

DEPARTMENT OF
CITY PLANNING
200 N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801
AND
6262 VAN NUYS BLVD., SUITE 351
VAN NUYS, CA 91401

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

WILLIAM ROSCHEN, FAIA
PRESIDENT
REGINA M. FREER
VICE-PRESIDENT
SEAN O. BURTON
DIEGO CARDOSO
GEORGE HOVAGUIMIAN
JUSTIN KIM
ROBERT LESSIN
BARBARA ROMERO
MICHAEL K. WOO
JAMES K. WILLIAMS
COMMISSION EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT II
(213) 978-1300

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA



ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA
MAYOR

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

MICHAEL J. LOGRANDE
DIRECTOR
(213) 978-1271
ALAN BELL, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
(213) 978-1272
EVA YUAN-MCDANIEL
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
(213) 978-1273
FAX: (213) 978-1275
INFORMATION
(213) 978-1270
www.planning.lacity.org

DATE : JUL 01 2011

Planning and Land Use Management Committee
Council of the City of Los Angeles
City Hall, Room 395
Los Angeles, CA 90012

ATTN: Michael Espinosa, Legislative Assistant

CITY PLAN CASE NO. 2010-1073-CA

CORRECTED DETERMINATION**

*Transmitted herewith is a proposed ordinance amending Section 12.21F of the Los Angeles Municipal Code with development regulations that require on-site shopping cart containment systems for new stores and major remodels that provide six or more shopping carts for use to its patrons. ***

On June 9, 2011, following a public hearing, the City Planning Commission approved the proposed ordinance (attached) and recommended its adoption by the City Council. Adopted the Findings; adopted the Negative Declaration (ENV-2010-1074-ND); and adopted the staff report as its report on the subject.

This action was taken by the following vote:

Moved: Roschen
Seconded: Woo
Ayes: Freer, Hovaguimian, Kim, Lessin
Absent: Burton, Cardoso, Romero

Vote: 6-0


James K. Williams, Commission Executive Assistant II
City Planning Commission

Attachments: Proposed Ordinance, Findings
City Planning Associate: Gabriela Juarez
cc: Amy Brothers, Michael Bostrom, Deputy City Attorneys, Land Use Division

ORDINANCE NO. _____

A proposed ordinance amending Section 12.21F of the Los Angeles Municipal Code with development regulations that require on-site shopping cart containment systems for new stores and major remodels that provide six or more shopping carts for use to its patrons.

THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES
DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Subsection F of Section 12.21 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read:

F. ~~Vesting Applications.~~ On-Site Shopping Cart Containment.

1. **Purpose.** It is the purpose of this subsection to establish a development standard for all stores that provide six or more shopping carts on-site for use to its patrons as a means to fulfill the following objectives: reduce obstructions to pedestrian and vehicular traffic in the public right of way, reduce hazards to the health and safety of the general public and the visual and aesthetic blight in our neighborhoods.

2. **Definitions.** Notwithstanding any provisions of this Code to the contrary, the following definitions shall apply to this subsection:

a. **Bollard.** An upright post consisting of a piece of timber, wood, metal or other such material fixed firmly in an upright position that creates a narrowed passageway onto a premise such that a shopping cart could not be removed.

b. **Bureau of Street Services.** The Bureau of Street Services is the Bureau within the Department of Public Works or any successor agency.

c. **Premises.** The site area where shopping carts must be maintained and managed by the property owner or its designee.

d. **Project.** Any new or major remodel of a business, store, merchant, wholesaler, establishment or other business operation operating in any zone that provides or maintains at least six or more shopping carts on the premises for use by their patrons or customers.

e. **Remodels, Major.** Any remodel of a main building on a lot whenever the aggregate value of all alternations within a one-year period exceeds 50 percent of the cost of the main building.

f. **Shopping cart.** Any basket of any size, mounted on wheels or a similar device, including parts thereof, provided by a store operator for the purpose of

transporting goods of any kind within a business establishment or designated parking or loading area of that business establishment.

3. **Containment Methods.** All projects must contain all shopping carts on the premises at all times or otherwise controlled or accounted for by the project. Permitted methods shall be limited to:

a. **Bollards.** The project may install bollards to contain shopping carts on the premises;

b. **Wheel Locking or Stopping Mechanisms.** The project may equip shopping carts with a wheel locking or stopping mechanism that is used in conjunction with an electronic or magnetic barrier along the perimeter of the store premises. The wheel locking or stopping mechanism must activate when the shopping cart crosses the electronic or magnetic barrier;

c. **Customer Service.** The project may designate certain employees to help customers take groceries and purchased merchandise out to their vehicles, not allowing the carts to be removed by their customers;

d. **Other Methods.** The project may employ other methods for onsite containment so long as the Bureau of Street Services has approved the systems or methods which would effectively contain or control shopping carts on store premises.

4. **Application.** All new projects shall comply with the regulations defined herein upon the effective date of this ordinance.

5. **Enforcement.** Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 12.26 of this Code, the Bureau of Street Services shall have the authority and responsibility of this subsection.

Section 2. The City Clerk shall certify to the passage of this ordinance and have it published in accordance with Council policy, either in a daily newspaper circulated in the City of Los Angeles or by posting for ten days in three public places in the City of Los Angeles: one copy on the bulletin board located at the Main Street entrance to the Los Angeles City Hall; one copy on the bulletin board located at the Main Street entrance to the Los Angeles City Hall East; and one copy on the bulletin board located at the Temple Street entrance to the Los Angeles County Hall of Records.

I hereby certify that this ordinance was passed by the Council of the City of Los Angeles by a vote of not less than three-fourths of all of its members, at its meeting of _____.

JUNE LAGMAY, City Clerk

By _____ Deputy

Approved _____

Mayor

Pursuant to Section 558 of the City Charter, the City Planning Commission on June 9, 2011, recommended this ordinance be adopted by the City Council.



James K. Williams, Commission Executive Assistant II
City Planning Commission

File No. _____

ATTACHMENT 1

LAND USE FINDINGS

The City Planning Department recommends that the City Planning Commission, in accordance with Charter Section 556, find:

1. In accordance with Charter Section 556, the proposed ordinance (Appendix A) is in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent, and provisions of the City's General Plan in that it furthers:
 - Goal 5A of the Framework Element, which states "[a] liveable City for existing and future residents and one that is attractive to future investment," by eliminating errant carts through an on-site shopping cart containment system.
 - Objective 5.5, which states that the City must "[e]nhance the liveability of all neighborhoods by upgrading the quality of development and improving the quality of the public realm."
 - Policy 5.5.3 states that the City must "[f]ormulate and adopt building and site design standards and guidelines to raise the quality of design Citywide.
2. in accordance with Charter Section 558 (b)(2), the proposed ordinance (Appendix A) will be in conformity with the public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice in that it furthers:
 - Item 1 of the City Planning Commission policy, "Do Real Planning", to "demand walkable city" whereby storefronts and sidewalks are inviting.
 - Item 9 of the City Planning Commission policy, "Do Real Planning", to "arrest visual blight" by promoting visual calm on public rights of way and streets.

The proposed ordinance enhances the liveability of all neighborhoods creating a future environment that is attractive to future investment and raises the quality of design Citywide by requiring merchants to provide a safe, uncluttered and inviting commercial area that is free from errant shopping carts.

ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a Negative Declaration (Attachment 2) was published on June 3, 2010. On all measures the proposed ordinance (Appendix A) will have either no or a less than significant effect on the environment. The proposed ordinance makes no changes to existing zoning, any specific plans or other land use regulations that affect the physical environment.

**DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
RECOMMENDATION REPORT**

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION	CASE NO:	CPC-2010-1073-CA
DATE: June 9, 2011	CEQA:	ENV-2010-1074-ND
TIME: after 8:30 a.m.*	LOCATION:	Citywide
PLACE: Los Angeles City Hall	COUNCIL DISTRICT:	All
200 N. Spring St.	PLAN AREAS:	All
Room 1010, 10 th Floor		
Los Angeles, CA 90012		

PUBLIC HEARING REQUIRED

SUMMARY: The proposed ordinance (Appendix A) amends Sections 12.03 and 12.21 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) to impose a shopping cart containment standard on all new and major remodeled stores with six or more shopping carts. This report also addresses the requested feasibility study for applying the on-site shopping cart containment development standard to existing stores which resulted from the Department's report, dated March 11, 2010, to City Council and the PLUM committee.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

1. **Adopt** the staff report as its report on the subject.
2. **Adopt** the findings in Attachment 1.
3. **Approve** the Negative Declaration as the CEQA clearance on the subject.
4. **Approve** the proposed ordinance (Appendix A) and recommend its adoption by the City Council.

