

**CEQA Findings of Fact and
Statement of Overriding Considerations**

**For the
Ponte Vista Project**

February 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

SFI Bridgeview, LLC (the Project Applicant), is proposing to develop a residential development of up to 700 units on a 61.5-acre site located at 26900 South Western Avenue in the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan Area of the City of Los Angeles. The Project would involve the demolition and removal of all existing improvements on the Site, which include 245 vacant residential units, a 2,161-square foot community center, and a 3,454-square foot retail convenience facility which were constructed in approximately 1962 by the U.S. Navy for the purpose of housing and accommodating personnel stationed at the Long Beach Naval Shipyard. The Site (formerly known as “San Pedro Housing”) was closed in the late 1990s.

The Project's residential units would be comprised of single-family, townhome, and flats ranging in size from 600 to approximately 2,800 square feet, within buildings constructed over and/or adjacent to residential parking garages. The Project would also provide an access road from Western Avenue to the off-site, private Mary Star of the Sea High School. The Project would incorporate internal open space and recreational areas, including a community clubhouse and pool/recreation area, a 2.42-acre publically accessible park, and approximately 24.15 acres of total open space. Additional recreational amenities would be distributed throughout the site. A Specific Plan is proposed to provide zoning, architectural, landscape, and streetscape standards to guide the Project's development.

In compliance with Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was prepared by the Department of City Planning and distributed to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, responsible agencies, and other interested parties on October 26, 2010. The NOP for the Draft EIR was circulated until November 29, 2010.

A Notice of Availability (NOA) and the Draft EIR were submitted to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, various public agencies, citizen groups, and interested individuals for a 61-day public review period from November 8, 2012, through January 7, 2013.

During that time, the Draft EIR was also available for review at the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, various City libraries, and via Internet at <http://cityplanning.lacity.org>. The Draft EIR analyzed the effects of a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project. Following the close of the public review period, written responses were prepared to the comments received on the Draft EIR. Comments on the Draft EIR and the responses to those comments are included within the Final EIR (Final EIR).

The Final EIR is comprised of: an Introduction; List of Commenters; Responses to Comments; Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR; a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; and Appendices. The Final EIR, together with the Draft EIR and the Supplemental Analysis of Project Revisions, makes up the Final EIR as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15132 (the Final EIR).

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which the City of Los Angeles' CEQA findings are based are located at the Department of City Planning, 200 Spring Street, Room 750, Los Angeles, CA 90012. This information is provided in compliance with CEQA Section 21081.6(a)(2).

Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines require a public agency, prior to approving a project, to identify significant impacts of the project and make one or more of three possible findings for each of the significant impacts.

- A. The first possible finding is that “[c]hanges or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subd. (a)(1))
- B. The second possible finding is that “[s]uch changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subd. (a)(2))
- C. The third possible finding is that “specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subd. (a)(3))

The findings reported in the following pages incorporate the facts and discussions of the environmental impacts that are found to be significant in the Final EIR for the Project as fully set forth therein. Although Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines does not require findings to address environmental impacts that an EIR identifies as merely “potentially significant,” these findings will nevertheless fully account for all such effects identified in the Final EIR. For each of the significant impacts associated with the Project, either before or after mitigation, the following sections are provided:

Description of Significant Effects - A specific description of the environmental effects identified in the Final EIR, including a judgment regarding the significance of the impact.

Mitigation Measures - Identified mitigation measures or actions that are required as part of the Project.

Finding - One or more of three specific findings in direct response to CEQA Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091.

Rationale - A summary of the reasons for the finding(s).

Reference - A notation on the specific section in the Draft EIR or Final EIR, which includes the evidence and discussion of the identified impact.

II. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

The Project Site is located within the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Planning Area of the City. The Project Site consists of approximately 61.5 acres of land and is located at 26900 South Western Avenue in the City of Los Angeles, approximately two miles north of downtown San Pedro, and 1.5 miles northwest of the Port of Los Angeles. The Project Site is the location of the former U.S. Navy San Pedro Housing complex and is bordered by Western Avenue (State Route 213) to the west, Fitness Drive and multi-family residential developments to the south, the U.S. Navy's Defense Fuel Support Point (DFSP) to the north, and Mary Star of the Sea High School to the east.

