



## Lorne Project

Case Number: ENV-2019-3203-MND

---

**Project Location:** 11146 – 11148 Lorne Street, Los Angeles, California, 91352

**Community Plan Area:** Sun Valley La Tuna Canyon

**Council District:** 6 – Martinez

**Project Description:** The project includes a Zone Change from R1-1-CUGU to (T)(Q)RD1.5-1-CUGU. The project involves the demolition of 3 existing single-family dwellings units for the construction use and maintenance of a 17-unit apartment with attached garages on an approximate 26,296.6 square foot lot.

**PREPARED BY:**

The City of Los Angeles  
Department of City Planning

**APPLICANT:**

Sogomon Petrosyan

March 2025



# INITIAL STUDY

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3. Project Description .....</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1. Project Summary .....	12
3.2. Environmental Setting.....	12
3.3. Description of Project.....	13
3.4. Requested Permits and Approvals .....	13
<b>4. Environmental Checklist .....</b>	<b>15</b>
I. Aesthetics .....	15
II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources .....	18
III. Air Quality .....	19
IV. Biological Resources .....	24
V. Cultural Resources .....	27
VI. Energy .....	31
VII. Geology and Soils.....	32
VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions .....	37
IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	39
X. Hydrology and Water Quality .....	43
XI. Land Use and Planning.....	47
XII. Mineral Resources .....	48
XIII. Noise.....	49
XIV. Population and Housing.....	52
XV. Public Services .....	53
XVI. Recreation .....	56
XVII. Transportation/Traffic.....	58
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources .....	60
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems.....	64
XX. Wildfire .....	67
XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	70
<b>5. Preparers and Persons Consulted .....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>6. References, Acronyms and Abbreviations .....</b>	<b>71</b>



# INITIAL STUDY

## 1 INTRODUCTION

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

### 1.1 PURPOSE OF AN INITIAL STUDY

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

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

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

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

## **1.2. ORGANIZATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY**

This Initial Study is organized into four sections as follows:

### **1 INTRODUCTION**

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

### **2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

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

### **3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

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

### **4 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

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



# INITIAL STUDY

## 2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<b>PROJECT TITLE</b>	<b>11147 - 11148 LORNE STREET</b>
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL CASE NO.</b>	<b>ENV-2019-3203-MND</b>
<b>RELATED CASES</b>	<b>APCNV-2019-3202-ZCJ</b>

<b>PROJECT LOCATION</b>	<b>11146 – 11148 LORNE STREET</b>
<b>COMMUNITY PLAN AREA</b>	SUN VALLEY – LA TUNA CANYON
<b>GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION</b>	LOW MEDIUM II RESIDENTIAL
<b>ZONING</b>	R1-1-CUGU
<b>COUNCIL DISTRICT</b>	6 - PADILLA

<b>LEAD AGENCY</b>	<b>City of Los Angeles</b>
<b>STAFF CONTACT</b>	DANG NGUYEN
<b>ADDRESS</b>	6262 VAN NUYS BLVD, VAN NUYS CA 91401 #430
<b>PHONE NUMBER</b>	818 – 374 – 5027
<b>EMAIL</b>	DANG.NGUYEN@LACITY.ORG

<b>APPLICANT</b>	SOGOMON PETROSYAN
<b>ADDRESS</b>	750 N FAIRVIEW ST., BURBANK CA 91505
<b>PHONE NUMBER</b>	



## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The project includes a Zone Change from R1-1-CUGU to (T)(Q)RD1.5-1-CUGU. The project involves the demolition of 3 existing single-family dwellings units for the construction use and maintenance of a 17-unit apartment with attached garages on an approximate 26,296.6 square foot lot.

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

---

## **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The subject site is a level, rectangular-shaped lot, consisting of 26,296.6 gross square feet of lot area located on the south side of Lorne Street. The site is located within the Sun Valley – La Tuna Canyon Community Plan area, with a land use designation of Low Medium II Residential and is currently zoned R1-1-CUGU. The subject site is currently developed with 3 single-family dwellings, constructed around 1950.

The properties to the north, are zoned OS-1XL-CUGU and is improved with a large recreational park facility including a soccer field, tennis courts, a baseball diamond, and other miscellaneous recreational uses, and is owned and operated by the City of Los Angeles, Department of Recreation and Parks. The adjacent property to the west, is zoned R1-1-CUGU and is improved with a single family dwelling. Further west, are properties zoned M2-1-G-CUGU, [T]P-1-G-CUGU, M3-1-G-CUGU and is a large industrial mineral processing plant operated by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. The properties to the south are zoned R1-1-CUGU, and (T)(Q)RD1.5-1-CUGU and are improved with single family dwellings. The properties to the east, The properties to the east and south east are zoned (Q)RD1.5-1-CUGU, and are developed with multiple stories (up to 4 stories) multiple family dwelling unit apartments.

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

---

## **OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED**

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

None

---

## 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources    | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing          | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance   |

## DETERMINATION

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Dang Nguyen  
PRINTED NAME

City Planner  
TITLE

*Dang Nguyen*  
SIGNATURE

March 7 2025  
DATE

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

# INITIAL STUDY

## 3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### 3.1 PROJECT SUMMARY

The project includes a Zone Change from R1-1-CUGU to (T)(Q)RD1.5-1-CUGU. The project involves the demolition of 3 existing single-family dwellings units for the construction use and maintenance of a 17 unit apartment with attached garages on an approximate 26,296.6 square foot lot.

### 3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### 3.2.1 Project Location

*11146 – 11148 Lorne Street – Sun Valley – La Tuna Canyon Community Plan, in the City of Los Angeles, to the east of main streets Fair Avenue and Lorne Street.*

#### 3.2.2 Existing Conditions

The subject site is a level, rectangular-shaped lot, consisting of 26,296.6 gross square feet of lot area located on the south side of Lorne Street. The site is located within the Sun Valley – La Tuna Canyon Community Plan area, with a land use designation of Low Medium II Residential and is currently zoned R1-1-CUGU.

The subject site is currently developed with 3 single-family dwellings, constructed around 1950. SurveyLA, the City’s historic resources survey, does not list the current dwelling as a significant resource, nor is it located on any other local, state, or national registers. The site contains 8 non-protected trees and are all subject for removal. The proposed Project would demolish the existing structures and remove the non-protected trees. The applicant has a zone change to clarify the zoning on the property and to allow for the proposed density of development.

#### 3.2.3 Surrounding Land Uses

The properties to the north, are zoned OS-1XL-CUGU and is improved with a large recreational park facility including a soccer field, tennis courts, a baseball diamond, and other miscellaneous recreational uses, and is owned and operated by the City of Los Angeles, Department of Recreation and Parks. The adjacent property to the west, is zoned R1-1-CUGU and is improved with a single family dwelling. Further west, are properties zoned M2-1-G-CUGU, [T]P-1-G-CUGU, M3-1-G-CUGU and is a large industrial mineral processing plant operated by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. The properties to the south are zoned R1-1-CUGU, and (T)(Q)RD1.5-1-CUGU and are improved with single family dwellings. The properties to the east, The properties to the east and south east are zoned (Q)RD1.5-1-CUGU, and are developed with multiple stories (up to 4 stories) multiple family dwelling unit apartments.

### **3.3 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**

#### **3.3.1 Project Overview**

The project involves a Zone Change from R1-1-CUGU to (T)(Q)RD1.5-1-CUGU and includes the demolition of 3 existing single-family dwellings units for the construction use and maintenance of a 17 unit apartment with attached garages on an approximate 26,296.6 square foot lot.