MICHAEL J. LOGRANDE
Director of Planning

ALAN BELL, AICP
Deputy Director

LINN K. WYATT
Chief Zoning Administrator

CHARLIE RAUSCH
Senior City Planner, Office of the Zoning Administrator

THOMAS ROTHMANN
City Planner, Code Studies

GABRIELA JUAREZ
City Planning Associate, Plan Implementation
Telephone: (213) 978-1199

ADVICE TO PUBLIC: *The exact time this report will be considered during the meeting is uncertain since there may be several other items on the agenda. Written communication may be mailed to the Commission Secretariat, 200 North Main Street, Room 532, Los Angeles, CA 90012 (Phone No. 213/978-1300). While all written communications are given to the Commission for consideration, the initial packets are sent a week prior to the Commission's meeting date. If you challenge these agenda items in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing agendaized herein, or in written correspondence on these matters delivered to this agency at or prior to the public hearing. As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability, and upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to these programs, services, and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or other services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request no later than three working days (72 hours) prior to the meeting by calling the Commission Secretariat at 213/978-1300.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY	3
STAFF REPORT	3
REQUEST	3
BACKGROUND	4
DISCUSSION	5
CONCLUSION	9

ATTACHMENTS:

- APPENDIX A – PROPOSED ORDINANCE**
- ATTACHMENT 1 – FINDINGS**
- ATTACHMENT 2 – NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

SUMMARY

Abandoned shopping carts are a source of blight throughout the City of Los Angeles. An abandoned shopping cart is a shopping cart located outside the premises or parking lot or facility of the business establishment which furnishes the shopping cart for use by its patrons. Shopping carts are often used by patrons to carry groceries home and then these carts are commonly left on the streets, sidewalks, or near bus stops. The shopping carts can obstruct pedestrian and vehicular traffic in the public right of way, creating hazards to the health and safety of the public.

The Department of City Planning, in conjunction with the Department of Public Works, researched Glendale's shopping cart containment program that yields a 100 percent success rate to assess the feasibility of implementing a similar program in Los Angeles. The City of Glendale model was studied and assessed to be tailored and applied to the City of Los Angeles' needs and structure. Appendix A creates a new development standard that requires on-site shopping cart containment for all new stores and major remodels that provide six or more shopping carts. The streets and sidewalks would be free of abandoned carts and demonstrably safer as a result.

This report also discusses the Department of City Planning's March 11, 2010 report to the City Council, requesting a feasibility study for applying the on-site shopping cart program to existing stores. The study would analyze: (1) the number of stores that would qualify for the program, (2) costs associated with annual inspections and other program maintenance needs, (3) a fee analysis that compares economic impacts of various fee points to merchants, (4) a repayment schedule for the total costs involved in implementing the program, and (6) a timeframe for existing stores to comply with the new regulation. The study would be conducted by a consultant in coordination with the Bureau of Sanitation. If the study finds implementing an on-site shopping cart containment program to existing stores is feasible, an amendment to the proposed ordinance would be needed in order to include existing stores.

STAFF REPORT

REQUEST

The proposed ordinance (Appendix A) responds to a motion (CF 08-2070) introduced by Councilmembers Cardenas and Smith on August 6, 2008 instructing the Department of City Planning to develop a shopping cart containment program similar to Glendale's model that mandates shopping cart retention for all new stores and major remodels with six or more shopping carts.

BACKGROUND

Abandoned shopping carts are a source of blight throughout the City. In addition to the City's costs in monitoring, retrieving, storing, and returning these errant carts, store operators also incur huge costs to maintain their cart inventories. These costs are transferred by the store owner directly to all consumers (not just the individuals illegally

removing the carts) in the form of higher prices. Specifically, local store managers are forced to either absorb these costs in their monthly operating expenses or raise the price of goods sold. Therefore, as cart-associated costs increase, merchandise costs could also increase.

STATE REGULATIONS LIMITING MUNICIPAL CONTROL

The State legislature has limited municipalities' authority to address abandoned shopping carts. However, land use controls can be enacted on stores to contain shopping carts. In regards to shopping cart retrieval, cities may not enact any regulations that are more stringent than the State's regulations; nevertheless, there are numerous problems with the State regulations and their impacts on our City:

1. The State law prohibits cities from removing an abandoned cart from the street for 24 hours after it has been abandoned, so as to allow the store the opportunity to collect the cart. According to State law, City staff is required to monitor and watch each cart for a minimum of 24 hours. If the cart is still unclaimed by the owner, City staff must then tag it with the date, location, and time of pick-up when it is collected and removed from the site. Once the cart is removed and the City is in possession of the cart, local municipalities are required to immediately notify the owner. The owner may redeem the cart without paying any City costs if the cart is redeemed within three days. Carts not redeemed must be discarded at City cost. The direct costs to the City involved in following these regulations have been too onerous to document on a citywide basis. As a point of reference, the City of Glendale estimated approximately \$70,000 annually to address shopping cart related problems originating from their 41 shopping cart providing stores. However, previous estimates for shopping cart recovery program proposals, modeled after the City of San Jose, are approximately \$600,000 per council district in the City of Los Angeles. Due to the State requirements, 80%-90% of abandoned carts are not collected by City staff and remain on the street.

2. State law requires that each incident of illegal possession of each shopping cart be treated separately. It is difficult for local authorities to directly deal with the individuals who take the carts from the stores. Because possession of the cart is not a strict liability offense, the store manager must testify in court that *each* abandoned cart was taken without their express permission. This essentially makes prosecution of cart theft impossible, as store managers would be required to go to court on a daily basis, leaving their stores unattended, *and* the manager would be required to bring charges against one of the store's customers. For this reason, few citations are written for shopping cart removal under the State regulation, as the City Attorney's Office is unable to prosecute.

CURRENT METHODS USED BY THE CITY

The City's current "Cart Collection" strategy, where carts are retrieved after they have been abandoned, is ineffective because:

- There is no consequence for taking and subsequently abandoning a shopping cart. There is no penalty for taking a cart and there is no disincentive for taking

the cart. There is an expectation that the cart will be collected and returned to the store.

- Smaller stores usually do not operate their own collection system or contract with a professional service, placing the entire responsibility for picking up abandoned carts on City staff.
- Even though they operate their own collection service, the larger grocery stores cannot collect the carts from City streets as fast as they are abandoned.

In 2007, a six-month "Pilot Abandoned Shopping Cart Removal Program" was conducted in Council District 6. This program consisted of the Bureau of Sanitation recovering abandoned shopping carts during their district sweep routes. This resulted in the collection of a total of 5,340 carts. While this method did aid in reducing the number of abandoned shopping carts in neighborhoods, it resulted in an exorbitant number of unclaimed, unrecyclable shopping carts in the City storage yards, at great additional cost, as well as not being consistent with previously mentioned State regulations.

CURRENT METHODS USED BY LOCAL MERCHANTS

To deter the illegal removal of shopping carts, some merchants use methods such as cart retrieval services and electronic wheel locking systems. Shopping cart retrieval services are most commonly used. However, shopping cart retrieval services do not prevent theft. Instituting shopping cart retrieval services as a method of abating this issue neglects that the shopping cart has already been taken and is not a proactive approach. Wheel locking systems are also a common method to prevent illegal removal, however, some research shows that this is only an effective deterrent in about three out of four carts. While these efforts have been proactive, generally, they have not proven to be significantly effective. This is evidenced by the continued complaints reporting the abandoned carts, the continued hazard to the health, safety and general welfare, and the accumulating visual blight evident in our neighborhoods.

DISCUSSION

ON-SITE CONTAINMENT STRATEGIES

On-site shopping cart containment strategies restrict shopping carts to store premises. The store premises include the lot area maintained and managed by the business, which may include the building, parking lot and adjacent walkways. The methods of containing shopping carts on-site in the proposed ordinance (Appendix A) include:

- the installation of bollards to act as a barrier to prevent carts from leaving the store's premises;
- wheel locking systems which stop carts once they are removed from the store's boundaries;

- attaching tall bars that prevent carts from exiting the entrances of the store;
- having employees help customers take groceries and purchased merchandise out to their cars, not allowing the carts to be removed by their customers; or
- any other method or system that would effectively contain or control shopping carts on store premises as approved by the Bureau of Street Services.

