

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

**LEAD CITY AGENCY**  
 City of Los Angeles

**COUNCIL DISTRICT**  
 CD 14 - JOSÉ HUIZAR

**PROJECT TITLE**  
 ENV-2017-2051-ND

**CASE NO.**  
 APCE-2017-2050-ZAA-SPP-SPE

**PROJECT LOCATION**  
 1525 W COLORADO BLVD

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The proposed project includes the demolition of an existing one-story retail/auto repair building that is approximately 2,254 square feet in size; and the construction, use and maintenance of a mixed-use development consisting of six (6) residential townhouse units, a total of 1,016 square feet of office/retail commercial space and 3,636 square feet of roof deck areas. The project will contain 14 vehicle parking spaces, and 12 bicycle parking spaces of which eight (8) will be long-term spaces and four (4) will be short-term spaces. The building will be 46 feet 7 inches in height, with 10,379 square feet of floor area for a property that is 9,461.4 square feet in size, resulting in a 1.1:1 Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The site is zoned [Q]C4-2D with a General Plan Land Use designation of Neighborhood Commercial in the Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan.

The requested entitlements are a Specific Plan Exception from the Colorado Boulevard Specific Plan to allow a 10-percent increase in the maximum FAR permitted from 1:1 to 1.1:1, a Zoning Administrator's Adjustment to allow a six (6)-foot passageway in lieu of 12 feet as otherwise required, and a Specific Plan Project Permit Compliance Review.

**NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT IF OTHER THAN CITY AGENCY**

CARLIE YAPP  
 803 CONNIE DR  
 CAMPBELL, CA 95008

**FINDING:**

The City Planning Department of the City of Los Angeles has Proposed that a negative declaration be adopted for this project. The Initial Study indicates that no significant impacts are apparent which might result from this project's implementation. This action is based on the project description above.

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

THE INITIAL STUDY PREPARED FOR THIS PROJECT IS ATTACHED.

**NAME OF PERSON PREPARING THIS FORM**

**TITLE**

**TELEPHONE NUMBER**

NURI CHO

City Planning Associate

(213) 978-1177

**ADDRESS**

**SIGNATURE (Official)**

**DATE**

200 N. SPRING STREET, 7th FLOOR  
 LOS ANGELES, CA. 90012

May 13, 2019

**CITY OF LOS ANGELES**  
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK  
ROOM 395, CITY HALL  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012  
**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT**  
**INITIAL STUDY**  
**and CHECKLIST**  
(CEQA Guidelines Section 15063)

|   |   |                            |
|---|---|----------------------------|
| <b>LEAD CITY AGENCY:</b><br>City of Los Angeles   | <b>COUNCIL DISTRICT:</b><br>CD 14 - JOSÉ HUIZAR   | <b>DATE:</b><br>04/11/2019 |
| <b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES:</b> Department of City Planning  |   |                            |
| <b>ENVIRONMENTAL CASE:</b><br>ENV-2017-2051-ND  | <b>RELATED CASES:</b><br>APCE-2017-2050-ZAA-SPP-SPE   |                            |
| <b>PREVIOUS ACTIONS CASE NO.:</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Does have significant changes from previous actions.<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does NOT have significant changes from previous actions. |                            |
| <b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION:</b><br>DEMO OF AN EXISTING RETAIL / AUTO REPAIR BUILDING, AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW MIXED-USE OFFICE AND RESIDENTIAL BUILDING WITH SIX UNITS  |   |                            |
| <b>ENV PROJECT DESCRIPTION:</b><br><p>The proposed project includes the demolition of an existing one-story retail/auto repair building that is approximately 2,254 square feet in size; and the construction, use and maintenance of a mixed-use development consisting of six (6) residential townhouse units, a total of 1,016 square feet of office/retail commercial space and 3,636 square feet of roof deck areas. The project will contain 14 vehicle parking spaces, and 12 bicycle parking spaces of which eight (8) will be long-term spaces and four (4) will be short-term spaces. The building will be 46 feet 7 inches in height, with 10,379 square feet of floor area for a property that is 9,461.4 square feet in size, resulting in a 1.1:1 Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The site is zoned [Q]C4-2D with a General Plan Land Use designation of Neighborhood Commercial in the Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan.</p> <p>The requested entitlements are a Specific Plan Exception from the Colorado Boulevard Specific Plan to allow a 10-percent increase in the maximum FAR permitted from 1:1 to 1.1:1, a Zoning Administrator's Adjustment to allow a six (6)-foot passageway in lieu of 12 feet as otherwise required, and a Specific Plan Project Permit Compliance Review.</p>   |   |                            |
| <b>ENVIRONMENTAL SETTINGS:</b><br><p>The subject site consists of a rectangular-shaped lot with a total area of 9,461.4 square feet, with a frontage of approximately 51.33 feet on the north side of West Colorado Boulevard. The site is presently occupied by a retail/auto repair building that was constructed in 1928, which will be demolished as part of the proposed project.</p> <p>The subject property is zoned [Q]C4-2D with a Neighborhood Commercial General Plan Land Use Designation, and located within the Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan Area and Subarea III of the Colorado Boulevard Specific Plan.</p> <p>Ingress to the site will be through a 10-foot non-exclusive easement accessed through North Dahlia Drive, which is designated a Local Street with an approximate 36-foot roadway, and egress will be through West Colorado Boulevard, which is designated a Boulevard II with an approximate 80-foot roadway.</p> <p>The project will export 100 cubic yards of earth material.</p> <p>The property is located within the Raymond Fault Zone (Fault Type B), a Special Grading Area (BOE Basic Grid Map A-13372), a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and a Liquefaction Zone.</p> <p>Surrounding lots to the North are zoned R1-1 with a General Plan Land Use designation of Low Residential, consisting of single-family residences. The lots to the East and West are zoned [Q]C4-2D with General Plan Land Use designations of Neighborhood Commercial, and consist of a mixed-use commercial and residential building and a motel, respectively. The lots to the South are zoned PF-1 with a General Plan Land Use designation of Public Facilities, and consist of an elementary school.</p> |   |                            |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>PROJECT LOCATION:</b><br>1525 W COLORADO BLVD  |  |  |
| <b>COMMUNITY PLAN AREA:</b><br>NORTHEAST LOS ANGELES<br><b>STATUS:</b><br><br><input type="checkbox"/> Does NOT Conform to Plan<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Conform to Plan | <b>AREA PLANNING COMMISSION:</b><br>EAST LOS ANGELES                             | <b>CERTIFIED NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL:</b><br>EAGLE ROCK |
| <b>EXISTING ZONING:</b><br>[Q]C4-2D   | <b>MAX. DENSITY/INTENSITY ALLOWED BY ZONING:</b><br>1 d.u./1,500 sq. ft.         | LA River Adjacent:                                   |
| <b>GENERAL PLAN LAND USE:</b><br>NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL  | <b>MAX. DENSITY/INTENSITY ALLOWED BY PLAN DESIGNATION:</b><br>1 d.u./400 sq. ft. |  |
|   | <b>PROPOSED PROJECT DENSITY:</b><br>1 d.u./1,576 sq. ft.                         |  |

## Determination (To Be Completed By Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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



City Planning Associate

(213) 978-1177

Signature

Title

Phone

### Evaluation Of Environmental Impacts:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less 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 Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may 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 whatever 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.

