disturbing activities, the Project to retain a professional Native American monitor procured by the Fernandeano Tataviam Band of Mission Indians. If cultural resources are encountered, the Native American monitor will have the authority to request ground disturbing activities cease within 60-feet of discovery to assess and document potential finds in real time (Mitigation Measure Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR)-1 MM-TCR-1 and MM-TCR-2).

Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated and this issue does not need to be further analyzed in an EIR.

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

Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. Approved by Governor Brown on September 25, 2014, Assembly Bill 52 (AB52) establishes a formal consultation process for California Native American Tribes to identify potential significant impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs), as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074, as part of CEQA. Effective July 1, 2015, AB 52 applies to projects that file a Notice of Preparation of an ND, MND or EIR on or after July 1, 2015. PRC Section 21084.2 now establishes that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. To help determine whether a project may have such an effect, PRC Section 21080.3.1 requires a lead agency to consult with any California Native American tribe that requests consultation and is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a Proposed Project. That consultation must take place prior to the release of a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report for a project. As a result of AB 52, the following must take place: 1) prescribed notification and response timelines; 2) consultation on alternatives, resource identification, significance determinations, impact evaluation, and mitigation measures; and 3) documentation of all consultation efforts to support CEQA findings for the administrative record.

Under AB 52, if a lead agency determines that a project may cause a substantial adverse change to a TCR, the lead agency must consider measures to mitigate that impact. PRC Section 21074 provides a definition of a TCR. In brief, in order to be considered a TCR, a resource must be either: 1) listed, or determined to be eligible for listing, on the national, State, or local register of historic resources, or 2) a resource that the lead agency chooses, in its discretion supported by substantial evidence, to treat as a TCR. In the latter instance, the lead

agency must determine that the resource meets the criteria for listing in the State register of historic resources or City Designated Cultural Resource. In applying those criteria, a lead agency shall consider the value of the resource to the tribe.

As specified in AB 52, lead agencies must provide notice to tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a Proposed Project if the tribe has submitted a written request to be notified. The tribe must respond to the lead agency within 30 days of receipt of the notification if it wishes to engage in consultation on the project, and the lead agency must begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving the request for consultation. An informational letter was mailed to a total of 10 Tribes known to have resources in this area, on December 21, 2021, describing the Project and requesting any information regarding resources that may exist on or near the Project site.

On January 7, 2022, staff received an email from Jairo Avila, on behalf of the Cultural Resources Management (CRM) Division of the Fernandefio Tatviam Band of Mission Indians (FTBMI), who indicated that prior to providing comments, the CRM Division is interested in knowing more about the extent of the proposed groundwork, impacts on native/undisturbed soil and cultural investigations. Staff provided Mr. Avila with the Geotechnical Investigation Report, LADBS Soils Report Approval Letter, and grading plan for the Proposed Project.. The consultation was scheduled for February 17, 2022. On March 25, 2022 the CRM Division requested that prior to the initiation of ground-disturbing activities, the Project to retain a professional Native American monitor procured by the Fernandefio Tataviam Band of Mission Indians. If cultural resources are encountered, the Native American monitor will have the authority to request ground disturbing activities cease within 60-feet of discovery to assess and document potential finds in real time (Mitigation Measure Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR)-1 MM-TCR-1 and MM-TCR-2).

Thus, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated and this issue does not need to be further analyzed in an EIR.

Mitigation Measures

MM-TCR-1

- Prior to commencing any ground disturbance activities at the Project Site, the Applicant, or its successor, shall retain archeological monitors and tribal monitors that are qualified to identify subsurface tribal cultural resources. Ground disturbance activities shall include excavating, digging, trenching, plowing, drilling, tunneling, quarrying, grading, leveling, removing peat, clearing, driving posts, augering, backfilling, blasting, stripping topsoil or a similar activity at the project site. Any qualified tribal monitor(s) shall be approved by the Fernandefio Tataviam Band of Mission Indians. Any qualified archaeological monitor(s) shall be approved by the Department of City Planning, Office of Historic Resources ("OHR").

MM-TCR-2

- The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with the Fernandefio Tataviam Band of Mission Indians on the disposition and treatment of any Tribal Cultural Resource encountered during all ground disturbing activities.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Prior to any construction activities, the applicant would be required to coordinate with the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation (BOS) to determine the exact wastewater conveyance requirements of the Proposed Project, and any upgrades to the

wastewater lines in the vicinity of the Project Site that are needed to adequately serve the Proposed Project would be undertaken as part of the project. Therefore, impacts related to wastewater treatment would be less than significant.

The Project will be served by the City's sewer system and is not expected to exceed wastewater treatment requirements in the area. Impacts will be less than significant.

The Project Site is located in a developed, urbanized portion of Los Angeles that is served by existing electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications services. The Project would remove and replace an existing single-family dwelling, accessory structures, and storage yard with a new three-story self-storage building and surface parking lot. Substantial relocation of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) powerlines may be required in order to accommodate the required street dedication and improvements. The Applicant will be required to coordinate with LADWP staff to ensure compliance with LADWP requirements.