These methods are far more effective and efficient than contracting shopping cart retrieval services for a few reasons. One reason is that in creating physical barriers that obstruct cart retrieval, most opportunities for improper cart removal are preempted. Another reason is that these on-site shopping cart containment methods have yielded a 100% success rate in the City of Glendale. Furthermore, through higher prices, consumers have been paying for retrieval companies to pick up the carts after they are abandoned. By preventing the removal of shopping carts on store properties, consumers will no longer have to pay for the retrieval of hundreds of abandoned carts per day and the blight and nuisance will be abated.

CITY OF GLENDALE, CA MODEL

The City of Glendale adopted a shopping cart containment ordinance in January 2006 with a 100% success rate. Staff time needed to maintain the program has decreased significantly in the three years needed to establish the program. All 41 of the stores in the program have been compliant with the new containment regulations, making it the most successful on-site containment program in the country.

The City of Glendale model has two primary components:

- Merchants that provide carts to their customers are required to contain all carts on store premises by utilizing a control system or barricade. The City does not mandate a particular system, but simply requires a system that effectively contains all carts. The City monitors the systems through an annual inspection of stores with six or more carts. Abandoned carts are fined on a "per cart" and "per day" rate to the store owner.
- Cart users must be made aware of containment systems and should be encouraged to use personal convenience carts outside of store premises through an educational program. Individuals have needed to change their habits by acquiring, then using, personal convenience carts, in lieu of store-provided shopping carts. To facilitate this, merchants could offer personal convenience carts to be purchased on-site as part of their regular merchandise in stock.

There was a 12-month "grace period" for compliance with the containment regulations to educate merchants about the new regulations and allow merchants time to secure and install an appropriate system.

This plan does not conflict with the State's legislation, as it only addresses the issue of containment, and not retrieval or abatement. The Glendale City Attorney issued an opinion that the State has not pre-empted local cities from enacting legislation that addresses cart containment as a land use issue.

APPLYING THE GLENDALE MODEL TO LOS ANGELES

In order to apply the Glendale model to the City of Los Angeles, the program will be administered by the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation. The Bureau of Sanitation currently is in coordination with Bureau of Street Services on other citywide abatement programs such as the Bulky Item Program, which is likely to serve as a structural model for the shopping cart program. The Bulky Item Program is a self-funding program that set up a reimbursement structure with the various other city departments based on the monthly revenue collected. Together, these agencies have the staff and equipment to effectively enforce the proposed program.

The Department of City Planning met with various stakeholders, including the California Grocers Association. Stakeholders gave their input consisting of issues and opportunities for creating more effective shopping cart abatement methods, primarily with preemptive strategies that contain carts on-site with little or no opportunity for the carts to be taken offsite.

The Department of City Planning coordinated with the Bureau of Sanitation and Council District 6 to meet with the City of Glendale staff. A City staff working group was established to design a program model that would be best suited for the needs of the City of Los Angeles. Based on the City of Glendale's model and other cities' models, the most effective and efficient method for abandoned shopping cart abatement is on-site containment. The proposed ordinance used City of Glendale and other cities' models to create an ordinance appropriate for the City of Los Angeles.

Lastly, in order to apply the ordinance to remodeled stores, the definition of "Remodels, Major" will be added to the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC). As such, shopping cart containment will be required for any existing stores with six or more carts that meet the following definition:

Remodels, Major. Any remodel of a main building on a lot whenever the aggregate value of all alterations within a one-year period exceeds 50 percent of the replacement cost of the main building.

This new definition will advance the goals of implementing on-site shopping cart containment by creating a clear parameter to distinguish projects that are minor maintenance related projects from those that are truly large scale alterations.

FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR EXISTING STORES

At the public hearing on April 27, 2010, the Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM)

Committee considered a City Planning Department report in response to the motion instructing the Planning Department to prepare a citywide ordinance, similar to the City of Glendale ordinance, to prohibit the proliferation of abandoned shopping carts. The PLUM committee instructed the Bureau of Sanitation to pursue a feasibility study for the application of on-site shopping cart containment development standards and for the City Planning Department to create development standards that require on-site shopping cart containment for all new stores and major remodels.

The study will be coordinated through the Bureau of Sanitation and it will discuss the feasibility of applying on-site shopping cart containment development standards to existing stores. The study should include the following:

- the number of stores in the City that provide six or more shopping carts to their patrons;
- a map showing the concentration of stores in the City by watershed district;
- the costs involved in developing and implementing a citywide shopping cart containment program;
- a fee analysis that compares the economic impacts of various fee points to store owners using various factors including but not limited to size and type of business;
- a repayment schedule for the total costs involved in developing and implementing the citywide program;
- a timeframe, including phasing options, for existing stores to comply with the citywide shopping cart containment program; and
- any other relevant analysis needed to fully consider implementation to all existing stores with six or more shopping carts.

Should the study find that it is feasible to include existing stores, and the City Council adopts a new program that applies on-site shopping cart containment development standards to existing stores, an amendment to the proposed ordinance (Appendix A) would be necessary in order to include the existing stores.

OUTREACH AND STAFF HEARING

On March 31, 2011, the Planning Department held a public staff hearing on this matter. After a staff presentation of the proposed ordinance the floor was opened to a question and answer period. Following the question and answer period, the hearing officer opened the public hearing for testimony. There were 4 speakers, 1 in opposition and three in favor of the proposed ordinance. Additionally, five letters in support of the proposed ordinance were received during the comment period that ended on April 25, 2011.

Summary and staff responses to main concerns from the staff public hearing and comments received during the public comment period:

Opposition:

Having the magnetic strips embedded within parking lots creates a piling of shopping carts at those limits obstructing access to other businesses within multi-commercial properties such as strip malls.

Staff response: Shopping carts will be required to be labeled with merchant information so that ownership of the carts can be properly identified. Merchants and individual property owners are responsible for collecting and retrieving their shopping carts onsite to make them available for their patrons.

Support:

Abandoned shopping carts are a huge issue in business districts and residential areas alike. This is not only a matter of nuisance and blight, but a serious safety concern as well. Many different neighborhood councils, community groups and concerned citizens have made several attempts at shopping cart sweeps only to find their efforts are temporary solutions due to the frequent recurrence of abandoned shopping carts. Taking a preventative approach of containing the shopping carts onsite is the best solution towards eliminating abandoned shopping carts. Taking the next step of requiring all stores, not just new and major remodeled stores, with six or more shopping carts is imperative towards resolving this issue citywide. Also, it was suggested that merchants could provide foldable individual carts for sale for their patrons to use as alternative for those that need assistance transporting their purchased merchandise. An ordinance like this is long overdue.

Staff response: This proposed ordinance is the first step of a larger multi-departmental program in order to abate all errant shopping carts citywide. An annual inspection and monitoring program would be created, established and coordinated through the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Street Services and Bureau of Sanitation as the next steps in order to address existing stores with six or more shopping carts.

CONCLUSION

The City of Los Angeles is continually looking to improve the quality of life for its residents and businesses. Old methods and systems are no longer effective in dealing with abandoned shopping carts. Reducing the number of carts taken and abandoned would have a positive impact on the quality of our neighborhoods and the overall cost of groceries and product to our residents. An added benefit is the reduced impact on City staff. Addressing the problem at the source would seem to be the most equitable as well as the least financially imposing on all consumers.

The proposed ordinance will amend the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) to add a new development standard requiring all new stores and major remodels with six or more shopping carts to maintain an effective method of on-site shopping cart containment. The streets and sidewalks will be free of abandoned carts and demonstrably safer as a result.

The overall quality of life for residents will have been improved in Los Angeles neighborhoods. Further, this amendment will not supersede any specific plan requirements or any rule set forth in a community plan and is consistent with the City Planning Commission policy, "Do Real Planning", to "demand a walkable city" and "arrest visual blight."

ORDINANCE NO. _____

A proposed ordinance amending Section 12.21F of the Los Angeles Municipal Code with development regulations that require on-site shopping cart containment systems for new stores and major remodels that provide six or more shopping carts for use to its patrons.

THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES
DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Subsection F of Section 12.21 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read:

F. Vesting Applications. On-Site Shopping Cart Containment.

1. Purpose. It is the purpose of this subsection to establish a development standard for all stores that provide six or more shopping carts on-site for use to its patrons as a means to fulfill the following objectives: reduce obstructions to pedestrian and vehicular traffic in the public right of way, reduce hazards to the health and safety of the general public and the visual and aesthetic blight in our neighborhoods.

2. Definitions. Notwithstanding any provisions of this Code to the contrary, the following definitions shall apply to this subsection:

a. Bollard. An upright post consisting of a piece of timber, wood, metal or other such material fixed firmly in an upright position that creates a narrowed passageway onto a premise such that a shopping cart could not be removed.

b. Bureau of Street Services. The Bureau of Street Services is the Bureau within the Department of Public Works or any successor agency.

c. Premises. The site area where shopping carts must be maintained and managed by the property owner or its designee.

d. Project. Any new or major remodel of a business, store, merchant, wholesaler, establishment or other business operation operating in any zone that provides or maintains at least six or more shopping carts on the premises for use by their patrons or customers.

e. Remodels, Major. Any remodel of a main building on a lot whenever the aggregate value of all alternations within a one-year period exceeds 50 percent of the cost of the main building.

f. Shopping cart. Any basket of any size, mounted on wheels or a similar device, including parts thereof, provided by a store operator for the purpose of

APPENDIX A

transporting goods of any kind within a business establishment or designated parking or loading area of that business establishment.

3. **Containment Methods.** All projects must contain all shopping carts on the premises at all times or otherwise controlled or accounted for by the project. Permitted methods shall be limited to:

a. **Bollards.** The project may install bollards to contain shopping carts on the premises;

b. **Wheel Locking or Stopping Mechanisms.** The project may equip shopping carts with a wheel locking or stopping mechanism that is used in conjunction with an electronic or magnetic barrier along the perimeter of the store premises. The wheel locking or stopping mechanism must activate when the shopping cart crosses the electronic or magnetic barrier;

c. **Customer Service.** The project may designate certain employees to help customers take groceries and purchased merchandise out to their vehicles, not allowing the carts to be removed by their customers;

d. **Other Methods.** The project may employ other methods for onsite containment so long as the Bureau of Street Services has approved the systems or methods which would effectively contain or control shopping carts on store premises.

4. **Application.** All new projects shall comply with the regulations defined herein upon the effective date of this ordinance.

5. **Enforcement.** Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 12.26 of this Code, the Bureau of Street Services shall have the authority and responsibility of this subsection.

Sec. 2. The City Clerk shall certify...

ATTACHMENT 1

LAND USE FINDINGS

The City Planning Department recommends that the City Planning Commission, in accordance with Charter Section 556, find:


1. In accordance with Charter Section 556, the proposed ordinance (Appendix A) is in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent, and provisions of the City's General Plan in that it furthers:
 - Goal 5A of the Framework Element, which states "[a] liveable City for existing and future residents and one that is attractive to future investment," by eliminating errant carts through an on-site shopping cart containment system.
 - Objective 5.5, which states that the City must "[e]nhance the liveability of all neighborhoods by upgrading the quality of development and improving the quality of the public realm."
 - Policy 5.5.3 states that the City must "[f]ormulate and adopt building and site design standards and guidelines to raise the quality of design Citywide."
2. in accordance with Charter Section 558 (b)(2), the proposed ordinance (Appendix A) will be in conformity with the public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice in that it furthers:
 - Item 1 of the City Planning Commission policy, "Do Real Planning", to "demand walkable city" whereby storefronts and sidewalks are inviting.
 - Item 9 of the City Planning Commission policy, "Do Real Planning", to "arrest visual blight" by promoting visual calm on public rights of way and streets.

The proposed ordinance enhances the liveability of all neighborhoods creating a future environment that is attractive to future investment and raises the quality of design Citywide by requiring merchants to provide a safe, uncluttered and inviting commercial area that is free from errant shopping carts.

ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a Negative Declaration (Attachment 2) was published on June 3, 2010. On all measures the proposed ordinance (Appendix A) will have either no or a less than significant effect on the environment. The proposed ordinance makes no changes to existing zoning, any specific plans or other land use regulations that affect the physical environment.

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 CITYW	
PROJECT TITLE ENV-2010-1074-ND		CASE NO. CPC-2010-1073-CA	
PROJECT LOCATION N/A N/A			
PROJECT DESCRIPTION Amendment to Section 12.21 F of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to add a new onsite shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. No development is proposed as part of the project. No change in land use, density, or intensity is proposed as part of this project.			
NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT IF OTHER THAN CITY AGENCY City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning 200 N Spring Street, Room 763 Los Angeles, CA 90012			
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
GABRIELA JUAREZ		City Planning Associate	(213) 978-1337
ADDRESS		SIGNATURE (Official)	DATE
200 N. SPRING STREET, 7th FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA. 90012			5/28/ 2010

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)

LEAD CITY AGENCY: City of Los Angeles	COUNCIL DISTRICT: CITYW	DATE:
RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES: Department of City Planning		
ENVIRONMENTAL CASE: ENV-2010-1074-ND	RELATED CASES: CPC-2010-1073-CA	
PREVIOUS ACTIONS CASE NO.:	<input type="checkbox"/> Does have significant changes from previous actions. <input type="checkbox"/> Does NOT have significant changes from previous actions	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: ONSITE SHOPPING CART CONTAINMENT ORDINANCE		
ENV PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Amendment to Section 12.21 F of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to add a new onsite shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. No development is proposed as part of the project. No change in land use, density, or intensity is proposed as part of this project.		
ENVIRONMENTAL SETTINGS: The City of Los Angeles is the second largest city in the United States by population with an estimated 4 million residents. The city's boundaries cover a total area of 498.3 square miles (1,291 km ²), comprising 469.1 square miles (1,214.9 km ²) of land and 29.2 square miles (75.7 km ²) of water, reflecting a diverse terrain of urbanized areas, beaches, mountains, and valleys. The City of Los Angeles is divided into 15 City Council districts and 35 Community Plan Areas.		
PROJECT LOCATION: N/A N/A		
COMMUNITY PLAN AREA: CITYWIDE STATUS: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Conform to Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Does NOT Conform to Plan	AREA PLANNING COMMISSION: CITYWIDE	CERTIFIED NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL: CITYWIDE
EXISTING ZONING: Various	MAX. DENSITY/INTENSITY ALLOWED BY ZONING: Various	LA River Adjacent: NO
GENERAL PLAN LAND USE: Various	MAX. DENSITY/INTENSITY ALLOWED BY PLAN DESIGNATION: Various	
	PROPOSED PROJECT DENSITY: Various (No Change)	

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.



Signature

City Planning Associate

Title

(213) 978-1337

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

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

Background

PROPOSER NAME:

City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning

PHONE NUMBER:

(213) 978-1337

PROPOSER ADDRESS:

100 N Spring Street, Room 763
Los Angeles, CA 90012

DATE SUBMITTED:

04/29/2010

AGENCY REQUIRING CHECKLIST:

Department of City Planning

PROPOSAL NAME (if Applicable):

Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

I. AESTHETICS			
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?		✓
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES			
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?		✓
III. AIR QUALITY			
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?		✓
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
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 Game 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 Game or US 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?		✓
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES			

Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

· Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?			✓	
· Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?			✓	
· Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			✓	
· Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			✓	

I. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

· 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.			✓	
i. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Strong seismic ground shaking?			✓	
· Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			✓	
i. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Landslides?			✓	
· 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?			✓	
j. 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?			✓	
· 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?			✓	

II. GREEN HOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

i. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			✓	
· Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			✓	

III. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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?			✓	
----	---	--	--	---	--

IX. 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?			✓	

X. 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?			✓	

XI. 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?			✓	

XII. 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	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

1. 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?			✓	
2. 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?			✓	

III. POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. 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)?			✓	
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			✓	
3. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			✓	

IV. PUBLIC SERVICES

1. 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?			✓	
2. 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?			✓	
3. 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?			✓	
4. 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?			✓	
5. 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?			✓	

KV. RECREATION

1. 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?			✓	
2. 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?			✓	

KVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

1. 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	Potentially significant unless 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)?		✓	

XVII. 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?		✓	

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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 dated 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-2010-1074-ND and the associated case(s), CPC-2010-1073-CA .

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/ 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".