## 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<br><input type="checkbox"/> AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES<br><input type="checkbox"/> AIR QUALITY<br><input type="checkbox"/> BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES<br><input type="checkbox"/> CULTURAL RESOURCES<br><input type="checkbox"/> ENERGY<br><input type="checkbox"/> GEOLOGY AND SOILS | <input type="checkbox"/> GREEN HOUSE GAS EMISSIONS<br><input type="checkbox"/> HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS<br><input type="checkbox"/> HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY<br><input type="checkbox"/> LAND USE AND PLANNING<br><input type="checkbox"/> MINERAL RESOURCES<br><input type="checkbox"/> NOISE | <input type="checkbox"/> POPULATION AND HOUSING<br><input type="checkbox"/> PUBLIC SERVICES<br><input type="checkbox"/> RECREATION<br><input type="checkbox"/> TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC<br><input type="checkbox"/> TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES<br><input type="checkbox"/> UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS<br><input type="checkbox"/> WILDFIRE | <input type="checkbox"/> MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE |
|---|--|--|---|

### INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST (To be completed by the Lead City Agency)

*Background*

**PROPONENT NAME:**

CARLIE YAPP

**PHONE NUMBER:**

(888) 311-6740

**APPLICANT ADDRESS:**

803 CONNIE DR  
 CAMPBELL, CA 95008

**AGENCY REQUIRING CHECKLIST:**

Department of City Planning

**DATE SUBMITTED:**

05/24/2017

**PROPOSAL NAME (if Applicable):**

| Potentially significant impact | Less than significant with mitigation incorporated | Less than significant impact | No impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

| <b>I. AESTHETICS</b>                        |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|
| 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.  | Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  |  | ✓ |
| d.  | Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?  |  | ✓ |
| <b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES</b> |   |  |   |
| 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 nonagricultural use?  |  | ✓ |
| b.  | Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?   |  | ✓ |
| 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))?                           |  | ✓ |
| d.  | Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?   |  | ✓ |
| 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?   |  | ✓ |
| <b>III. AIR QUALITY</b>                     |   |  |   |
| a.  | Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?  |  | ✓ |
| b.  | Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?   |  | ✓ |
| c.  | Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?                          |  | ✓ |
| d.  | Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?   |  | ✓ |
| e.  | Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?  |  | ✓ |
| <b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>             |   |  |   |
| 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? |  | ✓ |
| 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?   |  | ✓ |
| c.  | Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?   |  | ✓ |
| 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?   |  | ✓ |
| e.  | Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  |  | ✓ |
| f.  | Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?   |  | ✓ |
| <b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>                |   |  |   |

|  | Potentially significant impact | Less than significant with mitigation incorporated | Less than significant impact | No impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?  |                                |  | ✓                            |           |
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?   |                                |  | ✓                            |           |
| c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?  |                                |  | ✓                            |           |
| d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?   |                                |  | ✓                            |           |
| <b>VI. ENERGY</b>  |                                |  |                              |           |
| a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.  |                                |  | ✓                            |           |
| b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?  |                                |  | ✓                            |           |
| <b>VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>  |                                |  |                              |           |
| a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. |                                |  |                              | ✓         |
| b. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Strong seismic ground shaking?  |                                |  | ✓                            |           |
| c. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?   |                                |  | ✓                            |           |
| d. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Landslides?   |                                |  |                              | ✓         |
| e. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?  |                                |  | ✓                            |           |
| f. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?   |                                |  | ✓                            |           |
| g. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?   |                                |  | ✓                            |           |
| h. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?   |                                |  | ✓                            |           |
| <b>VIII. GREEN HOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</b>   |                                |  |                              |           |
| a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?  |                                |  | ✓                            |           |
| b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?   |                                |  | ✓                            |           |
| <b>IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>   |                                |  |                              |           |
| a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  |                                |  | ✓                            |           |
| 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?  |                                |  | ✓                            |           |
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  |                                |  | ✓                            |           |
| 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?   |                                |  |                              | ✓         |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?   |                                |  |                              | ✓         |

| Potentially significant impact | Less than significant with mitigation incorporated | Less than significant impact | No impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

|    |   |  |  |   |   |
|----|---|--|--|---|---|
| f. | For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  |  |  |   | ✓ |
| g. | Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  |  |  |   | ✓ |
| h. | Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? |  |  | ✓ |   |

#### X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

|    |   |  |  |   |   |
|----|---|--|--|---|---|
| a. | Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?  |  |  | ✓ |   |
| b. | Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? |  |  | ✓ |   |
| c. | Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?   |  |  | ✓ |   |
| d. | Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?  |  |  | ✓ |   |
| e. | Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?  |  |  | ✓ |   |
| f. | Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?  |  |  |   | ✓ |
| g. | Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?   |  |  |   | ✓ |
| h. | Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?  |  |  |   | ✓ |
| i. | Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?   |  |  |   | ✓ |
| j. | Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?  |  |  |   | ✓ |

#### XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

|    |  |  |  |  |   |
|----|--|--|--|--|---|
| a. | Physically divide an established community?  |  |  |  | ✓ |
| b. | Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? |  |  |  | ✓ |
| c. | Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?   |  |  |  | ✓ |

#### XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

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

#### XIII. NOISE

|    |  |  |  |   |  |
|----|--|--|--|---|--|
| a. | Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? |  |  | ✓ |  |
| b. | Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?   |  |  | ✓ |  |
| c. | A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  |  |  | ✓ |  |
| d. | A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  |  |  | ✓ |  |

| Potentially significant impact | Less than significant with mitigation incorporated | Less than significant impact | No impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

|                                     |   |  |  |   |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|
| e.                                  | For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?  |  |  |   | ✓ |
| f.                                  | For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?   |  |  |   | ✓ |
| <b>XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING</b>  |   |  |  |   |   |
| a.                                  | Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?  |  |  | ✓ |   |
| b.                                  | Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?  |  |  |   | ✓ |
| c.                                  | Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?  |  |  |   | ✓ |
| <b>XV. PUBLIC SERVICES</b>          |   |  |  |   |   |
| a.                                  | 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: Fire protection?         |  |  | ✓ |   |
| b.                                  | 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: Police protection?       |  |  | ✓ |   |
| c.                                  | 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: Schools?                 |  |  | ✓ |   |
| d.                                  | 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: Parks?                   |  |  | ✓ |   |
| e.                                  | 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: Other public facilities? |  |  | ✓ |   |
| <b>XVI. RECREATION</b>              |   |  |  |   |   |
| 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?   |  |  | ✓ |   |
| 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?  |  |  | ✓ |   |
| <b>XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</b> |   |  |  |   |   |
| a.                                  | Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?                        |  |  | ✓ |   |

| Potentially significant impact | Less than significant with mitigation incorporated | Less than significant impact | No impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

|    |   |  |  |   |   |
|----|---|--|--|---|---|
| b. | Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?   |  |  | ✓ |   |
| c. | Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?  |  |  |   | ✓ |
| d. | Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?   |  |  | ✓ |   |
| e. | Result in inadequate emergency access?  |  |  |   | ✓ |
| f. | Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? |  |  |   | ✓ |

**XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**

|    |  |  |  |   |  |
|----|--|--|--|---|--|
| a. | 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), or  |  |  | ✓ |  |
| b. | 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. |  |  | ✓ |  |

**XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

|    |  |  |  |   |  |
|----|--|--|--|---|--|
| a. | Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?   |  |  | ✓ |  |
| b. | Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                            |  |  | ✓ |  |
| c. | Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                                     |  |  | ✓ |  |
| d. | Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  |  |  | ✓ |  |
| e. | Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? |  |  | ✓ |  |
| f. | Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?  |  |  | ✓ |  |
| g. | Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?   |  |  | ✓ |  |

**XX. WILDFIRE**

|    |   |  |  |   |   |
|----|---|--|--|---|---|
| a. | Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?   |  |  | ✓ |   |
| b. | Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?   |  |  |   | ✓ |
| c. | Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? |  |  | ✓ |   |

| Potentially significant impact | Less than significant with mitigation incorporated | Less than significant impact | No impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

|  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| 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?  |  |  | ✓ |  |
| <b>XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>   |  |  |   |  |
| a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? |  |  | ✓ |  |
| 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)?   |  |  | ✓ |  |
| c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?  |  |  | ✓ |  |

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083, 21083.05, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 65088.4, Gov. Code; Sections 21080, 21083.05, 21095, Pub. Resources Code; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

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

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

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

The project as identified in the project description will not cause potentially significant impacts on the environment. Therefore, this environmental analysis concludes that a Negative Declaration shall be issued for the environmental case file known as **ENV-2017-2051-ND** and the associated case(s), **APCE-2017-2050-ZAA-SPP-SPE**.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:**

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

For City information, addresses and phone numbers: visit the City's website at <http://www.lacity.org> ; City Planning - and Zoning Information Mapping Automated System (ZIMAS) [cityplanning.lacity.org/](http://cityplanning.lacity.org/) or EIR Unit, City Hall, 200 N Spring Street, Room 763.

Seismic Hazard Maps - <http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/>

Engineering/Infrastructure/Topographic Maps/Parcel Information - <http://boemaps.eng.ci.la.ca.us/index01.htm> or

City's main website under the heading "Navigate LA".

|                                 |  |   |                            |
|---------------------------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| <b>PREPARED BY:</b><br>Nuri Cho | <b>TITLE:</b><br>City Planning Associate | <b>TELEPHONE NO.:</b><br>(213) 978-1177 | <b>DATE:</b><br>04/11/2019 |
|---------------------------------|--|---|----------------------------|

| Impact? | Explanation | Mitigation Measures |
|---------|-------------|---------------------|
|---------|-------------|---------------------|

**APPENDIX A: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS EXPLANATION TABLE**

**I. AESTHETICS**

|    |                              |   |
|----|------------------------------|---|
| a. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. A scenic vista refers to views of focal points or panoramic views of broader geographic areas that have visual interest. A focal point view would consist of a view of a notable object, building, or setting. An impact on a scenic vista would occur if the bulk or design of a building or development contrasts enough with a visually interesting view, so that the quality of the view is permanently affected. The project site is located in the northern portion of the Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan Area, in the Colorado Boulevard Specific Plan and approximately 7.0 miles northeast of downtown Los Angeles. The area has a pattern of low density residential uses interspersed with areas of higher density residential and commercial uses along major boulevards. Long narrow corridors of commercial activity can be found along major boulevards, including Colorado Blvd, Eagle Rock Blvd, and York Blvd. In the immediate vicinity of the project site, Colorado Boulevard is developed with a mix of low-rise multi-family residential uses and commercial uses. Therefore, although the proposed project would increase the height and massing of development on the project site, project implementation would not obstruct any views of unique scenic vistas or focal points. Therefore, impacts related to scenic vistas would be less than significant. Development of the proposed project would result in an incremental intensification of existing prevailing land uses in an already urbanized area of Los Angeles. Furthermore, development of the project and related projects is expected to occur in accordance with adopted plans and regulations. Therefore, cumulative aesthetic impacts would be less than significant.</p> |
| b. | NO IMPACT                    | <p>A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially damage scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway. The City of Los Angeles' General Plan Mobility Element (Citywide General Plan Circulation System Maps) as well as the CalTrans website at <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/angeles.htm">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/angeles.htm</a> indicate that no State-designated scenic highways are located near the project site. Therefore, no impacts related to a State scenic highway would occur.</p>  |
| c. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>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 project area is developed with a mix of land uses, including residential, commercial and institutional. The Dahlia Heights Elementary School is located to the south of the project site across Colorado Boulevard. Immediately east and west of the project site are a mixed-use commercial and residential project, and a motel, respectively. Immediately north of the project site are single-family residences. 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.</p>  |

| Impact? | Explanation | Mitigation Measures |
|---------|-------------|---------------------|
|---------|-------------|---------------------|

|    |                              |  |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| d. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>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 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.</p> |
|----|------------------------------|--|

**II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES**

|    |           |  |
|----|-----------|--|
| a. | NO IMPACT | <p>A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would convert valued farmland to non-agricultural uses. The project site is developed with a one-story commercial building, and is surrounded by other developed properties. No Farmland, agricultural uses, or related operations are present within the project site or surrounding area. Due to its urban setting, the project site and surrounding area are not included in the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, the proposed project would not convert any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use, and no impact would occur.</p> |
| b. | NO IMPACT | <p>A significant impact would occur if the proposed project conflicted with existing agricultural zoning or agricultural parcels enrolled under the Williamson Act. The project site is not zoned for agricultural use or under a Williamson Act Contract. As the project site and surrounding area do not contain farmland of any type, the proposed project would not conflict with a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, no impacts would occur.</p>  |
| c. | NO IMPACT | <p>A significant impact would occur if the proposed project conflicted with existing zoning or cause rezoning of forest land or timberland, or result in the loss of forest land or in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The project site and the surrounding area are not zoned for forest land or timberland. Accordingly, the proposed project would not conflict with forest land or timberland zoning or result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact would occur.</p>   |
| d. | NO IMPACT | <p>A significant impact would occur if the proposed project conflicted with existing zoning or cause rezoning of forest land or timberland, or result in the loss of forest land or in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The project site and the surrounding area are not zoned for forest land or timberland. Accordingly, the proposed project would not conflict with forest land or timberland zoning or result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact would occur.</p>   |
| e. | NO IMPACT | <p>A significant impact would occur if the proposed project caused the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. The project site does not contain farmland, forestland, or timberland. Therefore, no impacts would occur.</p>   |

**III. AIR QUALITY**

| Impact? | Explanation | Mitigation Measures |
|---------|-------------|---------------------|
|---------|-------------|---------------------|

|    |                              |  |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| a. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>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.</p>  |
| b. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Based on published studies for similar projects, during the construction phase the proposed project would not likely exceed the regional SCAQMD significance thresholds for emissions of Carbon Monoxide (CO), Reactive Organic Compounds (ROG), Nitrogen Oxides (NOx), Particulate Matter (PM10 and PM2.5), and Sulfur Dioxide (SOx). Therefore, regional emission impacts for the proposed project would be less than significant for all construction phases. Motor vehicles that access the project site would be the predominant source of long-term project operations emissions. Additional emissions would be generated by area sources, such as energy use and landscape maintenance activities. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to regional operational emissions. The project would be subject to Regulatory Compliance Measures, which reduce the impacts of operational and construction regional emissions.</p>   |
| c. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>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 (O3), Respirable Particulate Matter (PM10 and PM2.5), 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 (NO2), Sulfur Oxides (SOx), and lead (Pb). Because the Basin is designated as a State and/or federal nonattainment air basin for O3, PM10, PM2.5, and NO2, 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 (6 units) would not likely exceed the project-level SCAQMD localized significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants and the impact would be less than significant.</p> |
| d. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>Based on the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide, a significant impact may occur if a project were to generate pollutant concentrations to a degree that would significantly affect sensitive receptors. The SCAQMD identifies the following as sensitive receptors: long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities. The SCAQMD has developed localized significance thresholds (LSTs) that are based on the</p>   |