The Project proposes the development of a residential community of up to 700 units featuring single-family homes, duplexes, townhomes, and flats. Streets within the Project would be both private and public, with access to the Project Site provided through two entrances from Western Avenue, at Green Hills Drive and at a new east-west road near the southerly boundary line of the Project Site that would intersect Western Avenue at Avenida Aprenda. An access road would also be provided and maintained to the neighboring multi-family developments to the south (Seaport Homes and Casa Verde), to allow those residents to access to Western Avenue via the Project's new east-west road.

Gross residential densities developed within the Project would range from 8 units per acre to 23 units per acre. The average density for the Project would be 11.4 DU/acre (gross).

The Proposed Project would be comprised of a combination of dwelling units within the following categories:

- Two- and three-story detached single-family homes with street-loaded private garages
- Two-story buildings containing townhomes with driveway-loaded private garages
- Two-story townhomes and flats with driveway-loaded private garages
- Four story buildings containing flats with elevators over a secured common basement garage containing flats

The dwelling units would range in size from approximately 600 to 2,800 square feet and would be housed within Mediterranean, Tuscan, and contemporary-style buildings built over and/or adjacent to residential parking garages. Residential buildings along Western Avenue would be two to three stories in height (between 30 and 48 feet) and would be buffered by trees and landscaping and set back from the street by approximately 18-80 feet, depending on the location and product type. Residential buildings throughout the rest of the Project Site would vary in height, with buildings averaging three stories, but not exceeding four stories (approximately 55 feet) in the interior of the site near its southern boundary. Based on data provided by the Project Applicant, the weighted average sale price for all for-sale units would be \$489,474 (2011 dollars).

Vehicular access to the Project would be from Western Avenue at the two existing signalized intersections with Green Hills Drive and Avenida Aprenda on the north and south, respectively. The proposed southerly Project entrance at the Western Avenue/Avenida Aprenda intersection would feed into a new east-west road crossing the southern portion of the Project Site that would provide access to the property currently occupied by the Mary Star of the Sea High School campus adjacent to the site on the east.

With the exception of the east-west road described above providing access across the Project Site to Mary Star of the Sea High School and the access road to the neighboring multi-family developments, both of which would be privately maintained but publicly accessible and not gated, all other streets within the Project would be private and vehicular access would be provided through two gated entrances: one from Western Avenue at Green Hills Drive and a second off of the new public east-west road near the southerly boundary line of the Project Site that would intersect Western Avenue at Avenida Aprenda. The new access road for Mary Star of the Sea High School would terminate at the eastern edge of the Project Site, from which a private driveway would extend off-site to the east providing access to the property currently occupied by the Mary Star of the Sea campus.

When completed, the Project would redevelop 100 percent of the Project Site. The Project would incorporate a seismic setback area along a splay of the Palos Verdes Fault crossing the center of the site. The Proposed Project would incorporate over 24 acres of total open space, consisting of outdoor recreational amenity space (including primary and secondary recreation centers with adjacent community clubhouses and pool/event lawn areas for project residents), dedicated park area (including an open space/trail network around the perimeter of the Project Site and a publically-accessible park near Western Avenue), landscaped common areas throughout the Project, and other open space. The open space/trail network and publically-accessible park areas would be accessible to both Project residents and the general public. Additional indoor recreational amenities (e.g., rec rooms, fitness centers, etc.) would be distributed across the site for the private use of residents.

A Specific Plan is proposed for the Project to provide zoning, architectural, landscape, and streetscape standards to guide the Project's development. At residential densities ranging from 8 dwelling units per acre to approximately 23 dwelling units per acre, the Project would fall within the City of Los Angeles' Low, Low-Medium I, and Low-Medium II General Plan Land Use Designations.

Although a maximum of 212 residential units would be permitted under the Specific Plan within Subarea 6, only 188 units are currently being proposed. In order to provide additional housing within Subarea 6 exceeding the currently proposed 188 units but not more than 212 units, a new subdivision map would be required, although no Specific Plan Amendment would be required.

Construction of the Proposed Project is estimated to begin in late 2013 and continue over a five-year period. The existing slope along the northeastern boundary of the Project Site would be modified to support the construction of the residential dwelling units along its toe. However, following completion of construction and landscaping, the re-engineered slope would be fully vegetated with a variety of native plant and tree species. The entire Project Site would be densely landscaped with a variety of ornamental

and native plant and tree species. As individual phases of the development are completed, associated landscaping would be installed on an incremental basis.