PREPARED BY:	TITLE:	TELEPHONE NO.:	DATE:
SABRIELA JUAREZ	City Planning Associate	(213) 978-1337	05/28/2010

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

APPENDIX A: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS EXPLANATION TABLE

I. AESTHETICS		
a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. The code amendment project itself does not include any specific physical development. The proposed code amendment would not change existing City regulations governing building heights, nor would it change allowed land uses or development intensity within the City of Los Angeles. Implementation of the proposed regulations through future development projects would not represent any change in how future development would affect scenic vistas. No adverse impact would result.</p>
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>Scenic resources including trees (inclusive of street trees and other landscape trees) and historic buildings are found throughout the City of Los Angeles. However, the proposed code amendment project itself does not include any specific physical development that would affect these resources, and the proposed regulations would not encourage tree removal, damage to historic structures, or any increase in development intensity or distribution in the project area. No adverse impact would result.</p>
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. The code amendment project itself does not include any specific physical development. No adverse impact would result.</p>
d.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>Future development approved within the City of Los Angeles has the potential to create new sources of substantial light or glare that could adversely affect day or nighttime views. However, this proposed code amendment project does not include any specific development and does not encourage more lighting or glare-generating architectural features than are allowed under existing regulations. Impacts would be less than</p>

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures	
	significant. Any property that lies adjacent to the Los Angeles River and appropriate design guidelines must be incorporated into the project to ensure consistency with the City's efforts for its revitalization.		
. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES			
a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. The code amendment project itself does not include any specific physical development. Further, the proposed regulations themselves do not include any specific development and do not encourage conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses or impacts to land under Williamson Act contract. No impacts to agricultural resources would occur. This property lies adjacent to the Los Angeles River and appropriate design guidelines must be incorporated into the project to ensure consistency with the City's efforts for its revitalization.	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. The code amendment project itself does not include any specific physical development. Further, the proposed regulations themselves do not include any specific development and do not encourage conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses or impacts to land under Williamson Act contract. No impacts to agricultural resources would occur.	
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. The code amendment project itself does not include any specific physical development. Further, the proposed regulations themselves do not include any specific development and do not encourage conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses or impacts to land under Williamson Act contract. No impacts to agricultural resources would occur.	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures	
d.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. The code amendment project itself does not include any specific physical development. Further, the proposed regulations themselves do not include any specific development and do not encourage conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses or impacts to land under Williamson Act contract. No impacts to agricultural resources would occur.	
e.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. The code amendment project itself does not include any specific physical development. Further, the proposed regulations themselves do not include any specific development and do not encourage conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses or impacts to land under Williamson Act contract. No impacts to agricultural resources would occur.	
III. AIR QUALITY			
a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Implementation of the code amendment project would not increase population levels or net density in the City of Los Angeles. As the project would not contribute to population growth in excess of that forecasted in the AQMP, no impact would occur.	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No development is proposed as part of or would be facilitated by the code amendment project, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. Thus, no impact is anticipated from new stationary sources of pollutants, such as generators or household uses (stoves, heaters, fireplaces etc). As no construction is proposed, impacts from construction emissions would not be increased. Thus, overall air quality would be unaffected by project implementation. The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts.	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	The code amendment project itself does not include any specific physical development. No adverse impacts would occur.	
c. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No development is proposed as part of or would be facilitated by the code amendment project, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. Thus, no impact is anticipated from new stationary sources of pollutants, such as generators or household uses (stoves, heaters, fireplaces etc). As no construction is proposed, impacts from construction emissions would not be increased. Thus, overall air quality would be unaffected by project implementation. The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. The code amendment project itself does not include any specific physical development. No adverse impacts would occur.	
d. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Commercial and industrial uses of the type that would result in substantial pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors would not be facilitated by the proposed code amendment project. No changes in land use designations or allowed uses are proposed, and no development would be directly approved by the project. No adverse impacts would occur.	
e. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Commercial and industrial uses of the type that would result in substantial pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors would not be facilitated by the proposed code amendment project. No changes in land use designations or allowed uses are proposed, and no development would be directly approved by the project. No adverse impacts would occur.	
V. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
a. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Biological resources may be found throughout the City of Los Angeles. However, the proposed code amendment project itself does not include any physical development that would affect these resources, and the proposed regulations would not encourage tree removal, damage to identified species, riparian communities, or sensitive natural	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	habitats, or any increase in development intensity or distribution in the project area. Implementation of the proposed regulations through future development projects would not represent any change in how future development would affect scenic vistas. No adverse impacts to biological resources, including identified species, riparian communities or sensitive natural communities, wetlands, protected trees, and habitats, are anticipated from the proposed code amendment.	
b. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Biological resources may be found throughout the City of Los Angeles. However, the proposed code amendment project itself does not include any physical development that would affect these resources, and the proposed regulations would not encourage tree removal, damage to identified species, riparian communities, or sensitive natural habitats, or any increase in development intensity or distribution in the project area. Implementation of the proposed regulations through future development projects would not represent any change in how future development would affect scenic vistas. No adverse impacts to biological resources, including identified species, riparian communities or sensitive natural communities, wetlands, protected trees, and habitats, are anticipated from the proposed code amendment.	
c. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Biological resources may be found throughout the City of Los Angeles. However, the proposed code amendment project itself does not include any physical development that would affect these resources, and the proposed regulations would not encourage tree removal, damage to identified species, riparian communities, or sensitive natural habitats, or any increase in development intensity or distribution in the project area. Implementation of the proposed regulations through future development projects would not represent any change in how future development would affect scenic vistas. No adverse impacts to biological resources, including identified species, riparian communities or sensitive natural communities, wetlands, protected trees, and habitats, are anticipated from the proposed code amendment.	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>Biological resources may be found throughout the City of Los Angeles. However, the proposed code amendment project itself does not include any physical development that would affect these resources, and the proposed regulations would not encourage tree removal, damage to identified species, riparian communities, or sensitive natural habitats, or any increase in development intensity or distribution in the project area. Implementation of the proposed regulations through future development projects would not represent any change in how future development would affect scenic vistas. No adverse impacts to biological resources, including identified species, riparian communities or sensitive natural communities, wetlands, protected trees, and habitats, are anticipated from the proposed code amendment.</p>	
g. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>Biological resources may be found throughout the City of Los Angeles. However, the proposed code amendment project itself does not include any physical development that would affect these resources, and the proposed regulations would not encourage tree removal, damage to identified species, riparian communities, or sensitive natural habitats, or any increase in development intensity or distribution in the project area. Implementation of the proposed regulations through future development projects would not represent any change in how future development would affect scenic vistas. No adverse impacts to biological resources, including identified species, riparian communities or sensitive natural communities, wetlands, protected trees, and habitats, are anticipated from the proposed code amendment. Any property that lies adjacent to the Los Angeles River and appropriate design guidelines must be incorporated into the project to ensure consistency with the City's efforts for its revitalization.</p>	
f. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>Biological resources may be found throughout the City of Los Angeles. However, the proposed code amendment project itself does not include any physical development that would affect these resources, and the proposed regulations would not encourage tree removal, damage to identified species, riparian communities, or sensitive natural habitats, or any increase in development</p>	

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

	<p>intensity or distribution in the project area. Implementation of the proposed regulations through future development projects would not represent any change in how future development would affect scenic vistas. No adverse impacts to biological resources, including identified species, riparian communities or sensitive natural communities, wetlands, protected trees, and habitats, are anticipated from the proposed code amendment.</p>	
--	---	--

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>The proposed project involves regulatory changes and does not include any specific physical development. The proposed standards would not facilitate nor encourage new development projects. Because no construction or physical changes to existing buildings is proposed as part of the project and because of the existing regulations and protections in place, including required CEQA review for projects with potential impacts to historic resources, adoption of the proposed code amendment is not anticipated to have any adverse impacts to historic resources.</p>	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>The proposed project involves regulatory changes and does not include any specific physical development. In addition, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 et seq. require that if human remains are discovered the Coroner shall be contacted and an investigation undertaken. If the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American, or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the Native American Heritage Commission. No adverse impacts to archaeological or paleontological resources associated with implementation of the proposed code amendment are anticipated. Thus, the impact, if any, would be less than significant.</p>	
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>The proposed project involves regulatory changes and does not include any specific physical development. In addition, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 et seq. require that if human remains are discovered the Coroner shall be contacted and an investigation undertaken. If the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American, or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native</p>	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	<p>American, he or she must contact the Native American Heritage Commission. No adverse impacts to archaeological or paleontological resources associated with implementation of the proposed code amendment are anticipated. Thus, the impact, if any, would be less than significant.</p>	
<p>i. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</p>	<p>The proposed project involves regulatory changes and does not include any specific physical development. In addition, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 et seq. require that if human remains are discovered the Coroner shall be contacted and an investigation undertaken. If the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American, or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, he or she must contact the Native American Heritage Commission. No adverse impacts to archaeological or paleontological resources associated with implementation of the proposed code amendment are anticipated. Thus, the impact, if any, would be less than significant.</p>	