Furthermore, the Applicant shall be required to implement applicable building code and LA Green Building Code requirements that would further reduce demand for water, wastewater and energy services. Based on the above, potential impacts of the Project would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project would increase water consumption to such a degree that the capacity of facilities currently serving the Project Site would be exceeded. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) conducts water planning based on forecast population growth. Accordingly, the increase in employees at the site resulting from the Proposed Project would not be considered substantial in consideration of anticipated growth. The Proposed Project would be consistent with Citywide growth, and, therefore, the project demand for water is not anticipated to require new water supply entitlements and/or require the expansion of existing or construction of new water treatment facilities beyond those already considered in the LADWP 2010 Urban Water Management Plan. Thus, it is anticipated that the Proposed Project would not create any water system capacity issues, and there would be sufficient reliable water supplies available to meet project demands. Prior to any construction activities, the project applicant would be required to coordinate with the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation (BOS) to determine the exact wastewater conveyance requirements of the Proposed Project, and any upgrades to the wastewater lines in the vicinity of the Project Site that are needed to adequately serve the Proposed Project would be undertaken as part of the project. Therefore, the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact related to water or wastewater infrastructure and no mitigation is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project will be served by the City's sewer system and is not expected to exceed wastewater treatment requirements in the area. Impacts will be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed three-story self-storage storage building will be required to comply with current regulations required by the Department of Building and Safety (L.A.M.C. Section 99.04.408.1) and the Bureau of Sanitation (L.A.M.C. Section 66.32), which requires the recycling and proper disposal of solid waste. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact could occur if a project would generate solid waste that was not disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations. These regulations include:

- California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Assembly Bill [AB] 939). AB 939 requires cities and counties to reduce the amount of solid waste entering existing landfills through recycling, reuse, and waste prevention efforts. These efforts have included permitting procedures for waste haulers and handlers.
- California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991 (AB 1327), which requires local jurisdictions to adopt an ordinance requiring commercial buildings to provide an adequate storage area for the collection and removal of recyclable materials. The City of Los Angeles passed such an ordinance in 1997.
- AB 341 of 2012 requires businesses to arrange for recycling services.
- Los Angeles Green Code incorporates the CALGreen Code and is applicable to the construction of new buildings by addressing construction waste reduction, disposal, and recycling.
- Los Angeles Citywide Construction and Demolition Waste Recycling Ordinance requires haulers and contractors responsible for handling C&D waste to obtain a Private Solid Waste Hauler Permit from the Bureau of Sanitation prior to collecting, hauling, and transporting C&D waste, and C&D waste can only be taken to City-certified C&D processing facilities.

The proposed industrial project must comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations relating to solid waste. Impacts will therefore be less than significant.

XX. WILDFIRE

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

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

- c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

No Impact. The Project is not located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard zones. The Project Site is located within an urbanized area of the City, does not include wildlands or high-fire-hazard terrain. As such, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.

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

No Impact. The Project is not located in State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard zones, although a very high fire hazard zone is about 0.5 mile northeast of the Project Site, the Site is separated by other urban land uses and the Foothill Freeway (I-210). In addition, the Project Site is located within an urbanized area of the City and does not include wildlands or high-fire-hazard terrain. As such, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.

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

No Impact. The Project is not located in State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard zones, although a very high fire hazard zone is about 0.5 mile northeast of the project site, separated by other urban land uses and the Foothill Freeway (I-210). The Project Site is located within an urbanized area of the City and does not include wildlands or high-fire-hazard terrain. In addition, the Project Site is not identified by the City as being located within an area susceptible to fire hazards. As such, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.

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

No Impact. The Project is not located in State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard zones. The Project Site is located within an urbanized area of the City and does not

include wildlands or high-fire-hazard terrain. In addition, as previously discussed, the Project Site is not susceptible to potential flooding or landslide, nor would the Project result in potential drainage changes. As such, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. As indicated above, the Project site and immediate vicinity contains a total of 14 protected species (8 coast live oak trees and 6 Mexican elderberry shrubs) (see Appendix C for the Protected Tree Inventory Report prepared by Seven Elk Ranch Design Inc. dated April 7, 2022). It is anticipated that two (2) of the protected trees will require removal to construct the project as proposed. Each protected tree to be removed

will be replaced within the property by trees of a protected variety at a ratio determined by the City or at least four (4) specimens of a protected variety included within the definition set forth in Section 17.02 of the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Ordinance.

The Project Site is currently developed and located in an urbanized area. No wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites are present on the Project Site or in the surrounding area. Further, due to the urbanized nature of the Project area, the potential for native resident or migratory wildlife species movement through the Project Site is negligible. Foothill Boulevard is a highly utilized street and I-210 is a freeway with high levels of ambient noise and human disturbance associated with pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

Nonetheless, since the Proposed Project will result in the removal of vegetation and disturbances to the ground, it may result in take of nesting native bird species. As the Project would include disturbances to the ground and the removal of existing trees on the Project Site, the removal of vegetation with nesting birds during the breeding season is considered a potentially significant impact. Accordingly, Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-1 as recommended by the California Department of Fish and Game would be implemented to reduce potential impacts to protected nesting birds consistent with the Federal MBTA.