| Impact?                         | Explanation   | Mitigation Measures  |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
|                                 | <p>amount of maximum daily localized construction emissions per day that can be generated by a project that would cause or contribute to adverse localized air quality impacts. These apply to projects that are less than or equal to five acres in size and are only applicable to Respirable Particulate Matter (PM10 and PM2.5), Carbon Monoxide (CO), and Nitrogen Oxides (NOx). The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has published guidance for locating new sensitive receptors (e.g., residences) away from nearby sources of air pollution. Relevant recommendations include avoiding siting new sensitive land uses within 500 feet of a freeway or 300 feet of a large gas station (defined as a facility with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater). The location of the proposed project would be consistent with the CARB recommendations for locating new sensitive receptors. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact.</p> |  |
| e.                              | <p>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</p>   | <p>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.</p> |
| <b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b> |   |  |
| a.                              | <p>NO IMPACT</p>  | <p>A significant biological impact would occur through the loss or destruction of individuals of a species or through the degradation of sensitive habitat. The subject site is currently occupied by a one-story structure with minimal vegetation. Development of the project site will most likely not have an 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and no impacts would occur.</p>   |
| b.                              | <p>NO IMPACT</p>  | <p>A significant impact would occur if any riparian habitat or natural community would be lost or destroyed as a result of urban development. The project site does not contain any riparian habitat and does not contain any streams or water courses necessary to support riparian habitat. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or the United States Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS), and no impacts would occur.</p>   |
| c.                              | <p>NO IMPACT</p>  | <p>A significant impact would occur if federally protected wetlands would be modified or removed by a project. The project site does not contain any federally protected wetlands, wetland resources, or other waters of the United States as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The project site is located in a highly urbanized area and developed/previously developed with residential, office, and commercial uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means, and no impacts would occur.</p>  |

| Impact? | Explanation | Mitigation Measures |
|---------|-------------|---------------------|
|---------|-------------|---------------------|

|    |           |   |
|----|-----------|---|
| d. | NO IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would interfere with, or remove access to, a migratory wildlife corridor or impede use of native wildlife nursery sites. Due to the highly urbanized nature of the project site and surrounding area, the lack of a major water body, and the limited number of trees, the project site does not support habitat for native resident or migratory species or contain native nurseries. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere with wildlife movement or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, and no impact would occur.   |
| e. | 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 (CFGF). Both the MBTA and CDFW protects migratory birds that may use trees on or adjacent to the project site for nesting, and may be disturbed during construction of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance (e.g., oak trees or California walnut woodlands), and no impacts would occur. |
| f. | NO IMPACT | The project site and its vicinity are not part of any draft or adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan, and no impacts would occur.   |

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

|    |                              |  |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| a. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially alter the environmental context of, or remove identified historical resources. The project includes the demolition of an existing retail/auto repair building. However, the site has not been identified as a historic resource by local or state agencies, and the project site has not been determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, the Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments Register, and/or any local register. In addition, the site was not found to be a potential historic resource based on SurveyLA, the citywide survey of Los Angeles or the City's HistoricPlacesLA website. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.  |
| b. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if a known or unknown archaeological resource would be removed, altered, or destroyed as a result of the proposed development. Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines significant archaeological resources as resources that meet the criteria for historical resources or resources that constitute unique archaeological resources. A project-related significant impact could occur if a project would significantly affect archaeological resources that fall under either of these categories. If archaeological resources are discovered during excavation, grading, or construction activities, work shall cease in the area of the find until a qualified archaeologist has evaluated the find in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Per regulatory compliance measures, personnel of the proposed project shall not collect or move any archaeological materials and associated materials. Construction activity may continue unimpeded on other portions of the project site. The found deposits would be |

| Impact?           | Explanation                  | Mitigation Measures  |
|-------------------|------------------------------|--|
|                   |                              | treated in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.  |
| c.                | 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.   |
| d.                | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if previously interred human remains would be disturbed during excavation of the project site. Human remains could be encountered during excavation and grading activities associated with the proposed project. While no formal cemeteries, other places of human interment, or burial grounds or sites are known to occur within the project area, there is always a possibility that human remains can be encountered during construction. If human remains are encountered unexpectedly during construction demolition and/or grading activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98. If human remains of Native American origin are discovered during project construction, compliance with state laws, which fall within the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) (Public Resource Code Section 5097), relating to the disposition of Native American burials will be adhered to. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.  |
| <b>VI. ENERGY</b> |                              |  |
| a.                | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | The proposed project is would be 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. In accordance with the City of Los Angeles Green Building Code (Chapter IX, Article 9, of the Los Angeles Municipal Code), the Project shall comply with all applicable mandatory provisions of the 2013 Los Angeles Green Code and as it may be subsequently amended or modified. Therefore, the impacts would be less than significant.   |
| b.                | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would conflict or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The proposed project is would be 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. In accordance with the City of Los Angeles Green Building Code (Chapter IX, Article 9, of the Los Angeles Municipal Code), the Project shall comply with all applicable mandatory provisions of the 2013 Los Angeles Green Code and as it may be subsequently amended or modified. In addition, the project will be subject to SB 375, which requires the metropolitan planning organizations to prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in their regional transportation plans to achieve the per capita GHG reduction targets. For the SCAG region, the SCS is contained in the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS focuses the majority of new housing and job growth in high-quality transit areas and other opportunity areas on existing main streets, in downtowns, and |

| Impact? | Explanation   | Mitigation Measures |
|---------|---|---------------------|
|         | <p>commercial corridors, resulting in more opportunity for transit-oriented development. In addition, SB 743, adopted September 27, 2013, encourages land use and transportation planning decisions that reduce vehicle miles traveled, which contribute to GHG emissions, as required by AB 32. The project would provide infill residential development proximate to a major transportation corridor (i.e., Colorado Boulevard) and would not interfere with SCAG's ability to implement the regional strategies outlined in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. The proposed project, therefore, would be consistent with statewide, regional and local goals and policies aimed at reducing inefficient energy consumption and would result in a less-than-significant impact.</p> |                     |

**VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

|    |                              |  |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| a. | NO IMPACT                    | <p>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 project site is located within the Raymond Fault but not within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone or a 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 impact would occur.</p> |
| b. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>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. The project site is within the Raymond Fault Zone, Fault Type B. 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. Furthermore, the potential for exposing people or structures to</p>  |

| Impact? | Explanation                  | Mitigation Measures   |
|---------|------------------------------|---|
|         |                              | <p>seismic risks would be further reduced with the following applicable Regulatory Compliance Measures (RCM) RC-GEO-1, which requires the design and construction of the project 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, in conjunction with the above RCM and CDMG requirements, impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.</p>  |
| c.      | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>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. Liquefaction is the loss of soil strength or stiffness due to a buildup of pore-water pressure during severe ground shaking. While the subject site is located within a Liquefaction Zone, specific Regulatory Compliance Measures in the City of Los Angeles regulate the grading and construction of projects in these particular types of locations and will reduce any potential impacts to less than significant. Regulatory Compliance Measures (RCMs) include the Uniform Building Code Chapter 18, Division 1, Section 1804.5: Liquefaction Potential and Soil Strength Loss. These RCMs have been historically proven to work to the satisfaction of the City Engineer to reduce any impacts from the specific environment the project is located. Furthermore, the applicant submitted a geology and soils report to the Department of Building and Safety for review. The Building and Safety, Grading Department issued a Soils Approval Letter dated July 26, 2018 (Log Reference #104341) and their conditions are incorporated herein, by reference. Therefore, impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be less than significant.</p>   |
| d.      | NO IMPACT                    | <p>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. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential effects resulting from landslides, and no impacts would occur.</p>  |
| e.      | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>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 during site clearance, excavation, and grading, which could create the potential for soil erosion to occur. The potential to result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil would be further reduced with the following applicable Regulatory Compliance Measures (RCM) RC-WQ-1, which requires that all wastewater from the project be treated according to requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) as authorized by the Los Angeles Building Code and the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) through the City's Stormwater Management Division. In addition, the proposed project would be required to develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would require implementation of an erosion control plan to reduce the potential for wind or waterborne erosion during the construction process. Furthermore, RC-GEO-6 requires that expansive soils areas be assessed in a geotechnical report and compliance with conditions contained in the Department of Building and Safety's Soils Report Approval letter when issued. In addition, all onsite grading and site preparation would be required to comply with applicable provisions of Chapter</p> |

| Impact? | Explanation | Mitigation Measures |
|---------|-------------|---------------------|
|---------|-------------|---------------------|

|    |                              |  |
|----|------------------------------|--|
|    |                              | IX, Division 70 of the LAMC, and conditions imposed by the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety's Soils Report Approval Letter July 26, 2018 (Log Reference #104341). Therefore, in conjunction with the above RCMs and the Department of Building and Safety's Soils Report Approval Letter, a less than significant impact would occur with respect to erosion or loss of topsoil.  |
| f. | 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. The project site is not identified as being located in an oil field or within an oil drilling area. The potential for the proposed project to expose people or structures to geological failure would be further reduced with the following applicable Regulatory Compliance Measure (RCM) RC-GEO-1, as described in Section VI.b; RC-GEO-2, which requires that the grading plan conform with the City's Landform Grading Manual guidelines, subject to approval by the Department of Building and Safety's Grading Division, and appropriate erosion control and drainage devices to the satisfaction of the Building and Safety Department; RC-GEO-4, which includes the Uniform Building Code Chapter 18, Division 1, Section 1804.5: Liquefaction Potential and Soil Strength Loss and has been historically proven to work to the satisfaction of the City Engineer to reduce impacts from the specific environment the project is located; and RC-GEO-6, as described in Section VI.e. Therefore, in conjunction with the above RCMs and with the implementation of the Building Code requirements and the Department of Building and Safety's Soils Report Approval Letter dated July 26, 2018 (Log Reference #104341) with conditions that must be complied with during the site development, the potential for landslide lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse would be less than significant. |
| g. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be built on expansive soils without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for project buildings, thus, posing a hazard to life and property. Expansive soils have relatively high clay mineral and expand with the addition of water and shrink when dried, which can cause damage to overlying structures. However, the proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements of the UBC, LAMC, and other applicable building codes. Compliance with such requirements would reduce impacts related to expansive soils, and impacts would be less than significant.  |
| h. | 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.   |

**VIII. GREEN HOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

| Impact? | Explanation | Mitigation Measures |
|---------|-------------|---------------------|
|---------|-------------|---------------------|

|    |                              |  |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| a. | 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. The City has adopted the LA Green Plan to provide a citywide plan for achieving the City's GHG emissions targets, for both existing and future generation of GHG emissions. In order to implement the goal of improving energy conservation and efficiency, the Los Angeles City Council has adopted multiple ordinances and updates to establish the current Los Angeles Green Building Code (LAGBC) (Ordinance No. 181,480). The LAGBC requires projects to achieve a 20 percent reduction in potable water use and wastewater generation. Through required implementation of the LAGBC, the proposed project would be consistent with local and statewide goals and policies aimed at reducing the generation of GHGs. Therefore, the proposed project's generation of GHG emissions would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to emissions and impacts would be less than significant.  |
| b. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | The California legislature passed Senate Bill (SB) 375 to connect regional transportation planning to land use decisions made at a local level. SB 375 requires the metropolitan planning organizations to prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in their regional transportation plans to achieve the per capita GHG reduction targets. For the SCAG region, the SCS is contained in the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS focuses the majority of new housing and job growth in high-quality transit areas and other opportunity areas on existing main streets, in downtowns, and commercial corridors, resulting in more opportunity for transit-oriented development. In addition, SB 743, adopted September 27, 2013, encourages land use and transportation planning decisions that reduce vehicle miles traveled, which contribute to GHG emissions, as required by AB 32. The project would provide infill residential development proximate to a major transportation corridor (i.e., Colorado Boulevard) and would not interfere with SCAG's ability to implement the regional strategies outlined in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. The proposed project, therefore, would be consistent with statewide, regional and local goals and policies aimed at reducing GHG emissions and would result in a less-than-significant impact related to plans that target the reduction of GHG emissions. |

**IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

|    |                              |   |
|----|------------------------------|---|
| a. | 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 mixed-use residential and retail/commercial 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, |
|----|------------------------------|---|

| Impact? | Explanation | Mitigation Measures |
|---------|-------------|---------------------|
|---------|-------------|---------------------|

|    |                              |   |
|----|------------------------------|---|
|    |                              | and impacts would be less than significant.   |
| b. | 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 commercial building on the project site was built in 1928 and therefore 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. | 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. Dahlia Heights Elementary School is located approximately 200 feet across W. Colorado Blvd south of the project site. The proposed project would provide for a mixed-use, infill development that consists of residential and retail uses. These types of uses would be expected to use and store very small amounts of hazardous materials, such as paints, solvents, cleaners, pesticides, etc. All hazardous materials within the project site would be acquired, handled, used, stored, transported, and disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, State, and local requirements. With this compliance, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact.   |
| d. | NO IMPACT                    | A significant impact would occur if the project site is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) maintains a database (EnviroStor) that provides access to detailed information on hazardous waste permitted sites and corrective action facilities, as well as existing site cleanup information. EnviroStor also provides information on investigation, cleanup, permitting, and/or corrective actions that are planned, being conducted, or have been completed under DTSC's oversight. A review of EnviroStor did not identify any records of hazardous waste facilities on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites or create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, and no impact would occur. |
| e. | NO 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. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area, and no impacts would occur.  |
| f. | NO 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. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area, and no impacts would occur.  |
| g. | NO IMPACT                    | The nearest emergency route is North Figueroa Street approximately 0.65 miles to the southeast of the project site (City of Los Angeles, Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan, Critical Facilities and Lifeline Systems, Exhibit H, November 1996.) The proposed project would not require the closure of any public or private streets and would not impede emergency vehicle access to the project site or surrounding area. Additionally, emergency access to and from the project site would be provided in accordance with requirements of the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD). Therefore, the   |

| Impact?                          | Explanation | Mitigation Measures   |
|----------------------------------|-------------|---|
|                                  |             | proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and no impact would occur.  |
| h. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT. |             | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project exposed people and structures to high risk of wildfire. 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 D, the site is located in a Fire Buffer Zone. The project site is located in a Very High Fire Severity Zone a short distance from hills, which are subject to wildland fires. However, the proposed project would be designed and constructed in accordance with State and local Building and Fire Codes, including installing sprinklers and planting fire resistant landscaping as appropriate, to reduce the potential for exposure of people or structures to wildfires to the maximum extent possible. Therefore, the impact of the project in exposing people or structures to a risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, would be less than significant. |