/I. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<p>a. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</p>	<p>Los Angeles County, like most of Southern California, is a region of high seismic activity and is therefore subject to risk and hazards associated with earthquakes. Several active faults within the region are considered capable of affecting property throughout the City of Los Angeles. The proposed project involves regulatory changes and does not include any specific physical development. No increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. No specific development is proposed and no development would be specifically approved by adoption of the project. Individual future development projects, to which the proposed regulations would be applicable, would be subject to the requirements of the International Building Code and the California Building Code, which would ensure that the design and construction of new structures are engineered to withstand the expected ground acceleration, liquefaction, or other hazards that may occur on-site. Because no new development is proposed and due to required compliance with applicable building codes, no impacts related to</p>	
--	--	--

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	seismic hazards are anticipated.
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>Los Angeles County, like most of Southern California, is a region of high seismic activity and is therefore subject to risk and hazards associated with earthquakes. Several active faults within the region are considered capable of affecting property throughout the City of Los Angeles. The proposed project involves regulatory changes and does not include any specific physical development. No increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. No specific development is proposed and no development would be specifically approved by adoption of the project. Individual future development projects, to which the proposed regulations would be applicable, would be subject to the requirements of the International Building Code and the California Building Code, which would ensure that the design and construction of new structures are engineered to withstand the expected ground acceleration, liquefaction, or other hazards that may occur on-site. Because no new development is proposed and due to required compliance with applicable building codes, no impacts related to seismic hazards are anticipated.</p>

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	no new development is proposed and due to required compliance with applicable building codes, no impacts related to seismic hazards are anticipated.	
i. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Landslides are often triggered by earthquakes or torrential rainstorms. As noted throughout this document, no specific development is proposed as part of nor would any individual development be approved by the project, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. No landslide impacts are anticipated.	
e. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Erosion potential from site preparation for larger projects would be largely addressed through standard erosion control BMPs that are typically required during project construction; for example, projects with greater than one acre of ground disturbance require State Water Resources Control Board Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans. In addition, no specific development is proposed as part of this code amendment project, no individual development would be approved by the code amendment, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. No impacts resulting from soil erosion or loss of topsoil are anticipated.	
f. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No specific development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no individual development would be approved by the code amendment, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. In addition, compliance with California Building Code standards for safe construction generally ensures that no impacts related to expansive soils would occur.	
g. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No specific development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no individual development would be approved by the code amendment, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. In addition, compliance with California Building Code standards for safe construction generally ensures that no impacts related to expansive soils would occur.	
h. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No specific development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no individual development would be approved by the code amendment, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. No impacts	

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

would occur related to septic capability.

VII. GREEN HOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>No development is proposed as part of or would be facilitated by the code amendment project, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. Thus, no impact is anticipated, directly or indirectly, regarding generation of greenhouse gas emissions. As no construction is proposed, impacts from construction emissions would not be increased. The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. The code amendment project itself does not include any specific physical development. No adverse impacts would occur.</p>	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>No development is proposed as part of or would be facilitated by the code amendment project, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. Thus, adoption of the code amendment is not anticipated to conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. As no construction is proposed, impacts from construction emissions would not be increased. The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. The code amendment project itself does not include any specific physical development. No adverse impacts would occur.</p>	

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>Individual future development projects that may be proposed and developed as outlined in LAMC 12.21 F may be located on or near sites that could raise concerns regarding hazardous materials use, contamination, or other hazards. However, no increases in land use density, intensity or distribution, are proposed as part of the proposed code amendment. No specific development is proposed, and no individual development would be approved by adoption of the code amendment. In addition, a number of existing state and federal laws and</p>	
----	------------------------------	--	--

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	<p>programs apply to hazards and hazardous materials and would apply to subsequent future individual development projects. These include the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, California Fire Codes, Senate Bill 1082 (Facilities Subject to Corrective Action), Department of Health Services regulations, and Department of Housing regulations. Finally, Municipal Code Section 54.05 requires that a hazardous substance clearance report, including provisions for site remediation if warranted, be approved by the County Health Department and recorded with the County for sale or transfer of any property, upon which there has been an unauthorized disposal or release of a hazardous substance.</p>	
<p>d. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</p>	<p>Individual future development projects that may be proposed and developed as outlined in LAMC 12.21 F may be located on or near sites that could raise concerns regarding hazardous materials use, contamination, or other hazards. However, no increases in land use density, intensity or distribution, are proposed as part of the proposed code amendment. No specific development is proposed, and no individual development would be approved by adoption of the code amendment. In addition, a number of existing state and federal laws and programs apply to hazards and hazardous materials and would apply to subsequent future individual development projects. These include the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, California Fire Codes, Senate Bill 1082 (Facilities Subject to Corrective Action), Department of Health Services regulations, and Department of Housing regulations. Finally, Municipal Code Section 54.05 requires that a hazardous substance clearance report, including provisions for site remediation if warranted, be approved by the County Health Department and recorded with the County for sale or transfer of any property, upon which there has been an unauthorized disposal or release of a hazardous substance.</p>	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>Individual future development projects that may be proposed and developed as outlined in LAMC 12.21 F may be located on or near sites that could raise concerns regarding hazardous materials use, contamination, or other hazards. However, no increases in land use density, intensity or distribution, are proposed as part of the proposed code amendment. No specific development is proposed, and no individual development would be approved by adoption of the code amendment. In addition, a number of existing state and federal laws and programs apply to hazards and hazardous materials and would apply to subsequent future individual development projects. These include the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, California Fire Codes, Senate Bill 1082 (Facilities Subject to Corrective Action), Department of Health Services regulations, and Department of Housing regulations. Finally, Municipal Code Section 54.05 requires that a hazardous substance clearance report, including provisions for site remediation if warranted, be approved by the County Health Department and recorded with the County for sale or transfer of any property, upon which there has been an unauthorized disposal or release of a hazardous substance.</p>
d.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>Individual future development projects that may be proposed and developed as outlined in LAMC 12.21 F may be located on or near sites that could raise concerns regarding hazardous materials use, contamination, or other hazards. However, no increases in land use density, intensity or distribution, are proposed as part of the proposed code amendment. No specific development is proposed, and no individual development would be approved by adoption of the code amendment. In addition, a number of existing state and federal laws and programs apply to hazards and hazardous materials and would apply to subsequent future individual development projects. These include the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, California Fire Codes, Senate Bill 1082 (Facilities Subject to Corrective Action), Department of Health Services regulations, and Department of Housing regulations. Finally, Municipal Code</p>

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	Section 54.05 requires that a hazardous substance clearance report, including provisions for site remediation if warranted, be approved by the County Health Department and recorded with the County for sale or transfer of any property, upon which there has been an unauthorized disposal or release of a hazardous substance.	
e. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The City of Los Angeles contains the Los Angeles International Airport, the Van Nuys Airport, and Whiteman Airport. No safety hazard impacts would occur because no new individual development or increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed as part of the proposed code amendment. No adverse impacts are anticipated	
f. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The City of Los Angeles contains the Los Angeles International Airport, the Van Nuys Airport, and Whiteman Airport. No safety hazard impacts would occur because no new individual development or increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed as part of the proposed code amendment. No adverse impacts are anticipated	
g. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The circulation network would remain unchanged under the proposed regulations. Access to and from existing structures and to and through the project area would remain unchanged. Existing requirements for fire and other emergency access would continue to be applied to development as it is proposed and reviewed. No adverse impacts are anticipated	
h. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The City of Los Angeles is highly urbanized but contains large areas of undeveloped lands adjacent to urban areas, where the possibility of wildfires exist at the wildland-urban interface. However, no specific development is proposed by the code amendment project, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. Individual future development projects that may be proposed and developed as outlined in LAMC 12.21 F will be subject to requirements of the International Building Code and the California Building Code. No impacts would occur.	