Per the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) report dated March 29, 2022, provided in Appendix D, the archaeological sensitivity of the project location is unknown because there are no previous studies for the subject property. Additionally, most of the natural ground-surface appears to be obscured by urban development; consequently, not all surface artifacts would not be visible during a survey. While there are currently no recorded archaeological sites within the project area, buried resources could potentially be unearthed during project activities. Therefore, customary caution and a halt-work condition will in place for all ground-disturbing activities. In the event that any evidence of cultural resources is discovered, all work within the vicinity of the find will stop until a qualified archaeological consultant can assess the find and make recommendations. Excavation of potential cultural resources will not be attempted by project personnel. Additionally, per the CRM Division's request on March 25, 2022, MM-TCR-1 and MM-TCR-2 will be implemented.

- The key elements of the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the proposed project include those presented below: The description of the mitigation measure;
- The phases of the project at which each mitigation measure must be implemented;
- The party who is responsible for the necessary implementing actions;
- The necessary implementing vehicle;
- The party who is responsible for verifying that the necessary implementing action is taken; and
- The primary record documenting the necessary implementing action.

Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program - 12121 Foothill Boulevard, LLC

Mitigation Measure	MM-BIO-1	MM- TCR-1	MM-TCR-2
Summary Description	Protection of breeding and protected birds	Monitoring of soil-disturbing activities	Consultation with the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians on the disposition and treatment of any Tribal Cultural Resource encountered during all ground disturbing activities
Implementation Phases	Site preparation, grading, excavating, trenching	Site preparation, grading, excavating, trenching	Site preparation, grading, excavating, trenching
Responsible Party	Project Engineer	Project Engineer	Project Engineer
Implementation Vehicle	Qualified Biologist	Professional Native American Monitor	Professional Native American Monitor
Verification Responsibility	Project Manager	Project Manager	Project Manager
Record of Implementation	Field notebooks, photos, reports for project files, subject to inspection/review	Field notebooks, photos, reports for project files, subject to inspection/review	Field notebooks, photos, reports for project files, subject to inspection/review

MM-BIO-1 Full Description

Proposed project activities (including disturbances to native and non-native vegetation, structures and substrates) should take place outside of the breeding bird season which generally runs from March 1- August 31 (as early as February 1 for raptors) to avoid take (including disturbances which would cause abandonment of active nests containing eggs and/or young). Take means to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture or kill (Fish and Game Code Section 86).

If project activities cannot feasibly avoid the breeding bird season, beginning thirty days prior to the disturbance of suitable nesting habitat, the applicant shall:

- a. Arrange for weekly bird surveys to detect any protected native birds in the habitat to be removed and any other such habitat within 300 feet of the construction work area (within 500 feet for raptors) as access to adjacent areas allows. The surveys shall be conducted by a Qualified Biologist with experience in conducting breeding bird surveys. The surveys shall continue on a weekly basis with the last survey being conducted no more than 3 days prior to the initiation of clearance/construction work.
- b. If a protected native bird is found, the applicant shall delay all clearance/construction disturbance activities within 300 feet of suitable nesting habitat for the observed protected bird species (within 500 feet for suitable raptor nesting habitat) until August 31.
- c. Alternatively, the Qualified Biologist could continue the surveys in order to locate any nests. If an active nest is located, clearing and construction within 300 feet of the nest (within 500 feet for raptor nests) or as determined by a qualified biological monitor, shall be postponed until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged and when there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. The buffer zone from the nest shall be established in the field with flagging and stakes. Construction personnel shall be instructed on the sensitivity of the area.
- d. The applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures described above to document compliance with applicable State and Federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds. Such record shall be submitted and received into the case file for the associated discretionary action permitting the project.

MM-TCR-1 Full Description

Prior to commencing any ground disturbance activities at the Project Site, the Applicant, or its successor, shall retain archeological monitors and tribal monitors that are qualified to identify subsurface tribal cultural resources. Ground disturbance activities shall include excavating, digging, trenching, plowing, drilling, tunneling, quarrying, grading, leveling, removing peat, clearing, driving posts, augering, backfilling, blasting, stripping topsoil or a similar activity at the project site. Any qualified tribal monitor(s) shall be approved by the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians. Any qualified archaeological monitor(s) shall be approved by the Department of City Planning, Office of Historic Resources ("OHR").

MM-TCR-2 Full Description

The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians on the disposition and treatment of any Tribal Cultural Resource encountered during all ground disturbing activities.

Thus, with the MMRP implemented, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated and these issues do not need to be further analyzed in an EIR.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?**

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project, in conjunction with related projects, would result in impacts that are less than significant when viewed separately but significant when viewed together. Although projects may be constructed in the project vicinity, the cumulative impacts to which the Proposed Project would contribute would be less than significant. None of these potential impacts are considered cumulatively considerable. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project has the potential to result in significant impacts, as discussed in the preceding sections. No significant impacts were identified. The Proposed Project would not have the potential to result in substantial adverse impacts on human beings either directly or indirectly. No mitigation is required.