The proposed apartments have varying heights. Building “A” is proposed for a maximum height of 35 feet and 3 inches, while Buildings “B” & “C” are proposed for a maximum height of 36 feet and 9 inches. Building “A” is proposed for a total of 4,822 square feet, while Building “B” is proposed for 11,802 square feet, and Building “C” is proposed for 10,116 square feet of floor area, for a combined total of 26,740 square feet of floor area. The project will provide 33 parking spaces. The project proposes the removal of 8 non-protected trees, and proposes 2,850 square feet of open space including 1,292 square feet of common open space, and 1,600 square feet of private open space. Access to the residences will be from a common driveway with one curb cut on Lorne Street.

#### **3.3.2 Design and Architecture**

The proposed apartments have varying heights. Building “A” is proposed for a maximum height of 35 feet and 3 inches, while Buildings “B” & “C” are proposed for a maximum height of 36 feet and 9 inches. Building “A” is proposed for a total of 4,822 square feet, while Building “B” is proposed for 11,802 square feet, and Building “C” is proposed for 10,116 square feet of floor area.

Proposed three buildings are designed as townhome style apartments featuring direct access through the proposed 10 foot passageways including direct access from each unit’s attached garages. The units will have private open spaces including a shared common open space and recreation room. Two of the buildings facing the public street are proposed with large windows, porches and balconies with decorative wrought iron railings.

#### **3.3.3 Open Space and Landscaping**

The project proposes the removal of 8 existing on-site trees and proposes approximately 3098 square feet of new landscaping area are proposed with private open spaces along with a common open space area accessed through a passageway with direct access to the units.

#### **3.3.4 Access, Circulation, and Parking**

The project proposes 26 foot 10 inch driveway and vehicular access from the southside of Lorne Street including a 20 foot fire-lane, and turnaround area bisecting buildings B and C. The project also features 33 on-site parking spaces. The project proposes three buildings connected through shared driveway with direct access featuring a decorative wrought iron gate and no outside parking areas. The proposed 10 foot passageways will provide direct access from each unit’s attached garages.

The project is conditioned to Construct a new full-width concrete sidewalk along the property frontage. Repair all existing concrete curb, gutter and roadway pavement. Remove the existing driveway and construct a new ADA compliant driveway.

### **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 Section 12.32 F, a Zone Change from R1-1-CUGU to (T)(Q)RD1.5-1-CUGU
- Other discretionary and ministerial permits and approvals that may be deemed necessary, including, but not limited to, temporary street closure permits, grading permits, excavation permits, foundation permits, building permits, and sign permits.

# INITIAL STUDY

## 4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

### I. AESTHETICS

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

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

- a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
- b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
- 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?
- d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

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

**No Impact.** A scenic vista, as defined by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), is a viewpoint that provides expansive views of a highly valued landscape for the benefit of the general public. A significant impact could occur if the Project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. A focal point 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 site is located within the Sun Valley - La Tuna Canyon Community Plan area.

The San Fernando Valley encompasses an area of approximately about 260 square miles and is bound by the Santa Susana Mountains to the northwest, the Simi Hills to the west, the Santa Monica Mountains and Chalk Hills to the south, the Verdugo Mountains to the east, and the San Gabriel Mountains to the northeast. The San Gabriel Mountains to the north are visible in the distant background but only within the narrow corridor created by Sunland Boulevard. This is due to their distance from the project site, the intervening urbanized development, and street trees which block them from view. The Simi Hills are not visible to the west from any vantage proximate to the project site. Further, there are no scenic vistas within the area surrounding the project site. Because there are no panoramic views within the area of the project site, no impact to panoramic views is anticipated. Further, the proposed project will not extend across any public right-of-way, so no change to the visibility of these surrounding mountain ranges will occur.

Due to the relatively level topography and extent of development within the immediate area, there are no other scenic views or vantage points that afford scenic views. Furthermore there are no significant natural features on the Project Site or other valued views within the Project area that would be defined as a scenic vista. Therefore, no impact to scenic vistas would occur.

**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 could occur only if scenic resources were to be damaged or removed by a project, such as a tree, rock outcropping, or historic building within a designated scenic highway. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) administers the State Scenic Highway Program which includes a list of eligible or officially designated scenic highways. A portion of Route 101 located approximately 4.4 miles south of the Project site is identified as an Eligible State Scenic Highway. Route 27 on Mulholland Drive is located approximately 6 miles further south of the Project site and is listed as an Eligible State Scenic Highway. Both State-eligible scenic highways are not officially designated as scenic highways by Caltrans. Additionally, the City of Los Angeles' General Plan Mobility Element does not indicate any State-designated scenic highway located in the vicinity of the Project site. Furthermore, these scenic highways are not located within the immediate vicinity of the Project site.

The Project site is currently developed with 3 existing single-family dwelling units and does not contain any scenic resources such as trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings. Therefore, the proposed Project does not have the potential to damage resources within a State-designated scenic highway.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings. Significant impacts to the visual character of a site and its surroundings are generally based on the removal of features with aesthetic value, the introduction of contrasting urban features into a local area, and the degree to which the elements of the proposed project detract from the visual character of an area. The proposed Project area for the demolition of 3



existing single-family residential units for a 17 unit apartment. The area surrounding the project site is characterized by a large recreational park facility and other miscellaneous recreational uses, or multiple stories (up to 4 stories) multiple family dwelling unit apartments, single storied single-family dwellings, or a large scale industrial use. The proposed project would include design features and landscaping improvements to enhance the visual quality of the area. Accordingly, the proposed project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact on visual quality.

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

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

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 would include nighttime security lighting primarily along the perimeter of the project site. However, the security lighting would be night-friendly LEDs and would not substantially change existing ambient nighttime lighting conditions. The proposed project does not include any elements or features that would create substantial new sources of glare. Therefore, light and glare impacts would be less than significant.

## II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

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

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

**No Impact.** A significant impact could occur if the proposed Project were to convert valued farmland to non-agricultural uses. The Project site is in an urbanized area of the City of Los Angeles and is considered Urban and Built-up Land. The Project site is currently developed with three single-family dwelling residential units. In addition, the uses surrounding the Project site primarily include industrial, recreational or residential use. No agricultural uses or operations occur on site or in the vicinity of the Project site. The Project site and surrounding area are also not mapped as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency Department of Conservation. In addition, the proposed Project would not convert any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use. As such, no impacts would occur.

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

**No Impact.** A significant impact could occur if the proposed Project conflicted with existing agricultural zoning, or agricultural parcels enrolled under the Williamson Act. The Project site is zoned for Single-Family uses (R1-1-CUGU), and is designated for Low Medium II Residential uses by the Sun Valley – La Tuna Canyon Community Plan. The Project site is not zoned for agricultural use, nor is there farmland at the site. Additionally, none of the surrounding properties are zoned or utilized for agricultural use. Furthermore, the Project site and surrounding area are not enrolled under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act Contract. As such, no impacts would occur.

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

**No Impact.** A significant impact could occur if the proposed Project conflicted with existing zoning or caused rezoning of forest land or timberland or resulted in the loss of forest land or in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The Project site is currently developed with 3 existing single-family dwelling units. The Project site does not include any forest land or timberland. In addition, the Project site is zoned for Single-Family uses (R1-1-CUGU), and is designated for Low Medium II Residential uses by the Sun Valley – La Tuna Canyon Community Plan, and is not zoned and / or used as forest land. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land or timberland as defined by the aforementioned PRC or Government Code (GC). As such, no impacts would occur.