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures	
a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No specific development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no individual development will be approved as part of the code amendment, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. Regulations under the federal Clean Water Act require that a NPDES general construction storm water permit be obtained for projects that would disturb greater than one acre during construction. Acquisition of a NPDES permit is dependent on the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that contains BMPs to control the discharge of pollutants, including sediment, into the local surface water drainages. For project operation, the City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control regulations (Municipal Code, Chapter VI Article 4.4) require measures to control stormwater pollutants, including implementation of practices from the "Development Best Management Practices Handbook" adopted by the Board of Public Works. The City's NPDES Permit requires new development and redevelopment projects to incorporate water quality measures. Depending on the type of project, either a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) or a Site Specific Mitigation Plan is required to reduce the quantity and improve the quality of rainfall runoff that leaves the site. No impacts are anticipated.	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no individual development would be approved as part of the code amendment, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. Adoption of the proposed code amendment would not result in a measurable increase in the demand for water. No impacts are anticipated. Environmental impacts in the form of increased pollutant runoff may result from operation of the proposed project next to the Los Angeles River.	
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No specific development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no individual development will be approved as part of the code amendment, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. Regulations under the federal Clean Water Act require	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	<p>that a NPDES general construction storm water permit be obtained for projects that would disturb greater than one acre during construction. Acquisition of a NPDES permit is dependent on the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that contains BMPs to control the discharge of pollutants, including sediment, into the local surface water drainages. For project operation, the City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control regulations (Municipal Code, Chapter VI Article 4.4) require measures to control stormwater pollutants, including implementation of practices from the "Development Best Management Practices Handbook" adopted by the Board of Public Works. The City's NPDES Permit requires new development and redevelopment projects to incorporate water quality measures. Depending on the type of project, either a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) or a Site Specific Mitigation Plan is required to reduce the quantity and improve the quality of rainfall runoff that leaves the site. No impacts are anticipated.</p>	
<p>d. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</p>	<p>No specific development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no individual development will be approved as part of the code amendment, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. Regulations under the federal Clean Water Act require that a NPDES general construction storm water permit be obtained for projects that would disturb greater than one acre during construction. Acquisition of a NPDES permit is dependent on the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that contains BMPs to control the discharge of pollutants, including sediment, into the local surface water drainages. For project operation, the City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control regulations (Municipal Code, Chapter VI Article 4.4) require measures to control stormwater pollutants, including implementation of practices from the "Development Best Management Practices Handbook" adopted by the Board of Public Works. The City's NPDES Permit requires new development and redevelopment projects to incorporate</p>	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	<p>water quality measures. Depending on the type of project, either a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) or a Site Specific Mitigation Plan is required to reduce the quantity and improve the quality of rainfall runoff that leaves the site. No impacts are anticipated.</p>	
<p>e. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</p>	<p>No specific development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no individual development will be approved as part of the code amendment, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. Regulations under the federal Clean Water Act require that a NPDES general construction storm water permit be obtained for projects that would disturb greater than one acre during construction. Acquisition of a NPDES permit is dependent on the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that contains BMPs to control the discharge of pollutants, including sediment, into the local surface water drainages. For project operation, the City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control regulations (Municipal Code, Chapter VI Article 4.4) require measures to control stormwater pollutants, including implementation of practices from the "Development Best Management Practices Handbook" adopted by the Board of Public Works. The City's NPDES Permit requires new development and redevelopment projects to incorporate water quality measures. Depending on the type of project, either a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) or a Site Specific Mitigation Plan is required to reduce the quantity and improve the quality of rainfall runoff that leaves the site. No impacts are anticipated.</p>	
<p>f. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</p>	<p>No specific development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no individual development will be approved as part of the code amendment, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. Regulations under the federal Clean Water Act require that a NPDES general construction storm water permit be obtained for projects that would disturb greater than one acre during construction. Acquisition of a NPDES permit is dependent on the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution</p>	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	<p>Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that contains BMPs to control the discharge of pollutants, including sediment, into the local surface water drainages. For project operation, the City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control regulations (Municipal Code, Chapter VI Article 4.4) require measures to control stormwater pollutants, including implementation of practices from the "Development Best Management Practices Handbook" adopted by the Board of Public Works. The City's NPDES Permit requires new development and redevelopment projects to incorporate water quality measures. Depending on the type of project, either a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) or a Site Specific Mitigation Plan is required to reduce the quantity and improve the quality of rainfall runoff that leaves the site. No impacts are anticipated.</p>	
g. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>No development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no individual development would be approved as part of the code amendment, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. Existing requirements for flood management and mitigation would continue to be applied to development as it is proposed and reviewed. No adverse impacts are anticipated.</p>	
h. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>No development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no individual development would be approved as part of the code amendment, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. Existing requirements for flood management and mitigation would continue to be applied to development as it is proposed and reviewed. No adverse impacts are anticipated.</p>	
i. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>No development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no individual development would be approved as part of the code amendment, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. Existing requirements for flood management and mitigation would continue to be applied to development as it is proposed and reviewed. No adverse impacts are anticipated.</p>	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures	
j.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No development is proposed as part the code amendment project, no individual development would be approved as part of the code amendment, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. Coastal areas of the City of Los Angeles could potentially be subject to tsunami or seiche, and existing requirements for mitigation, including the Coastal Development Permitting process administered by the Coastal Development Commission, would continue to be applied to development as it is proposed and reviewed. No adverse impacts are anticipated.	
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING			
a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. No increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. No specific development is proposed, and no individual development would be approved by adoption of the code amendment. No changes in land use designations are proposed, and no major infrastructure or other projects or changes that would divide existing communities are proposed or would be directly facilitated. No impacts would occur.	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. No increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. No specific development is proposed, and no individual development would be approved by adoption of the code amendment. Implementation of the proposed changes to existing conditional use regulations through future requested projects within the City of Los Angeles would be consistent with the General Plan, applicable Community Plans, and Zoning Ordinance as amended by this code amendment project. No impacts would occur.	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
c. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. No increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. No specific development is proposed, and no development would be specifically approved by adoption of the program. Therefore, No habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans would be impacted.	
(I. MINERAL RESOURCES		
a. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. No increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. No specific development is proposed, and no development would be specifically approved by adoption of the program. Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources would occur.	
b. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. No increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. No specific development is proposed, and no development would be specifically approved by adoption of the program. Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources would occur.	
(II. NOISE		
a. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. No increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. No specific development is proposed, and no development would be specifically approved by adoption of the proposed code amendment. Because the proposed project does not include any development proposals or entitlements, adoption of the proposed code amendment would not place sensitive receptors in areas, subject to noise that exceeds noise standards.	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. No increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. No specific development is proposed, and no development would be specifically approved by adoption of the proposed code amendment. Because the proposed project does not include any development proposals or entitlements, adoption of the proposed code amendment would not place sensitive receptors in areas, subject to noise that exceeds noise standards.	
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. No increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. No specific development is proposed, and no development would be specifically approved by adoption of the proposed code amendment. Because the proposed project does not include any development proposals or entitlements, adoption of the proposed code amendment would not place sensitive receptors in areas, subject to noise that exceeds noise standards.	
d.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No specific development is proposed and no development would be specifically approved by adoption of the proposed code amendment. The proposed regulations do not involve any development proposals or entitlements. Any future development through LAMC 12.21 F to be developed in the City of Los Angeles will comply with Noise Ordinance No. 144,331 and 161,574, and any subsequent ordinances, which prohibit the emission or creation of noise beyond certain levels at adjacent uses unless technically infeasible. Therefore, no impacts related to temporary construction noise would occur.	
e.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. No specific development is proposed, and no individual development would be approved by adoption of the program. If adopted, the proposed code amendment	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	will not impact any existing or planned airport plans. Therefore, the project would not expose people to excessive noise levels associated with airport operations.	
LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. No specific development is proposed, and no individual development would be approved by adoption of the program. If adopted, the proposed code amendment will not impact any existing or planned airport plans. Therefore, the project would not expose people to excessive noise levels associated with airport operations.	
(III. POPULATION AND HOUSING		
a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No specific development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no individual development would be approved by the project, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. No housing is proposed for construction or removal, and no population inducing development or regulations are proposed. The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts; however, future development projects will not allow any increase in net density above what has been planned. Therefore, no population and housing impacts would occur.
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No specific development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no individual development would be approved by the project, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. No housing is proposed for construction or removal, and no population inducing development or regulations are proposed. The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts; however, future development projects will not allow any increase in net density above what has been planned. Therefore, no population and housing impacts would occur.