As part of Project construction, the existing surface drainage course crossing the southwestern corner of the Project Site would be removed and buried beneath this portion of the Project as a subterranean storm drain. This storm drain would serve the same purpose as the existing surface channel by conveying the off-site stormwater runoff from the culvert at Western Avenue across this portion of the Project Site. After accepting additional drainage from the Project Site, this storm drain would discharge runoff to the City storm drain system in the same general location as at present along the Project Site's southern boundary.

Site preparation for Project construction would involve conventional cut and fill grading techniques. A significant amount of existing fill is present on the Project Site and would be either removed or consolidated and recompact prior to the grading of building pads. Site grading would be required to prepare the proposed building pads for construction. Grading would also be required in order to construct the proposed roads, parking areas, and drainage improvements, and to install utilities. The combined grading operations would affect the entire site (or approximately 61.5 acres) and would involve a total earthwork quantity of approximately 1,225,000 cubic yards (cy), including approximately 350,000 cy of cut and fill for surface grading and an additional 875,000 cy of remedial grading for over-excavation and other requirements. No fill material would be imported to or exported from the Project Site. However, the removal of debris resulting from the demolition of existing structures on the Project Site would be required. Construction staging, laydown areas, and all construction equipment would be positioned on-site and would be moved from area to area on the Project Site, consistent with the sequence of construction.

The City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning is the Lead Agency for the Project. In order to construct the Project, the Project Applicant is requesting approval of the following discretionary and ministerial actions from the City of Los Angeles and/or other agencies:

- General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation in the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan for the Project Site from Low Residential and Open Space to Low Medium II Residential;
- Zone change to change the zoning designation for the Project Site from R1-1XL and OS-1XL to a new Specific Plan Zone;
- Specific Plan adopted for Ponte Vista establishing project-specific development standards and guidelines;
- Vesting Tract Map for the development of 676 residential dwelling units on the 61.5-acre Project Site;
- Haul Route Permit for the removal of demolished structures and associated materials from the Project Site;

- B-Permit for necessary street, sewer, storm drain, and lighting improvements;
- Grading Permits;
- Building Permits;
- Streambed Alteration Agreement pursuant to Section 1603 of the California Fish & Game Code;
- Permits pursuant to Sections 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act;
- Encroachment Permit from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans); and
- Any other necessary discretionary approvals or ministerial permits required for the construction or operation of the Project.

Other reviewing departments within the City may include:

- Los Angeles Police Department (Site Plan Review).
- Los Angeles Fire Department (Site Plan Review, Hydrants Unit Sign-Off).
- Los Angeles Department of Transportation (Traffic Study Review, Site Plan Review for Driveway Access and Pedestrian Safety).
- Los Angeles Department of Public Works (B-Permit)
- Building and Safety (Site Plan Review, Building Permits, Certificate of Occupancy).

III. IMPACTS FOUND TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT/NO IMPACT

The City of Los Angeles Planning Department prepared an Initial Study for the Project, in which it determined that the Project would not have the potential to cause significant impacts in the areas of Agricultural and Forestry Resources and Mineral Resources. Therefore, these issue areas were not examined in detail in the Draft EIR or the Final EIR. The rationale for the conclusion that no significant impact would occur is also summarized below:

A. Agricultural and Forestry Resources

The Project would not result in the conversion of either designated farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use because there is no agricultural land or forest land located on the Project Site or in the vicinity of the Project Site. The Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or forest use because the Project Site is not zoned for agricultural use or forest use. Finally, because the City of Los Angeles does not currently participate in the Williamson Act, the Project would not conflict with or result in the cancellation of a Williamson Act contract. For these reasons, the Initial Study determined that the Project would have no impact on agricultural or forestry resources.

B. Mineral Resources

The Project Site is not known to be a likely source for any mineral resources of value to the region, residents, or the State. The Project Site is not located within a locally important mineral resource recovery area delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Furthermore, the site is currently developed, precluding the availability of any resources that might have been present. Therefore, the Project would not alter the status of the site with respect to the availability of mineral resources. For these reasons, the Initial Study determined that the Project would have no impact on mineral resources.

IV. IMPACTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT PRIOR TO MITIGATION (No Mitigation Measures Required to Reduce Impacts)

The following effects associated with the Project were analyzed in the Draft EIR and found to be less than significant prior to mitigation and no mitigation measures are required:

A. Aesthetics (Views/Light and Glare)

Replacement of the existing abandoned development with a new residential community would introduce a land use to the site that is consistent with the single-family and multi-family residential visual character of areas to the east, west, and south of the Project Site. As a result, the Proposed Project would improve the existing visual character of the site. Project impacts on visual character and views would be less than significant, as detailed below.