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

**No Impact.** A significant impact could occur if the proposed Project conflicted with existing zoning, caused rezoning of forest land or timberland, or resulted in the loss of forest land or in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The Project site is in an urbanized area and does not include any forest land or timberland. Therefore, the Project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impacts would occur.

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

**No Impact.** A significant impact could occur if the proposed Project caused the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. The Project site is in a highly developed area and is zoned for Single-Family uses (R1-1-CUGU), and is designated for Low Medium II Residential uses by the Sun Valley – La Tuna Canyon Community Plan. The subject property is currently improved with three existing single-family dwelling residential units and is in an urbanized area of the City, and no agricultural uses, designated Farmland, or forest land uses occur at the Project site or within the surrounding area. As such, the Project would not result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use. No impact would occur.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

There are no related projects within a 0.5-mile radius. The Project site is not on land that is used for, or designated as, agricultural or forest land. Therefore, no cumulative impacts related to agriculture and forestry resources would occur.

### III. AIR QUALITY

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) to meet federal and state ambient air quality standards. A significant air quality impact may occur if a project is inconsistent with the AQMP or would in some way represent a substantial hindrance to employing the policies or obtaining the goals of that plan. The proposed project is not expected to conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the AQMP and SCAQMD rules. The proposed project is also subject to the City's Green Building Program Ordinance (Ord. No. 179,890), which was adopted to reduce the use of natural resources, create healthier living environments, and minimize the negative impacts of development on local, regional and global ecosystems. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**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.** The project will produce fugitive dust and mobile source emissions as a result of construction activity. The proposed project and the entire Los Angeles metropolitan area are located within the South Coast Air Basin, which is characterized by relatively poor air quality. The Basin is currently classified as a federal and State non-attainment area for Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), Respirable Particulate Matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>), and lead (Pb) and a federal attainment/maintenance area for Carbon Monoxide (CO). It is classified as a State attainment area for CO, and it currently meets the federal and State standards for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), Sulfur Oxides (SO<sub>x</sub>), and lead (Pb). Because the Basin is designated as a State and/or federal nonattainment air basin for O<sub>3</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and NO<sub>2</sub>, there is an on-going regional cumulative impact associated with these pollutants. However, an individual project can emit these pollutants without significantly contributing to this cumulative impact depending on the magnitude of emissions. This magnitude is determined by the project-level significance thresholds established by the SCAQMD. The project would be subject to regulatory compliance measures, which reduce the impacts of operational and construction regional emissions. A project of this size (17 units), would not likely exceed the project-level SCAQMD localized significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants, and the impact would be less than significant.

**c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The construction phase may increase the existing basin-wide air quality violations, however, the project is expected to comply with existing regulations that will ensure that these impacts will remain at a less than significant level.

**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 land uses 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.

## IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Have a substantial adverse effect on 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |



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

**No Impact.** A project could have a significant biological impact through the loss or destruction of individuals of a species or through the degradation of sensitive habitat. The Project site is located within an urbanized area and is currently developed with existing 3 single-family residential dwelling units. The surrounding areas are also developed with industrial, residential, and various recreational park facility uses. Due to the urbanized and disturbed nature of the Project site and the surrounding developed areas, as well as the lack of large expanses of open space areas proposed on the subject property, species likely to occur on the site are limited, mostly likely to small terrestrial and avian species typically found in developed settings. Areas not used for buildings, driveways, parking, or pedestrian amenities include landscaping in the form of non-native and/or non-protected trees and grass. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

**No Impact.** A significant impact could occur if any riparian habitat or natural community would be lost or destroyed as a result of urban development. The Project site is located in an urbanized area and is currently developed with an existing automotive service building. No riparian or other sensitive natural community exists on the Project site. The Project site is not located in, or adjacent to, a Biological Resource Area or Significant Ecological Area (SEA) as defined by the City of Los Angeles or County of Los Angeles. There are no other sensitive natural communities identified by CDFW or USFWS. Therefore, the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. As such, no impacts would occur.

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

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if federally protected wetlands would be modified or removed by a project. The Project Site is located in a highly urbanized area, and it 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. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means, and no impacts would occur.

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

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

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

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be inconsistent with local regulations pertaining to biological resources. The proposed project would not conflict with any policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Ordinance (No. 177,404). The project site does not contain locally-protected biological resources, such as oak trees, Southern California black walnut, western sycamore, and California bay trees. 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 (CFGC). Both the MBTA and CFGC protects migratory birds that may use trees on or adjacent to the project site for nesting, and may be disturbed during construction of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance (e.g., oak trees or California walnut woodlands), and no impacts would occur.

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

**No Impact.** The project site and its vicinity are not part of any draft or adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan. The project site and its vicinity are not part of any draft or adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan, and no impacts would occur.

## V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project would substantially alter the environmental context of, or remove historical resources. The project includes the demolition of three existing single-family dwellings. However, none of these structures 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, the Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments Register, and/or any local register. In addition, the site was not found to be a potential historic resource based on SurveyLA, the citywide survey of Los Angeles or the City's HistoricPlacesLA website.

Moreover, according to a Cultural Resources Letter Report dated April 29, 2022, a records search of the API and a 0.5-mile radius was conducted through the CHRIS SCCIC at CSU, Fullerton, California, to identify known cultural resources and previous cultural resource investigations. The results of that search determined that 10 previous investigations have been conducted within 0.5-mile of the Project API. Only one of the previous investigations overlap the Project API. The records search results did not identify any previously recorded cultural resources within the API or within a 0.5-mile radius of the API.

A search of the BERD for built environment resources within 1.0-mile of the API was conducted. The BERD results also included those built environment resources also listed on the CRHR. No built environment resources were identified as being within the API or within 0.50-mile of the API. Historic topographic maps and aerial imagery were reviewed, which identified that the Project API has seen significant development since the 1960s and prior to that was a mostly rural area. No historic built environment resources were identified as being within the API as a result of reviewing historic topographic maps and aerial imagery. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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

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

According to a Cultural Resources Letter Report dated April 29, 2022, the search of the SLF by the NAHC was negative for sensitive and sacred Native American resources, or TCRs. A buried site sensitivity assessment of the API, consisting of a pedestrian survey, was not conducted as the Project API is entirely paved and developed. Plans indicate all ground-disturbing activities associated with the construction of the proposed facility are anticipated to occur within disturbed sediments that are unlikely to contain intact, buried archaeological deposits.

Proposed Project activities are likely to have no effects to unknown, subsurface archaeological resources. As a result, there is no potential for surface archaeological sites within the API.

Based on the results of the records search from the SCCIC, BERD search, and SLF search, it appears that there are no historical resources as defined under CEQA (i.e., CRHR-eligible resources) within the API, and there would be no impact to historical resources from the proposed residential development of the API. Given the paved and disturbed nature of the API and lack of previously recorded resources in the immediate area of the Project (API), intact subsurface archaeological deposits are unlikely to exist.

In the event that unanticipated archaeological resources were encountered during Project implementation, work will cease in the area of the find until a qualified archaeologist has evaluated the find in accordance with Federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. In addition, MM-CUL-1 through MM-CUL-3 are incorporated into the project to supplement the City's current standard conditions of approval (COA) and ensure that impacts to unanticipated archaeological resources would be less than significant.