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures	
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No specific development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no individual development would be approved by the project, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. No housing is proposed for construction or removal, and no population inducing development or regulations are proposed. The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts; however, future development projects will not allow any increase in net density above what has been planned. Therefore, no population and housing impacts would occur.	
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES			
a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Because no development is proposed as part of or would be facilitated by the code amendment project, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed, the code amendment project would not increase the demand for fire or police protection services, schools, parks, or other public services. No new facilities would be required, and no alterations to existing facilities would result from adoption of the proposed code amendment. No adverse impacts related to public services or public services facilities would occur from adoption of the proposed code amendment.	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Because no development is proposed as part of or would be facilitated by the code amendment project, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed, the code amendment project would not increase the demand for fire or police protection services, schools, parks, or other public services. No new facilities would be required, and no alterations to existing facilities would result from adoption of the proposed code amendment. No adverse impacts related to public services or public services facilities would occur from adoption of the proposed code amendment.	
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Because no development is proposed as part of or would be facilitated by the code amendment project, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed, the code amendment project would not increase the demand	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	<p>for fire or police protection services, schools, parks, or other public services. No new facilities would be required, and no alterations to existing facilities would result from adoption of the proposed code amendment. No adverse impacts related to public services or public services facilities would occur from adoption of the proposed code amendment.</p>	
<p>i. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</p>	<p>Because no development is proposed as part of or would be facilitated by the code amendment project, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed, the code amendment project would not increase the demand for fire or police protection services, schools, parks, or other public services. No new facilities would be required, and no alterations to existing facilities would result from adoption of the proposed code amendment. No adverse impacts related to public services or public services facilities would occur from adoption of the proposed code amendment.</p>	
<p>a. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</p>	<p>Because no development is proposed as part of or would be facilitated by the code amendment project, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed, the code amendment project would not increase the demand for fire or police protection services, schools, parks, or other public services. No new facilities would be required, and no alterations to existing facilities would result from adoption of the proposed code amendment. No adverse impacts related to public services or public services facilities would occur from adoption of the proposed code amendment.</p>	

KV. RECREATION

<p>a. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</p>	<p>No development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no specific development would be approved by the code amendment, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. No housing or other uses are proposed or would be specifically approved that would result in increased demand for recreational facilities, and no population-inducing development or regulations are proposed. No adverse impacts related to recreation would occur.</p>	
--	---	--

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

b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no specific development would be approved by the code amendment, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. No housing or other uses are proposed or would be specifically approved that would result in increased demand for recreational facilities, and no population-inducing development or regulations are proposed. No adverse impacts related to recreation would occur.	
----	------------------------------	--	--

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No development is proposed nor would any specific development be approved by the proposed code amendment. Implementation of the proposed code amendment, which would not change the land use designations or density in the project area, would not be expected to affect traffic or circulation. Therefore, and because no specific development, changes in land use, or increases in allowed land use intensity are proposed as part of the proposed code amendment, project implementation would not increase traffic volumes within the City of Los Angeles. No adverse impacts would result.	
----	------------------------------	---	--

b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No development is proposed nor would any specific development be approved by the proposed code amendment. Implementation of the proposed code amendment, which would not change the land use designations or density in the project area, would not be expected to affect traffic or circulation. Therefore, and because no specific development, changes in land use, or increases in allowed land use intensity are proposed as part of the proposed code amendment, project implementation would not increase traffic volumes within the City of Los Angeles. No adverse impacts would result.	
----	------------------------------	---	--

c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No development is proposed nor would any specific development be approved by the proposed code amendment. Therefore, no change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks would result. Building heights would not be increased, nor would projects regulated by the proposed code amendment increase airport traffic levels. No adverse	
----	------------------------------	--	--

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	impacts would result.	
d. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No sharp curves, dangerous intersections or other hazardous traffic or intersection configurations are proposed or would be facilitated by implementation of the code amendment project. Major changes in road engineering, alignment or intersection controls that could affect traffic safety are not proposed. Farm equipment and other incompatible vehicular or transportation uses would not be introduced or facilitated by the project. No adverse impacts would result. Any property that lies adjacent to the Los Angeles River and appropriate design guidelines must be incorporated into the project to ensure public and emergency access.	
e. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The circulation network would remain unchanged under the proposed regulations. Access to and from existing structures and to and through the project area would remain unchanged. Existing requirements for fire and other emergency access would continue to be applied to development as it is proposed and reviewed. No adverse impacts are anticipated.	
f. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No development is proposed nor would any specific development be approved by the proposed code amendment. Therefore, no change in parking capacity is anticipated from adoption of the proposed project. The project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. No adverse impact would result.	
(VII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS)		
a. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no specific development would be approved by the project, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. The project would not result in a measurable increase in the demand for water nor in an increase in wastewater generation. No new or expanded facilities are proposed or would be required in order to implement the proposed code amendment. Impacts would be less than significant.	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no specific development would be approved by the project, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. The project would not result in a measurable increase in the demand for water nor in an increase in wastewater generation. No new or expanded facilities are proposed or would be required in order to implement the proposed code amendment. Impacts would be less than significant.	
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No new development or increases in potential development are proposed, and no wastewater facilities are proposed for alteration or expansion. New development built subject to the proposed regulations would be subject to various water conservation measures in the citywide landscape ordinance and other regulations. Impacts would be less than significant.	
d.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no specific development would be approved by the project, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. The project would not result in a measurable increase in the demand for water nor in an increase in wastewater generation. No new or expanded facilities are proposed or would be required in order to implement the proposed code amendment. Impacts would be less than significant.	
e.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no specific development would be approved by the project, and no increases in land use density, intensity, or distribution are proposed. The project would not result in a measurable increase in the demand for water nor in an increase in wastewater generation. No new or expanded facilities are proposed or would be required in order to implement the proposed code amendment. Impacts would be less than significant.	
f.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no specific development would be approved, and no increases in land use density or intensity are proposed. Implementation of the proposed code amendment would not result in a measurable increase in solid	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	waste generation. Impacts would be less than significant.	
j. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	No development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no specific development would be approved, and no increases in land use density or intensity are proposed. Implementation of the proposed code amendment would not result in a measurable increase in solid waste generation. Impacts would be less than significant.	
VIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE		
a. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. No development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no specific development would be approved by the project. As such, the project will not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, 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. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. No development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no specific development would be approved by the project. As such, the project will not have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable that have not already been taken into account in the respective community plan area.	
c. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed code amendment would add a new on-site shopping cart containment development standard for new development and major remodels for stores with six or more shopping carts. No development is proposed as part of the code amendment project, no specific development would be approved by the project. As such, the project does not have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures

DETERMINATION LETTER
CPC-2010-1073-CA
MAILING DATE: 06/23/11
Corrected Mailed: 07/01/11

Elektra Kruger
10544 Mahoney Dr.
Shadow Hills, CA 91040

Gabriela Juarez
City Planning Associate
City Hall, Room 621
Mail Stop #395

Amy Brothers
Deputy City Attorney
City Hall East, 7th Floor
Mail Stop #140

Michael Bostrom
Deputy City Attorney
City Hall East, 7th Floor
Mail Stop #140

GIS/Fae Tsukamoto
City Hall, Room 825
Mail Stop #395

First Council District
City Hall, Room 410
Mail Stop #201

Second Council District
City Hall, Room 425
Mail Stop #202

Third Council District
City Hall, Room 450
Mail Stop #204

Fourth Council District
City Hall, Room 480
Mail Stop #206

Fifth Council District
City Hall, Room 440
Mail Stop #208

Sixth Council District
City Hall, Room 455
Mail Stop #210

Seventh Council District
City Hall, Room 470
Mail Stop #211

Eighth Council District
City Hall, Room 460
Mail Stop #213

Ninth Council District
City Hall, Room 420
Mail Stop #215

Tenth Council District
City Hall, Room 430
Mail Stop #217

Eleventh Council District
City Hall, Room 415
Mail Stop #218

Twelfth Council District
City Hall, Room 405
Mail Stop #220, #237

Thirteenth Council District
City Hall, Room 475
Mail Stop #222

Fourteenth Council District
City Hall, Room 465
Mail Stop #223

Fifteenth Council District
City Hall, Room 435
Mail Stop #226