From Viewshed A (looking west from the east side of the Project Site), Project development would reduce the available field of view and block a portion of the view of the Palos Verdes Hills from the vicinity of the Mary Star of the Sea High School athletic fields and parking lots, as well as block most of the limited view of Green Hills Memorial Park. Such changes in views would be less than significant, as the City of Los Angeles does not consider changes to private views to be significant. From locations farther to the east within this viewshed area, these scenic views would be blocked by the Project to a substantially lesser degree.

From Viewshed B (looking north from the south side of the Project Site), at specific exterior locations where a relatively unobstructed view northward onto the Project Site is available, as well as from the interior of the units facing the Project Site, the Project flats/townhomes buildings would be visually prominent in the foreground and would constitute a change in the visual character of the Site. Most views of the riparian corridor would be blocked, with the exception of specific locations adjacent to gaps between the proposed on-site residential buildings. Similarly, most views across the Project Site to the DFSP property would also be blocked by the proposed on-site residential buildings. Residences adjacent to the southwestern corner of the Project Site would have a view of the publically-accessible park.

From Viewsheds C and D (looking east onto the Project Site from Western Avenue and from Green Hills Memorial Park, respectively), Project landscaping would shield most Project buildings from view and would create a type of visual “greenbelt” along the Western Avenue frontage. These trees and landscaping would replace the existing chain-link fence along the Western Avenue frontage of the Site as the principal on-site visual element visible from this viewshed area. In addition, a wide field of view would remain visible from vantage points in this area, and therefore, the Project would not create a substantial impact to the overall coverage of the available view, nor would it represent a change in overall visual character. Existing views towards the harbor across the central portion of the Project Site from higher elevations along Western Avenue would not be affected by Project buildings due to the difference in elevation between the street and the proposed single-family homes. Project development would potentially add additional height and mass to the existing skyline of views of the Project Site. However, while Project structures would have the potential to alter view lines somewhat, Project development

would not be tall enough or close enough to this area to alter the existing background views of the harbor area.

From Viewshed E (looking east toward the Project Site from Avenida Aprenda), views toward the Site are only partially available. Where views do exist towards the Project Site, they would be at least partially obstructed by neighboring homes and existing trees and vegetation. Views toward the harbor area (where the tops of some harbor cranes are partially visible) from some portions of Avenida Aprenda would continue to be available from elevations above the Project Site. However, the width of these views from lower elevations just west of the intersection of Avenida Aprenda and Western Avenue would be reduced by the presence of Project buildings as well as the existing residential units located to the south of the Project Site. Project trees and landscaping would screen most of the interior views of the Project Site.

With adherence to Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) regulations, light resulting from Project construction activities would not significantly impact off-site sensitive uses, substantially alter the character of off-site areas surrounding the construction area, or interfere with the performance of an off-site activity. Implementation of the Proposed Project would introduce new sources of light, including multi-story buildings with interior and exterior building lighting, low-level security/courtesy lighting for parking areas and parks, street lighting, and vehicle headlights. However, views into the Project Site would be limited by topography, surrounding buildings, and the Project's own buildings, landscaping, and fencing. Project lighting impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed Project residences would have stucco, wood, stone and/or brick and block facades. Windows would consist of non-highly reflective glass. Other prominent objects in vicinity viewsheds are illuminated (e.g., nearby refineries, roads, bridges, and harbor cranes). All new light generated by the Project's operation would be similar to that generated by typical single- and multi-family communities already existing in the area and would not significantly affect light-sensitive land uses by introducing new sources of light or glare that could have substantial adverse effects on day or nighttime views in the area. Thus, the Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact related to operational glare.

No "natural" open space currently exists on the Project Site. The entire site has been modified and graded at one point or another in its history. However, portions of the site are currently undeveloped and are thus characterized by unmaintained, somewhat overgrown open space and riparian vegetation. Development of the Project would convert this un-maintained open area to a combination of maintained open space (both public and private) and residential development. The entirety of the site would be landscaped. Proposed Project buildings would be integrated into the overall aesthetic context of the Site through the connective landscaping and tree placement surrounding the Site's perimeter. Given the current blighted condition of the Site, this impact would not be adverse.

Therefore, Project impacts and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with respect to aesthetics (views/light and glare), prior to mitigation.