**MM-CUL-1: Workers Environmental Awareness Program Training.** All construction personnel and monitors who are not trained archaeologists should be briefed regarding inadvertent discoveries prior to the start of construction activities. A basic presentation and handout or pamphlet should be prepared in order to ensure proper identification and treatment of inadvertent discoveries. The purpose of the Workers Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training is to provide specific details on the kinds of archaeological materials that may be identified during construction of the Project and explain the importance of and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. Each worker should also learn the proper procedures to follow in the event that cultural resources or human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities. These procedures include work curtailment or redirection, and the immediate contact of the site supervisor and archaeological monitor. To ensure consistency of the training with the City's standard conditions, a cultural resource inadvertent discovery clause should be included on all construction plans, and a copy kept on the Project site throughout the duration of all construction tasks.

**MM-CUL-2: Retention of a Qualified Archaeologist.** A qualified archaeologist should be retained and on-call to respond and address any inadvertent discoveries identified for the duration of construction activities.

**MM-CUL-3: Inadvertent Discovery Clause.** If any archaeological materials are encountered during the course of Project development, all further development activity in the vicinity of the materials shall halt and:

- The services of an archaeologist shall then be secured by contacting the South Central Coastal Information Center (657-278-5395) located at California State University Fullerton, or a member of the Society of Professional Archaeologist (SOPA) or a SOPA-qualified archaeologist, who shall assess the discovered material(s) and prepare a survey, study, or report evaluating the impact; The archaeologist's survey, study or report shall contain a recommendation(s), if necessary, for the preservation, conservation, or relocation of the resource; and
- The Project Applicant shall comply with the recommendations of the evaluating archaeologist, as contained in the survey, study, or report.

Project development activities may resume once copies of the archaeological survey, study or report are submitted to the following:

SCCIC Department of Anthropology  
McCarthy Hall 477

CSU Fullerton 800 North State College Boulevard  
Fullerton, California 92834

Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Project Applicant shall submit a letter to the case file indicating what, if any, archaeological reports have been submitted, or a statement indicating that no material was discovered. A covenant and agreement binding the Project Applicant to this condition shall be recorded prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if previously interred human remains would be disturbed during excavation of the project site. Human remains could be encountered during excavation and grading activities associated with the proposed project. While no formal cemeteries, other places of human interment, or burial grounds or sites are known to occur within the project area, there is always a possibility that human remains can be encountered during construction. If human remains are encountered unexpectedly during construction demolition and/or grading activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98. If human remains of Native American origin are discovered during project construction, compliance with state laws, which fall within the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) (Public Resource Code Section 5097), relating to the disposition of Native American burials will be adhered to. As analyzed under Section XVIII, Tribal Cultural Resources, mitigation measures will be implemented should human remains of a Native American origin be discovered during project construction. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

## VI. ENERGY

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact could occur if the Project were to substantially increase demand for energy resources, thereby exceeding the available supply. The Project would be constructed in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations, including applicable State and federal laws, and building regulations pursuant to the LAMC and Los Angeles Green Building Code (LAGBC), which are intended to promote efficient utilization of resources and minimize environmental impacts.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The State of California Energy Commission and the City's Departments of Water and Power and Public Works offer programs to encourage energy efficiency. The proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct either state or local plans for renewal energy or energy efficiency.

## VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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.**

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would cause personal injury or death or result in property damage as a result of a fault rupture occurring on the project site and if the project site is located within a State-designated Alquist-Priolo Zone or other designated fault zone. According to the California Department of Conservation Special Studies Zone Map, the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone or Fault Rupture Study Area. The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects resulting from the rupture of known earthquake faults. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act is intended to mitigate the hazard of surface fault rupture on structures for human occupancy. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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, development of the proposed project could expose people and structures to strong seismic ground shaking. However, the proposed project would be designed and constructed in accordance with State and local Building Codes to reduce the potential for exposure of people or structures to seismic risks to the maximum extent possible. The proposed project would be required to comply with the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG), which provides guidance for the evaluation and mitigation of earthquake-related hazards, and with the seismic safety requirements in the Uniform Building Code (UBC) and the LAMC. Compliance with such requirements would reduce seismic ground shaking impacts to the maximum extent practicable with current engineering practices. Therefore, impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

iii) **Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Based upon the criteria established in the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide, a significant impact may occur if a proposed project site is located within a liquefaction zone. The applicant submitted a Preliminary Soil Investigated Report (EXHIBIT XYZX???) for review February 16, 2022 (stamp dated May 3, 2022) and by reference, the subject property lies within a seismically active southern California region. As with all sites in southern California, the property will probably experience ground shaking from both near and distant earthquake sources during the life of the proposed structure. The type and magnitude of seismic hazard affecting at the site are dependent on the distance of causative faults and the intensity and magnitude of the seismic event. The site is not located within a currently designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. No faults, active or potentially active, are known to exist within the site. The probability of surface rupture at the site, is therefore, considered very low.

According to “Maps of Known Active Fault Near-Source- Zones in California and Adjacent Portions of Nevada” by California Department of Conservation, the site is within 2km of the

Verdugo Fault Zone. The report states that the intensity of future ground shaking at the site is not expected to be greater than any other sites in the immediate vicinity. The proposed structures shall be designed in accordance with the Earthquake Regulations of the California Building Code and seismic design parameters.

Earthquake-induced liquefaction is a phenomenon in which loose to medium dense saturated cohesionless soils undergo extreme losses in shear strength due to an earthquake shaking. The liquefaction potential is directly related to the groundwater conditions at the site as well as to the characteristics of the underlying soil deposits. Loose to medium dense sands below groundwater level are generally considered to be susceptible to liquefaction under strong ground shaking conditions. The site is not located in the area as delineated by the State Geologist to have potential of soil liquefaction during strong earthquakes. Hence, liquefaction evaluation of the site is not performed. As no groundwater was encountered in any test borings to a maximum depth of 20 feet, the report considers the potential of soil liquefaction at the site to be considered low.

Therefore, less than significant impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would occur.

#### **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.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if construction activities or future uses would result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Construction of the proposed project would result in ground surface disturbance which could create the potential for soil erosion to occur. 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 through the City's Stormwater Management Division. In addition, the proposed project would be required to develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. The Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan would require implementation of an erosion control plan to reduce the potential for wind or waterborne erosion during the construction process.

Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur with respect to erosion or loss of topsoil.

#### **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. Development of 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. According to the Safety Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan, Critical Facilities and Lifeline Systems, Exhibit E and/or the Environmental and Public Facilities Map (1996), the project site is not identified as being located in an oil field or within an oil drilling area. The proposed project would be required to implement standard construction practices that would ensure that the integrity of the project site and the proposed structures is maintained. Construction will be required by the Department of Building and Safety to comply with the City of Los Angeles Uniform Building Code (UBC) which is designed to assure safe construction and includes building foundation requirements appropriate to site conditions. With the implementation of the Building Code requirements and in reference to the submitted a Preliminary Soil Investigated Report dated February 16, 2022 (stamp dated May 3, 2022), by reference, concluding that the subject property lies within a seismically active southern California region. As with all sites in southern California, the property will probably experience ground shaking from both near and distant earthquake sources during the life of the proposed structure. The type and magnitude of seismic hazard affecting at the site are dependent on the distance of causative faults and the intensity and magnitude of the seismic event. The site is not located within a currently designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. No faults, active or potentially active, are known to exist within the site. The probability of surface rupture at the site, is therefore, considered very low.

According to “Maps of Known Active Fault Near-Source- Zones in California and Adjacent Portions of Nevada” by California Department of Conservation, the site is within 2km of the Verdugo Fault Zone. The report states that the intensity of future ground shaking at the site is not expected to be greater than any other sites in the immediate vicinity. The proposed structures shall be designed in accordance with the Earthquake Regulations of the California Building Code and seismic design parameters.