**X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

|    |                              |  |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| a. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project discharges water that does not meet the quality standards of agencies which regulate surface water quality and water discharge into storm water drainage systems, or does not comply with all applicable regulations as governed by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB). Stormwater runoff from the proposed project has the potential to introduce small amounts of pollutants into the stormwater system. Pollutants would be associated with runoff from landscaped areas (pesticides and fertilizers) and paved surfaces (ordinary household cleaners). Thus, the proposed project would be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) standards and the City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control regulations (Ordinance No. 172,176 and No. 173,494) to ensure pollutant loads from the project site are minimized for downstream receiving waters. The 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. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially deplete groundwater or interferes with groundwater recharge. The proposed project would not require the use of groundwater at the project site. Potable water would be supplied by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), which draws its water supplies from distant sources for which it conducts its own assessment and mitigation of potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the project would not require direct additions or withdrawals of groundwater. Excavation to accommodate subterranean levels is not being proposed and the scope of the work would not result in the interception of existing aquifers or penetration of the existing water table. Therefore, the impact on groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge would be less than significant.  |
| c. | 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 (SWPPP) would control and minimize  |

| Impact? | Explanation | Mitigation Measures |
|---------|-------------|---------------------|
|---------|-------------|---------------------|

|    |                              |  |
|----|------------------------------|--|
|    |                              | erosion and siltation. During project operation, storm water or any runoff irrigation waters would be directed into existing storm drains that are currently receiving surface water runoff under existing conditions. Significant alterations to existing drainage patterns within the project site and surrounding area would not occur. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impact related to the alteration of drainage patterns and on- or off-site erosion or siltation.   |
| d. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially alter the drainage pattern of an existing stream or river such that flooding would result. There are no streams or rivers located in the project vicinity. During project operation, storm water or any runoff irrigation waters would be directed into existing storm drains that are currently receiving surface water runoff under existing conditions. Impermeable surfaces resulting from the development of the project would not substantially change the volume of stormwater runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. Accordingly, significant alterations to existing drainage patterns within the site and surrounding area would not occur. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the alteration of drainage patterns and on- or off-site flooding. |
| e. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if runoff water would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm drain systems serving the project site, or if the proposed project would substantially increase the probability that polluted runoff would reach the storm drain system. Site-generated surface water runoff would continue to flow to the City's storm drain system. Any project that creates, adds, or replaces 500 square feet of impervious surface must comply with the Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance or alternatively, the City's Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), as a Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) requirement to address water runoff and stormwater pollution. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to existing storm drain capacities or water quality.  |
| f. | NO IMPACT                    | A significant impact may occur if a project includes potential sources of water pollutants that would have the potential to substantially degrade water quality. The proposed project does not include potential sources of contaminants, which could potentially degrade water quality and would comply with all federal, state and local regulations governing stormwater discharge. Therefore, no impact would occur.   |
| g. | NO IMPACT                    | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be located within a 100-year or 500-year floodplain or would impede or redirect flood flows. 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 F, the project site is not located within a 100-year or 500-year floodplain. Therefore, the proposed project would not be located in such areas, and no impact related to flood zones would occur.  |
| h. | NO IMPACT                    | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be located within a 100-year or 500-year floodplain or would impede or redirect flood flows. 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 F, the project site is not located within a 100-year or 500-year floodplain. Therefore, the proposed project would not be located in such areas, and no impact related to flood zones would occur.  |

| Impact? | Explanation | Mitigation Measures |
|---------|-------------|---------------------|
|---------|-------------|---------------------|

|    |           |  |
|----|-----------|--|
| i. | NO IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be located within an area susceptible to flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. The project site and the surrounding areas are not located within a flood hazard area. Accordingly, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact related to flooding.  |
| j. | NO IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be located within an area susceptible to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. A seiche is an oscillation of a body of water in an enclosed or semi-enclosed basin, such as a reservoir, harbor, or lake. A tsunami is a great sea wave produced by a significant undersea disturbance. Mudflows result from the down slope movement of soil and/or rock under the influence of gravity. The project site and the surrounding areas are not located near a water body to be inundated by seiche. Similarly, the project site and the surrounding areas are located approximately 20 miles east of the Pacific Ocean. Therefore, the project would have no impact related to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. |

#### XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

|    |           |  |
|----|-----------|--|
| a. | 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 mixed-use, infill development in an urbanized area in Los Angeles, would not divide an established community. Therefore, no impact would occur.   |
| b. | 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 Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan Area. The site is zoned [Q]C4-2D, with a General Plan land use designation of Neighborhood Commercial and located in Subarea III of the Colorado Boulevard Specific Plan, with Development Limitations and Conditions which limit the amount of Floor Area allowed on each lot. The proposed project would be comprised of six (6) residential dwelling units and 1,016 square feet of commercial area. Both Commercial and Residential uses are permitted in C4 zoned lots, the [Q] condition limits density to 1,500 square feet per dwelling unit and the Specific Plan restricts the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) to 1:1, which would allow 9,461.4 square feet. The project proponent has requested a Specific Plan Exception to exceed the allowable FAR by 10 percent to allow an FAR of 1.1:1. There will be no impact if the decision maker approved the Specific Plan Exception request and the project would otherwise conform to the allowable land uses pursuant to the Los Angeles Municipal Code. Impacts related to land use have been mitigated elsewhere, or are addressed through compliance with existing regulations. Therefore, there would be no impact. |
| c. | NO IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project were located within an area governed by a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. The project site is not subject to any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.  |

#### XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

| Impact? | Explanation | Mitigation Measures |
|---------|-------------|---------------------|
|---------|-------------|---------------------|

|    |           |   |
|----|-----------|---|
| a. | 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. According to the Conservation Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan, Mineral Resources, Exhibit A, 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. | 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. According to the Conservation Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan, Mineral Resources, Exhibit A, 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. |

**XII. NOISE**

|    |                              |   |
|----|------------------------------|---|
| a. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | 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. Construction and demolition shall be restricted to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturday. The project shall 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 noise exposure impact would be less than significant. |
| b. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | Construction activities can generate varying degrees of vibration, depending on the construction procedures and the type of construction equipment used. The operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish with distance from the source. Unless heavy construction activities are conducted extremely close (within a few feet) to the neighboring structures, vibrations from construction activities rarely reach the levels that damage structures. By complying with regulations, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to construction vibration.   |
| c. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the project caused a substantial permanent increase in noise levels above existing ambient levels. New stationary sources of noise, such as rooftop mechanical HVAC equipment, would be installed on the proposed development. The design of the equipment will be required to comply with LAMC Section 112.02, which prohibits noise from air conditioning, refrigeration, heating, pumping, and filtering equipment from exceeding the ambient noise level on the premises of other occupied properties by more than five dBA. With implementation of the regulations that address rooftop  |

| Impact?                         | Explanation | Mitigation Measures  |
|---------------------------------|-------------|--|
|                                 |             | mechanical equipment, a substantial permanent increase for nearby sensitive receptors would be reduced to a less than significant level.   |
| d. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT |             | A significant impact would occur if the project resulted in substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels. As discussed above, impacts are expected to be less than significant for construction and operational noise and vibration.   |
| e. NO IMPACT                    |             | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from a public airport or public use airport. The proposed project is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The project site is outside of the Los Angeles International Airport Land Use Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project would not expose people working or residing in the project area to excessive noise levels from a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, no impact would occur. |
| f. NO IMPACT                    |             | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from a private airstrip. The proposed project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Accordingly, the proposed project would not expose people working or residing in the project area to excessive noise levels from a private airstrip. Therefore, no impact would occur.  |

**XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

|                                 |  |   |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| a. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT |  | A potentially significant impact would occur if the proposed project would induce substantial population growth that would not have otherwise occurred as rapidly or in as great a magnitude. The proposed project would result in the development of six (6) residential units. The increase in residential population resulting from the proposed project would not be considered substantial in consideration of anticipated growth for the Northeast Los Angeles 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. NO 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 not result in the demolition of any residential units, only the existing commercial structure. Therefore, no impact would occur.  |
| c. NO 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 not result in the demolition of any residential units, only the existing commercial structure. Therefore, no impact would occur.  |

**XV. PUBLIC SERVICES**

|                                 |  |   |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| a. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT |  | A significant impact would occur if the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) could not adequately serve the proposed project, necessitating a new or physically altered station. The project site and the surrounding area are currently served by three LAFD stations -- Fire Station 42, located at 2021 Colorado Boulevard. (approximately 3.5 miles west of the project site), Fire Station 55, located at 4455 East York Boulevard. (approximately 2.2 miles |
|---------------------------------|--|---|

| Impact? | Explanation | Mitigation Measures |
|---------|-------------|---------------------|
|---------|-------------|---------------------|

|    |                              |  |
|----|------------------------------|--|
|    |                              | <p>southwest of the project site), and Fire Station 12, located at 5921 North Figueroa St. (approximately 2 miles southwest of the project site).The proposed project would result in a net increase of six (6) units, which could increase the number of emergency calls and demand for LAFD fire and emergency services. To maintain the level of fire protection and emergency services, the LAFD may require additional fire personnel and equipment. However, given that there are existing fire stations 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</p>   |
| b. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>A significant impact would occur if the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) could not adequately serve the proposed project, necessitating a new or physically altered station. The proposed project would result in a net increase of six (6) units and could increase demand for police service. The project site and the surrounding area are currently served by LAPD's Northeast Police Station, located at 3353 N San Fernando Rd, Los Angeles (approximately 3.2 mile southwest of the project 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 (CPTED) 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 in. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to police protection services.</p> |
| c. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would include substantial employment or population growth, which could generate a demand for school facilities that would exceed the capacity of the school district. The proposed project would add six (6) 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.</p>   |

| Impact?                            | Explanation                  | Mitigation Measures   |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| d.                                 | 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 six (6) dwelling units, which could result in increased demand for parks and recreation facilities. Pursuant to Section 21.10 of the LAMC, the applicant shall pay the Dwelling Unit Construction Tax for construction of apartment buildings. 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.                                 | 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 six (6) 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.   |
| <b>XVI. RECREATION</b>             |                              |   |
| a.                                 | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. 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 is for the construction of a mixed-use development with six residential dwellings, which may increase demand for parks and recreational facilities. While there may be growth in population by way of the six residential units, the quantity by which it may increase the demand for facilities would not be considered substantial enough to necessitate the construction of new facilities nor result in the deterioration of existing facilities. The construction of six residential dwelling units and 1,016 square feet of commercial area does not require or propose recreational facilities. The Applicant will be subject to RC-PS-3 as referenced in Section XIV (d). Therefore, impacts related to deterioration of park facilities would be less than significant. |
| b.                                 | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project included recreational facilities or required the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse effect on the environment. As discussed above, 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 is for the construction of a mixed-use development with six residential units and does not propose the construction or expansion of public or private recreational facilities. The Applicant will be subject to RC-PS-3 as referenced in Section XIV (d). Therefore, impacts related to recreational facilities having an adverse physical environment would be less than significant.   |
| <b>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</b> |                              |   |

| Impact? | Explanation | Mitigation Measures |
|---------|-------------|---------------------|
|---------|-------------|---------------------|

|    |                              |  |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| a. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact may occur if the project conflicts with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The project is the construction of six (6) residential dwelling units and 1,016 square feet of commercial space. Although the new project will result in an increase in trips, the increase does not exceed the LADOT threshold of 36 units to require a traffic analysis. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant  |
| b. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact may occur if the proposed project individually or cumulatively exceeded the service standards of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Congestion Management Program (CMP). This program was created Statewide as a result of Proposition 111 and has been implemented locally by Metro. The CMP for Los Angeles County requires that the traffic impacts of individual development projects of potential regional significance be analyzed. Specific arterial roadways and all State highways comprise the CMP system, and a total of 164 intersections are identified for monitoring throughout Los Angeles County. The local CMP requires that all CMP monitoring intersections be analyzed where a project would likely add more than 50 trips during either the a.m. or p.m. peak hours. The project is the construction of six (6) multi-family dwelling units and 1,016 square feet of commercial space. Although the new project will result in an increase in trips, the increase would not add more than 50 trips during either the a.m. or p.m. peak hours. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant |
| c. | NO IMPACT                    | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would cause a change in air traffic patterns that would result in a substantial safety risk. The proposed project does not include an aviation component or include features that would interfere with air traffic patterns. Therefore, no impact would occur.  |
| d. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially increase an existing hazardous design feature or introduce incompatible uses to the existing traffic pattern. The proposed project would not include unusual or hazardous design features and the proposed project is compatible with existing uses. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.   |
| e. | NO IMPACT                    | A significant impact may occur if the project design threatened the ability of emergency vehicles to access and serve the project site or adjacent uses. The nearest emergency/disaster routes to the project are North Figueroa Street to the east and Eagle Rock Boulevard to the west, (City of Los Angeles, General Plan Safety Element Exhibit H, Critical Facilities & Lifeline Systems, 1996). The proposed project would not require the closure of any public or private streets and would not impede emergency vehicle access to the project site or surrounding area. Additionally, emergency access to and from the project site would be provided in accordance with requirements of the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD). Therefore, the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access, and no impact would occur.  |
| f. | NO IMPACT                    | A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would conflict with adopted policies or involve modification of existing alternative transportation facilities located on- or off-site. The proposed project would not require the disruption of public transportation services or the alteration of public transportation routes. Since the proposed project would not modify or conflict with any alternative transportation policies, plans or programs, it would have no impact on such programs.   |

**VIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**

|    |                              |  |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| a. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>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 October 24, 2018, describing the Project and requesting any information regarding resources that may exist on or near the Project site. On October 29, 2018, one tribal response was received from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation ("Gabrieleno") who requested to consult on the project. The Gabrieleno submitted a letter dated October 29, 2018 requesting a consultation and explaining the project site's location within their ancestral tribal territory. The letter also states that NAHC has limited information on California Native Tribes that has been previously documented, while Gabrieleno can provide a more complete history on tribal cultural resources in the project area. The Gabrieleno also submitted a map titled "Original People of Los Angeles County" showing approximate tribal territories in Southern California. The City initiated the consultation with the Gabrieleno on November 14, 2018 by requesting a conference call to discuss the project. The first conference call was scheduled for December 13, 2018; however, on December 12, 2018, City staff received a phone call from the Gabrieleno to cancel the conference call due to a scheduling conflict. The Gabrieleno then advised City staff that the tribe will call again on the same day for a consultation; however, City staff never received a call back. Subsequently, City staff emailed the Gabrieleno on January 30, 2019 and on February 26, 2019 to reschedule the conference call. On February 26, 2019, the Gabrieleno responded to the City's requests, stating that the next availability is on May 8, 2019. Per Government Code Section 65352.4, "consultation" means the meaningful and timely process of seeking, discussing, and considering carefully the views of others, in a manner that is cognizant of all parties' cultural values and, where feasible, seeking agreement. The City, as the Lead Agency, has deemed that the Gabrieleno and the City could not engage in a meaningful and timely consultation despite the City's numerous attempts via emails and phone calls to schedule a conference call to seek, discuss and consider the Gabrieleno's comments on tribal cultural resources. Additionally, the City has not received any information on known or potential tribal cultural resources from the Gabrieleno to date. As such, on April 3, 2019, the City, after acting in good faith and reasonable effort, has concluded the AB 52 consultation with the Gabrieleno as a mutual agreement could not be reached. Furthermore, the project site is not included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or included in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k). Additionally, there is no substantial evidence that demonstrates that a substantial impact to tribal cultural resources will occur due to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.</p> |
|----|------------------------------|--|

|    |                              |  |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| b. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>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 October 24, 2018, describing the Project and requesting any information regarding resources that may exist on or near the Project site. On October 29, 2018, one tribal response was received from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation ("Gabrieleno") who requested to consult on the project. The Gabrieleno submitted a letter dated October 29, 2018 requesting a consultation and explaining the project site's location within their ancestral tribal territory. The letter also states that NAHC has limited information on California Native Tribes that has been previously documented, while Gabrieleno can provide a more complete history on tribal cultural resources in the project area. The Gabrieleno also submitted a map titled "Original People of Los Angeles County" showing approximate tribal territories in Southern California. The City initiated the consultation with the Gabrieleno on November 14, 2018 by requesting a conference call to discuss the project. The first conference call was scheduled for December 13, 2018; however, on December 12, 2018, City staff received a phone call from the Gabrieleno to cancel the conference call due to a scheduling conflict. The Gabrieleno then advised City staff that the tribe will call again on the same day for a consultation; however, City staff never received a call back. Subsequently, City staff emailed the Gabrieleno on January 30, 2019 and on February 26, 2019 to reschedule the conference call. On February 26, 2019, the Gabrieleno responded to the City's requests, stating that the next availability is on May 8, 2019. Per Government Code Section 65352.4, "consultation" means the meaningful and timely process of seeking, discussing, and considering carefully the views of others, in a manner that is cognizant of all parties' cultural values and, where feasible, seeking agreement. The City, as the Lead Agency, has deemed that the Gabrieleno and the City could not engage in a meaningful and timely consultation despite the City's numerous attempts via emails and phone calls to schedule a conference call to seek, discuss and consider the Gabrieleno's comments on tribal cultural resources. Additionally, the City has not received any information on known or potential tribal cultural resources from the Gabrieleno to date. As such, on April 3, 2019, the City, after acting in good faith and reasonable effort, has concluded the AB 52 consultation with the Gabrieleno as a mutual agreement could not be reached. Furthermore, the project site is not included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or included in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k). Additionally, there is no substantial evidence that demonstrates that a substantial impact to tribal cultural resources will occur due to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.</p> |
|----|------------------------------|--|

**XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

|    |                              |  |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| a. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB). All wastewater from the project would be treated according to requirements of the NPDES permit authorized by the LARWQCB. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to wastewater treatment requirements.</p> |
|----|------------------------------|--|

|                     |                              |  |
|---------------------|------------------------------|--|
| b.                  | 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 addition of six (6) multi-family 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 (UWMP). Prior to any construction activities, the project applicant would be required to coordinate with the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation (BOS) to determine the exact wastewater conveyance requirements of the proposed project, and any upgrades to the wastewater lines in the vicinity of the project site that are needed to adequately serve the proposed project would be undertaken as part of the project. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to water or wastewater infrastructure. |
| c.                  | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would increase surface water runoff, resulting in the need for expanded off-site storm water drainage facilities. Development of the proposed project would maintain existing drainage patterns; site-generated surface water runoff would continue to flow to the City's storm drain system. The proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exacerbate any existing deficiencies in the storm drain system or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to existing storm drain capacities.   |
| d.                  | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | Refer to Response to Checklist Question XIX (b).   |
| e.                  | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | Refer to Response to Checklist Question XIX (b).   |
| f.                  | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project's solid waste generation exceeded the capacity of permitted landfills. The Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation (BOS) and private waste management companies are responsible for the collection, disposal, and recycling of solid waste within the City, including the project site. Solid waste during the operation of the proposed project is anticipated to be collected by the BOS and private waste haulers, respectively. As the City's own landfills have all been closed and are non-operational, the destinations are private landfills. In compliance with Assembly Bill (AB) 939, the project applicant would be required to implement a Solid Waste Diversion Program and divert at least 50 percent of the solid waste generated by the project from the applicable landfill site. The proposed project would also comply with all federal, State, and local regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to solid waste.  |
| g.                  | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | Refer to Response to Checklist Question XIX (f).   |
| <b>XX. WILDFIRE</b> |                              |  |
| a.                  | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | Refer to Response to Checklist Question IX(g)  |
| b.                  | NO IMPACT                    | The project site is located in a highly urbanized area of the City and the area surrounding the project site is completely developed. The site is relatively flat with no significant slope and is not located in a High Wind Velocity Area as identified by High Wind Area map developed by the Bureau of Engineering. Therefore, no impact would occur.  |
| c.                  | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | As the project site is currently developed and surrounded by existing developments, the construction and operation of the proposed project can be characterized as in-fill development and will have minimal impact on the existing infrastructure. The proposed project would be designed and constructed in accordance with State and local Building and Fire Codes, including installing sprinklers and planting fire resistant landscaping as appropriate, to reduce the potential for exposure of people or structures to wildfires to the maximum extent possible. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact.  |
| d.                  | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | Refer to Response to Checklist Question X(i)   |

**XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

|    | <b>Impact?</b>               | <b>Explanation</b>   | <b>Mitigation Measures</b> |
|----|------------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| a. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>A significant impact would occur if the project had 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 or eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major period of California history or prehistory. Based on the analysis in this Initial Study, the proposed project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment in any of the ways described above. Therefore, through the implementation and compliance with existing regulations, impacts related to degradation of the environment would be less than significant.</p> |                            |
| b. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>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. Therefore, through the implementation and compliance with existing regulations, impacts related to cumulative impacts would be less than significant.</p>   |                            |
| c. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>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 to result in impacts at less than significant levels. Therefore, through the implementation and compliance with existing regulations, impacts related to adverse impacts on human beings either directly or indirectly would be less than significant.</p>  |                            |