Earthquake-induced liquefaction is a phenomenon in which loose to medium dense saturated cohesionless soils undergo extreme losses in shear strength due to an earthquake shaking. The liquefaction potential is directly related to the groundwater conditions at the site as well as to the characteristics of the underlying soil deposits. Loose to medium dense sands below groundwater level are generally considered to be susceptible to liquefaction under strong ground shaking conditions. The site is not located in the area as delineated by the State Geologist to have potential of soil liquefaction during strong earthquakes. Hence, liquefaction evaluation of the site is not performed. As no groundwater was encountered in any test borings to a maximum depth of 20 feet, the report considers the potential of soil liquefaction at the site to be considered low.

Therefore, the potential for landslide lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse would be less-than-significant.

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

**Less than Significant.** A significant impact could occur if the proposed Project were to 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 are typically associated with fine-grained clayey soils that have the potential to shrink and swell with repeated cycles of wetting and drying.

The Project site and immediate vicinity are fully developed, so no soil would be exposed to water and swell. The Project would not expose underlying soils permanently or inject soils with water that could cause it to swell, as no excavation activities are expected to occur during construction. Therefore, the Project would not exacerbate any existing environmental conditions that could create substantial risk to life or property due to expansive soil.

Furthermore, the Project would comply with the LABC, and all on-site grading and site preparation would comply with the applicable provisions of the LAMC Chapter IX, Division 70, which addresses grading, excavation, and fills. As such, impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are 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?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** A project would cause a significant impact if adequate wastewater disposal is not available. The project site is located in a highly urbanized area, where wastewater infrastructure is currently in place. The proposed project would connect to existing sewer lines that serve the project site and would not use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if excavation or construction activities associated with the proposed project would disturb paleontological or unique geological features. If paleontological resources are discovered during excavation, grading, or construction, the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety shall be notified immediately, and all work shall cease in the area of the find until a qualified paleontologist evaluates the find. Construction activity may continue unimpeded on other portions of the Project site. The paleontologist shall determine the location, the time frame, and the extent to which any monitoring of earthmoving activities shall be required. The found deposits would be treated in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

## VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Greenhouse gases (GHG) are those gaseous constituents of the atmosphere, both natural and human generated, that absorb and emit radiation at specific wavelengths within the spectrum of terrestrial radiation emitted by the earth’s surface, the atmosphere itself, and by clouds. In order to implement the goal of improving energy conservation and efficiency, the Los Angeles City Council has adopted multiple ordinances to establish and update the Los Angeles Green Building Code (LAGBC) (Ordinance No. 181,480). The most recent update of the LAGBC, and the one to which the project would be subject, occurred on December 23, 2022. As of that date, LADBS is required to enforce the 2022 Edition of the California Building Standards Codes, also known as Title 24. Although the project will directly and indirectly generate GHGs, because it is required to comply with the LAGBC it 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 and impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The California legislature passed SB 375 to connect regional transportation planning to local land use decisions. The law requires that metropolitan planning organizations prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in their regional transportation plans to achieve per capita GHG reduction targets. For the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the regional planning organization for the Southern California region encompassing Ventura, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Orange Counties, the SCS is contained in the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. This plan focuses the majority of new housing and job growth in high-quality transit areas and other opportunity areas on existing main streets, downtowns, and commercial corridors, resulting in more opportunity for transit-oriented development. A separate law on analysis of transportation

impacts under CEQA, SB 743, encourages land use and transportation planning decisions that reduce vehicle miles traveled and thus also reduce GHG emissions.

The project entails construction of an apartment building on a developed lot containing 17 residential units, and would not interfere with SCAG's ability to implement the regional strategies outlined in the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS. The proposed project, therefore, would be consistent with statewide, regional and local goals and policies aimed at reducing GHG emissions and would result in a less than significant impact related to plans, policies, or regulations that target the reduction of GHG emissions.

## IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** 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 existing single-family dwelling on the subject site was constructed around 1950. Therefore, it is possible that these structures may contain asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paint (LBP). Demolition of these buildings would have the potential to release asbestos fibers into the atmosphere if such materials exist and they are not properly stabilized or removed prior to demolition activities. 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 buildings constructed prior to 1979. Compliance with existing State laws regarding removal would be required, resulting in a less than significant impact.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction activities have the potential to result in the release, emission, handling, and disposal of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing school. Arminta Street Elementary School is located 0.5 miles west of the subject site at 11530 Strathern St. A significant impact would occur if the proposed 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, and there are no existing or proposed schools within a one-quarter mile of the subject property. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed 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, impacts would be less than significant.

**e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project 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 not located in an airport land use plan area, or within two miles of any public or public use airports, or private air strips. Whiteman Airport is located at 12653 Osborne Street, approximately 3.3 miles to the north of the subject site. Hollywood/Burbank Airport (Bob Hope Airport) is located at 2627 N. Hollywood Way, approximately 1 miles southeast of the subject site. However, ZIMAS does not identify the subject site as an Airport Hazard. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Less than significant impact.** A significant impact could occur if a project were to interfere with roadway operations used in conjunction with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan or would generate traffic congestion that would interfere with the execution of such a plan. According to the Safety Element of the City of Los Angeles *General Plan* and County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, the nearest designated disaster route to the Project site is Interstate 5 – Golden State Freeway.

While it is expected that the majority of construction activities for the Project would be confined to the Project site, limited off-site construction activities may occur in adjacent street rights-of-way during certain periods of the day, which could potentially require temporary lane closures. However, if lane closures are necessary, the remaining travel lanes would be maintained in accordance with standard construction management plans that would be implemented to ensure adequate circulation and emergency access. Operation of the Project would generate traffic in the vicinity but would not result in modifications to site access. The Project would comply with

LAFD access requirements and would not impede emergency access within the Project vicinity. The Project would not cause an impediment along the City's designated disaster routes or impair the implementation of the City's emergency response plan, and, as such, impacts related to the implementation of the City's emergency response plan would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

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

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project exposed people and structures to high risk of wildfire. The project site is located in a highly urbanized area of the City and the area surrounding the project site is completely developed. Accordingly, the project site and the surrounding area are not subject to wildland fires. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, and no impact would occur.

## X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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

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

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially deplete groundwater or interfere with groundwater recharge. The proposed project would not require the use of groundwater at the project site. Potable water would be supplied by 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. Therefore, the impact on groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge would be less than significant.

**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;**
- 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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially alter the drainage pattern of an existing stream or river so that erosion or siltation would result. There are no streams or rivers located in the project vicinity. 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 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. Impermeable surfaces resulting from the development of the project would not substantially change the volume of stormwater runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. A significant impact would occur if runoff water would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm drain systems serving the project site, or if the proposed project would substantially increase the probability that polluted runoff would reach the storm drain system. Site-generated surface water runoff would continue to flow to the City's storm drain system. Any project that creates, adds, or replaces 500 square feet of impervious surface must comply with the Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance or alternatively, the City's Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan 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 existing storm drain capacities or water quality.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if a site would be located in a flood hazard zone. ZIMAS records show that the subject site is not in a flood zone. NavigateLA shows that the site is outside of a flood zone in Zone C. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be located within an area susceptible to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. A seiche is an oscillation of a body of water in an enclosed or semi-enclosed basin, such as a reservoir, harbor, or lake. A tsunami is a great sea wave produced by a significant undersea disturbance. Mudflows result from the down slope movement of soil and/or rock under the influence of gravity. The project site and the surrounding areas are not located near a water body to be inundated by seiche. Similarly, the project site and the surrounding areas are located approximately 15 miles northeast of the Pacific Ocean. Therefore, the project would have no impact related to flood hazard and/or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project discharges water that does not meet the quality standards of agencies which regulate surface water quality and water discharge into storm water drainage systems, or does not comply with all applicable regulations as governed by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. The proposed project would be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System standards and the City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control regulations (Ordinance No. 172,176 and No. 173,494) to ensure pollutant loads from the project site are minimized for downstream receiving waters. The ordinances contain requirements for construction activities and operation of projects to integrate low impact development practices and standards for stormwater pollution mitigation, and maximize open, green and pervious space on all projects consistent with the City's landscape ordinance and other related requirements in the City's Development BMPs Handbook. Any project that creates, adds, or replaces 500 square feet of impervious surface must comply with the LID Ordinance or alternatively, the City's Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan, as an LAMC requirement to address water runoff

and storm water pollution. Conformance would be ensured during the City's building plan review and approval process. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts.

## XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

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

### a) Physically divide an established community?

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be sufficiently large or configured in such a way so as to create a physical barrier within an established community. A physical division of an established community is caused by an impediment to through travel or a physical barrier, such as a new freeway with limited access between neighborhoods on either side of the freeway, or major street closures. The proposed project would not involve any street vacation or closure or result in development of new thoroughfares or highways. The proposed project, the construction of new 17 unit multi-family residential use in an urbanized area in Los Angeles, would not divide an established community. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project is inconsistent with the General Plan or zoning designations currently applicable to the project site, and would cause adverse environmental effects, which the General Plan and zoning ordinance are designed to avoid or mitigate. The site is located within the Sun Valley – La Tuna Canyon Community Plan area. The site is zoned R1-1-CUGU, with a General Plan land use designation of Low Medium II Residential. The applicant is requesting a Zone Change from R1-1-CUGU to (T)(Q)RD1.5-1-CUGU which is consistent with the General Commercial land use designation. The proposed Project would be comprised of 17 dwelling units (for total of 26,740 square feet of floor area). The requested 17 units are within the density allowed under the (T)(Q)RD1.5-1-CUGU Zone, which allows 1 unit per 1,500 square feet or in this instance, a maximum by-right density of 17 units if approved. Under the (T)(Q)RD1.5-1-CUGU Zone, a floor area ratio of 3:1 is allowed (78,888 square feet); the applicant is proposing a floor area ratio under 3:1 at 26,740 square feet. The proposed project would conform to the allowable land uses pursuant to the Los Angeles Municipal Code. The decision makers will determine whether discretionary requests will conflict with applicable plans/policies. Impacts related to land use have been mitigated elsewhere, or are addressed through compliance with existing regulations. Therefore, no impact would occur.

## XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

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



### XIII. NOISE

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

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

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

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

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

**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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the project would result in temporary or permanent noise levels above those permitted by any applicable regulations. The City of Los Angeles has established policies and regulations concerning the generation and control of noise that could adversely affect its citizens and noise-sensitive land uses. Construction activity would result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the project area on an

intermittent basis. Noise levels would fluctuate depending on the construction phase, equipment type and duration of use, distance between the noise source and receptor, and presence or absence of noise attenuation barriers. Construction noise for the project will cause a temporary increase in the ambient noise levels but will be subject to the LAMC Sections 112.05 (Maximum Noise Level of Powered Equipment or Powered Hand Tools) and 41.40 (Noise Due to Construction, Excavation Work – When Prohibited) regarding construction hours and construction equipment noise thresholds. The project is required to comply with the City of Los Angeles General Plan Noise Element and Ordinance No. 161,574, which prohibits the emission of creation of noise beyond certain levels at adjacent uses unless technically infeasible. Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to result in a less than significant impact related to the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

## XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A potentially significant impact would occur if the proposed project would induce substantial population growth that would not have otherwise occurred as rapidly or in as great a magnitude. The proposed project would result in a net increase of 14 residential dwelling units (for a total of 17 residential dwelling units). The increase in residential population resulting from the proposed project would not be considered substantial in consideration of anticipated growth for the Sun Valley – La Tuna Canyon Community Plan, and is within the Southern California Association of Governments’ (SCAG) 2020 population projections for the City in their 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan. The project would meet a growing demand for housing near jobs and transportation centers, consistent with State, regional and local regulations designed to reduce trips and greenhouse gas emissions. Operation of the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in the project area, either directly or indirectly. The physical secondary or indirect impacts of population growth such as increased traffic or noise have been adequately mitigated in other portions of this document. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A potentially significant impact would occur if the proposed project would displace a substantial quantity of existing residences or a substantial number of people. The proposed Project would result in the displacement of three single family residences. However, the proposed Project would be subject to the tenant relocation and displacement requirements of the City, if applicable. Compliance with these requirements, including the provision of notice and payment of relocation fees, if applicable, would reduce displacement impacts to less than significant.

## XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

### a) Fire protection?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) could not adequately serve the proposed Project, necessitating a new or physically altered station. The project site and the general surrounding area is currently served by Fire Station 77 located at 9224 Sunland Blvd, approximately 1.6 miles north of the subject site.

The proposed project would result in a net increase of 14 residential dwelling units (for a total of 17 residential dwelling units), which could increase the number of emergency calls and demand for LAFD fire and emergency services. To maintain the level of fire protection and emergency services, the LAFD may require additional fire personnel and equipment. However, given that there is an existing fire 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 fire station to serve the proposed project and maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection. By analyzing data from previous years and continuously monitoring current data regarding response times, types of incidents, and call frequencies, LAFD can shift resources to meet local demands for fire protection and emergency services. The proposed project would neither create capacity or service level problems nor result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact.

## **b) Police protection?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) could not adequately serve the proposed project, necessitating a new or physically altered station. The proposed project would result in the loss of three existing single-family dwelling structures for a proposed 17 unit apartment for a net increase of 14 residential dwelling units, which could increase demand for police service. The project site and the surrounding area are currently served by LAPD's Foothill Station located at 12760 Osborne St, approximately 3.4 miles northwest of the subject site. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the LAPD would review the project plans to ensure that the design of the project follows the LAPD's Design Out Crime Program, an initiative that introduces the techniques of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design to all City departments beyond the LAPD. Through the incorporation of these techniques into the project design, in combination with the safety features already incorporated into the proposed project, the proposed project would neither create capacity/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 police protection. Regarding operations, in the event a situation should arise requiring increased staffing or patrol units, additional resources can be called. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to police protection services.

## **c) Schools?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would include substantial employment or population growth, which could generate a demand for school facilities that would exceed the capacity of the school district. The proposed project would result in a net increase of 14 residential dwelling units (for a total of 17 residential dwelling units) which could increase enrollment at schools that serve the area. However, development of the proposed project would be subject to California Government Code Section 65995, which would allow LAUSD to collect impact fees from developers of new residential and commercial space. Conformance to California Government Code Section 65995 is deemed to provide full and complete mitigation of impacts to school facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact to public schools.

## **d) Parks?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would exceed the capacity or capability of the local park system to serve the proposed project. The City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) is responsible for the provision, maintenance, and operation of public recreational and park facilities and services in the City. The proposed project would result in a net increase of 14 residential dwelling units (for a total of 17 residential dwelling units), which could result in increased demand for parks and recreation facilities. Pursuant to Section 12.33 of the LAMC, the applicant shall pay the applicable fees for construction of dwelling units. Therefore, the proposed project would not create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial physical impacts associated with the provision or new or altered parks facilities. Accordingly, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact on park facilities.

**e) Other public facilities?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would result in substantial employment or population growth that could generate a demand for other public facilities, including libraries, which exceed the capacity available to serve the project site, necessitating new or physically altered public facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts. The proposed project would result in a net increase of 14 residential dwelling units (for a total of 17 residential dwelling units), which could result in increased demand for library services and resources of the Los Angeles Public Library System. However, the proposed project would not create substantial capacity or service level problems that would require the provision of new or expanded public facilities in order to maintain an acceptable level of service for libraries and other public facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact on other public facilities.

## XVI. RECREATION

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would exceed the capacity or capability of the local park system to serve the proposed project. The City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) is responsible for the provision, maintenance, and operation of public recreational and park facilities and services in the City. The proposed project would result in a net increase of 14 units (demolition of 3 existing single-family units for the construction of a 17 unit multiple family apartment), which could result in increased demand for parks and recreation facilities. Pursuant to Section 12.33 of the LAMC, the applicant shall pay the applicable fees for construction of dwelling units. Therefore, the proposed project would not create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial physical impacts associated with the provision or new or altered parks facilities. Accordingly, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact on park facilities.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would exceed the capacity or capability of the local park system to serve the proposed project. The City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) is responsible for the provision, maintenance, and operation of public recreational and park facilities and services in the City. The proposed project would result in a net increase of 14 units (demolition of 3 existing single-family units for the construction of a 17 unit multiple family apartment), which could result in increased demand for parks and recreation facilities. Pursuant to Section 12.33 of the LAMC, the applicant shall pay the applicable fees for construction of dwelling units. Therefore, the proposed 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. Accordingly, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact on park facilities.

## XVII. TRANSPORTATION<sup>1</sup>

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. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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.** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would conflict with adopted policies or involve modification of existing alternative transportation facilities located on or offsite. The proposed project would not require the disruption of public transportation services or the alteration of public transportation routes. Furthermore, the proposed project would not interfere with any Class I or Class II bikeway systems. While the project will increase the number of daily trips for the site, it does not reach a threshold that requires preliminary review by the Department of Transportation for the potential need of a traffic study (17 units). Therefore, it is not expected to contribute significantly to any traffic congestion or affect any congestion management program. Since the proposed project would not modify or conflict with any alternative transportation policies, plans or programs, it would have impacts that will be less than significant.

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

**Less than Significant.** The project will increase the number of daily trips for the site; however it does not reach a threshold that requires preliminary review by the Department of Transportation for the potential need of a traffic study. Impacts will be less than significant.

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

**Less than Significant.** The project does not involve any design features that are unusual for the area or any incompatible uses. Impacts will be less than significant.

**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. No impact will occur.

## XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project would substantially alter the environmental context of, or remove historical resources with cultural value to a Native American Tribe that are 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). The project includes the demolition of one single-family dwelling and attached garage constructed in 1946 and two commercial buildings constructed in the 1950s. However, none of these structures 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, the Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments Register, and/or any local register. In addition, the site was not found to be a potential historic resource based on SurveyLA, the citywide survey of Los Angeles or the City's HistoricPlacesLA website. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

**b) 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 With Mitigation Incorporated.** Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) established a formal consultation process for California Native American Tribes to identify potential significant impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources, as defined in Public Resources Code §21074, as part of CEQA. As specified in AB 52, lead agencies must provide notice inviting consultation to California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project if the Tribe has submitted a request in writing to be notified of proposed projects. The Tribe must respond in writing within 30 days of the City's AB 52 notice. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) provided a list of Native American groups and individuals who might have knowledge of the religious and/or cultural significance of resources that may be in and near the Project site. An informational letter was mailed to a total of 10 Tribes known to have resources in this area, on June 18, 2021, describing the Project and requesting any information regarding resources that may exist on or near the Project site. On July 8, 2021, the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (FTBMI) responded requesting a formal tribal consultation under the provisions of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CA Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. On May 26, 2022, the FTBMI advised the City that the proposed project is located within a culturally sensitive area and has the potential to impact tribal cultural resources during ground-disturbing activities. The Cultural Resource Management (CRM) Division of the FTBMI requests that the following measures be included in the project's Mitigated Negative Declaration / Conditions of Approval under Tribal Cultural Resources. On June 8, 2022, the City and the FTBMI held formal consultation. On June 14, 2022, the City forwarded the FTBMI draft language for Inadvertent Discovery, and on June 22, 2022, the FTBMI provided no further comments and the City and the FTBMI mutually agreed to close consultation.

As such the following Mitigation Measures has been applied to the project:

### **Tribal Cultural Resources.**

**FTBMI-TCR1:** In the event that cultural resources are discovered during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall assess the find. Work on the portions of the Project outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period. The FTBMI shall be contacted regarding any pre-contact and/or post-contact finds and be provided information after the archaeologist makes their initial assessment of the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal unput with regards to significance and treatment.

**FTBMI-TCR2:** Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), the Project applicant shall retain a professional Native American monitor procured by the FTBMI to observe all remaining ground-disturbing activities including, but not limited to, excavating, digging, trenching, plowing, drilling, tunneling, quarrying, grading, leveling, clearing, driving posts, auguring, blasting, stripping topsoil or similar activity and archaeological work.

**FTBMI-TCR3:** The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with the FTBMI on the disposition and treatment of any Tribal Cultural Resource encountered during all ground disturbing activities.

### **Conditions of Approval for Inadvertent Discovery of Tribal Cultural Resources.**

**Tribal Cultural Resource Inadvertent Discovery.** In the event that objects or artifacts that may be tribal cultural resources are encountered during the course of any ground disturbance activities (excavating, digging, trenching, plowing, drilling, tunneling, quarrying, grading, leveling, removing peat, clearing, driving posts, augering, backfilling, blasting, stripping topsoil or a similar activity), all such activities shall temporarily cease on the project site until the potential tribal cultural resources are properly assessed and addressed pursuant to the process set forth below.

- Upon a discovery of a potential tribal cultural resource, the Applicant shall immediately stop all ground disturbance activities and contact the following: (1) all California Native American tribes that have informed the City they are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project; (2) the Department of City Planning at (213) 978-1271.
- If the City determines pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21074 (a)(2), that the object or artifact appears to be tribal cultural resource, the City shall provide any affected tribe a reasonable period of time, not less than 15 days, to conduct a site visit and make recommendations to the Applicant and the City regarding the monitoring of future ground disturbance activities until this plan is approved by the City.
- If the Applicant does not accept a particular recommendation determined to be reasonable and feasible by the qualified archaeologist or by a culturally affiliated tribal monitor, the Applicant may request mediation by a mediator agreed to by the Applicant and the City who has the requisite professional qualifications and experience to mediate such a dispute. The Applicant shall pay any costs associated with the mediation.
- The Applicant may recommence ground disturbance activities outside of a specified radius of the discovery site, so long as this radius has been reviewed by the qualified archaeologist and by a culturally affiliated tribal monitor and determined to be reasonable and appropriate.
- Copies of any subsequent prehistoric archaeological study, tribal cultural resources study or report, detailing the nature of any significant tribal cultural resources, remedial actions taken, and disposition of any significant tribal cultural resources shall be submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) at California State University, Fullerton.

### **Conditions of Approval for Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains.**

- In the event that human skeletal remains are encountered at the project site during construction or the course of any ground disturbance activities, all such activities shall halt immediately, pursuant to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 which requires that no further ground disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to the origin and disposition pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. In the event human skeletal remains are discovered during construction or during any ground disturbance activities, the following procedures shall be followed:
  - o Stop immediately and contact the County Coroner  
1104 N Mission Road  
Los Angeles, CA 90033  
323-343-0512 (8am to 5pm Monday through Friday) or  
323 343-0714 (After Hours, Saturday, Sunday and Holidays)
  - o If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the Coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC).
  - o The NAHC will immediately notify the person it believes to be the most likely descendent of the deceased Native American.

As such, mitigation is recommended to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

# XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would increase water consumption or wastewater generation to such a degree that the capacity of facilities currently serving the project site would be exceeded. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) conducts water planning based on forecast population growth. The proposal of 17 residential dwelling units (a net addition of 14 dwelling units) as a result of the proposed project would be consistent with Citywide growth, and, therefore, the project demand for water is not anticipated to require new water supply entitlements and/or require the expansion of existing or construction of new water treatment facilities beyond those already considered in



the LADWP 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. 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. Furthermore, the General Plan Framework Element (originally adopted by the City Council in 1996 and readopted in 2001), sets forth a citywide comprehensive long-range growth strategy. Chapter 9 of the Framework Element, Infrastructure and Public Services, identifies the viability of the infrastructure system, including power, as supplied by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, and telecommunications, as provided by public and private entities. The goals, objectives, and policies contained in the Framework Element are implemented on a Citywide basis to ensure the adequacy of housing developments. The Southern California Gas Company provides natural gas to City residents, and the proposed 17 residential dwelling units (a net addition of 14 dwelling units) would not exceed capacity. Finally, both the Department of Water and Power and the Southern California Gas Company utilize energy efficient policies and programs as regulated by the state and the city so that the capacity of infrastructure systems remain adequate to serve City residents. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to water or wastewater, energy, natural gas, and/or telecommunications infrastructure.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would increase water consumption or wastewater generation to such a degree that the capacity of facilities currently serving the project site would be exceeded. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) conducts water planning based on forecast population growth. The proposed 17 residential dwelling units (a net addition of 14 dwelling units) as a result of the proposed project would be consistent with Citywide growth, and, therefore, the project demand for water is not anticipated to require new water supply entitlements and/or require the expansion of existing or construction of new water treatment facilities beyond those already considered in the LADWP 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. 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 supplies.

**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.** 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 wastewater treatment.

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

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

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

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

## XX. WILDFIRE

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

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Los Angeles Emergency Management Department coordinates with City departments, municipalities, and community-based organizations to ensure that the City and its residents have the resources to prepare, respond, and recover from emergencies, disasters and significant events. The City's Emergency Operations Organization comprises all agencies of the City's government, including Fire. The Los Angeles Fire Department actively engages in disaster preparedness and includes fire as one of 13 federally identified threats to the City. Therefore, the proposed 17 residential dwelling units (a net addition of 14 dwelling units) will not significantly impair any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project is a residential housing development located within a highly urbanized area. According to information provided by the applicant, 100% of the site is less than 10% slope. The subject site is not identified on ZIMAS as being located within a hillside area, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, or Fire District No. 1. The subject site is not located within a High Wind Velocity Area. Additionally, the proposed Project is subject to Fire Department review

and regulations. As such, slope, prevailing winds, or other factors will not exacerbate wildfire risks or contribute toward 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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The General Plan Framework Element (originally adopted by the City Council in 1996 and readopted in 2001), sets forth a citywide comprehensive long-range growth strategy. Chapter 9 of the Framework Element, Infrastructure and Public Services, identifies the viability of the infrastructure system, including fire. As development occurs within the City, the Fire Department reviews applications for needed facilities. Where appropriate, construction of new facilities is required as a condition of development.

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 general surrounding area is currently served by Fire Station 77 located at 9224 Sunland Blvd, approximately 1.6 miles north of the subject site.

The proposed project would result in a net increase of 14 residential dwelling units (for a total of 17 residential dwelling units), which could increase the number of emergency calls and demand for LAFD fire and emergency services. To maintain the level of fire protection and emergency services, the LAFD may require additional fire personnel and equipment. However, given that there is an existing fire 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 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 to fire risk.

**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.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be implemented on a site located in a hillside area with unstable geological conditions or soil types that would be susceptible to failure when saturated. The California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Seismic Hazard Zones Maps show that the subject site is not located with a landslide hazard zone. The project site and surrounding area are relatively flat. Additionally, there are no bodies of water, streams, or rivers located in the project vicinity that would expose soil to surface water run-off. The subject site is not located in a flood hazard zone. NavigateLA

shows that a portion of the subject site (located at 11146-11148 W Lorne Street) is located outside of a flood zone in Zone C, while the other portion of the subject site (located at 8032 N Fair Avenue) is located within a 500 year Flood Zone in Zone C. Therefore, there would be no impact due to downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

## XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Based on the analysis in this Initial Study, the proposed project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. The project is located in a developed, urbanized area and will not disrupt or hinder any known habitats. Impacts will be less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project, in conjunction with the related projects, would result in impacts that are less than significant when viewed separately but significant when viewed together. Although projects may be constructed in the project vicinity, the cumulative impacts to which the proposed project would contribute would be less than significant. The immediate adjacent properties are all residential in nature, and there are no known current or future projects in the immediate vicinity that, in conjunction with this proposed project, would result in cumulatively significant environmental impacts. Development of the Project in conjunction with the related projects would result in an incremental intensification of existing prevailing land uses in an already heavily urbanized area of Los Angeles.

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

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation.** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project has the potential to result in significant impacts, as discussed in the preceding sections. All potential impacts of the proposed project have been identified, and mitigation measures have been prescribed, where applicable, to reduce all potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. Upon implementation of the mitigation measure identified, the proposed project would not have the potential to result in substantial adverse impacts on human beings either directly or indirectly.

## **5 PREPARERS AND PERSONS CONSULTED**

Cultural Resources Letter Report – dated April 29, 2022 – Ashley L Hallock, Cultural Resource Specialist, Report Author, and, Heather Kamine, Senior Cultural Resource Specialist, Principal Investigator.

Preliminary Soil Investigation – stamp dated May 03, 2022 – GSS Engineering, INC.

## **6 REFERENCES, ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

ACM - asbestos-containing materials  
AQMP – Air Quality Management Plan  
BMP – Best Management Practices  
BOS – City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation  
CARB – California Air Resources Board  
CDFW – California Department of Fish and Wildlife  
CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act  
CFGC – California Fish and Game Code

CMP – Congestion Management Program  
DTSC – California Department of Toxic Substances Control  
FMMP – Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program  
GHG – greenhouse gasses  
LADBS – Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety  
LADOT – Los Angeles Department of Transportation  
LADWP – Los Angeles Department of Water and Power  
LAFD – Los Angeles Fire Department  
LAGBC – Los Angeles Green Building Code  
LAMC – Los Angeles Municipal Code  
LAPD – Los Angeles Police Department  
LBP – lead-based paint  
LESA - Land Evaluation and Site Assessment  
LID – low impact development  
LST – localized significance thresholds  
MBTA – Migratory Bird Treaty Act  
Metro – Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
MND – Mitigated Negative Declaration  
NAHC – Native American Heritage Commission  
PRC – California Public Resources Code  
RAP – Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks  
REC – Recognized Environmental Condition  
RTP – Regional Transportation Plan  
SCAG – Southern California Association of Governments  
SCAQMD – South Coast Air Quality Management District  
SCCIC - Central Coastal Information Center  
SCS – Sustainable Communities Strategy  
TDP - Treatment and Disposition Plan  
UBC – Uniform Building Code  
USFWS – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services