B. Aesthetics (Shade and Shadow)

Due to the location of the Project Site and the proposed height of structures, shade and shadow impacts are not considered relevant. Shadow impacts are typically greatest during the winter months due to the sun's low position in the sky, with the resultant longer shadows stretching roughly from the northwest to the northeast during daytime hours. Because shadows in the Northern Hemisphere trend to the north during the winter, shading caused by Project buildings would not affect any adjacent off-site residences during the wintertime. As a result, and due to the areas north of the Project Site being at a higher elevation, no impact resulting from shadows cast onto adjacent off-site properties by Project buildings is expected to occur.

Therefore, Project impacts and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with respect to aesthetics (shade and shadow), prior to mitigation.

C. Cultural Resources (Historic Resources)

The former San Pedro Naval Housing complex located on the Project Site is not currently listed as a landmark at the national, state, or local levels, and has not been identified as potentially significant in any historic resources surveys of the area. The complex was evaluated for its potential as a historic district because the complex consists of a group of residential duplexes that were planned and constructed at the same time, in 1964. None of the buildings were evaluated for individual eligibility, as they are alike and part of a larger tract. Based on the research and field inspection conducted for this report, the complex is ineligible for listing at the national, state, or local levels because the complex lacks historical significance or architectural distinction. The recommended evaluation code is 6Z, ineligible for designation at the national, state, or local levels through survey evaluation. Therefore, because the complex is not a historic resource subject to CEQA, the Project would have no impact on historical resources.

Therefore, Project impacts and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with respect to cultural resources (historic resources), prior to mitigation.

D. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Project construction emissions represent an episodic, temporary source of GHG emissions. Emissions are generally associated with the operation of construction equipment and the disposal of construction waste. The Project is expected to generate 4,850 trips during a typical weekday and 4,887 trips during a typical Saturday. Motor vehicle trips are the primary source of daily operational GHG emissions associated with the Project. The GHG emissions resulting from operation of the Project, which involves the usage of on-road mobile vehicles, electricity, natural gas, water, landscape equipment, hearth combustion, and generation of solid waste and wastewater, were calculated with the net increase in GHG emissions generated by the Project estimated at 9,687.08 CO₂e MTY (metric tons per year). Although the Proposed Project would emit GHGs, implementation of Compliance Measures and Project Design Features (including consistency with the City's Green Building Code) would reduce GHG emissions to the maximum extent feasible. Further, the Proposed Project would be consistent with all feasible and

applicable strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in California and the City of Los Angeles. As such, the Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The Project's impacts associated with GHG emissions would therefore be considered less than significant.

Therefore, Project impacts and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with respect to greenhouse gas emissions, prior to mitigation.

E. Hydrology and Water Quality

The Project proposes redevelopment of the entire site with a combination of single- and multi-family residential uses, private and public recreation facilities, and interior circulation and landscaping. Under future conditions, drainage patterns on the Project Site would remain substantially the same as under existing conditions. The Project would not have an adverse impact with respect to storm drain capacity and no mitigation measures are required. Similarly, development of the Project would have a less than significant impact on storm drainage infrastructure and flooding resulting from the alteration of existing drainage patterns and the increase in overall site imperviousness. Development of the Project would neither reduce nor increase the amount of surface water in any water body to a substantial degree.

Because the developed site would generate slightly more runoff than under existing conditions, the amount of runoff contributed by the site to the West Channel of Los Angeles Harbor would be increased by a slight amount, on the order of 18-20 cfs (cubic feet per second) under 50-year storm conditions. This impact would be less than significant.

Development of the Project would not result in a permanent, adverse change to the movement of surface water sufficient to produce a substantial change in the current or direction of water flow. The source and destination, as well as the general pattern of surface water flow both within the watershed and across the Project Site would remain the same as under existing conditions with Project development, although the existing open drainage channel crossing the site would be covered and the existing riparian vegetation removed.

The nearest body of water to the Project Site is the Palos Verdes Reservoir, located approximately 0.75 mile west of the Project Site. According to the Safety Element of *the General Plan of the City of Los Angeles* ("General Plan"), the Project Site is not located within any potential inundation area. The Palos Verdes Reservoir is not a flood control facility. As such, there is no hydrologic connection between the reservoir and the drainages that either cross or impact the Project Site. However, the remote, speculative and hypothetical event of a complete and instantaneous failure of the Palos Verdes Reservoir could, due to the intervening topography, potentially result in flooding across portions of the Project Site. However, the failure of the reservoir is considered a remote and speculative event. Additionally, development of the Project would not introduce persons or structures into an area where they might be subject to inundation risks not experienced by both previous residents of the site and current residents in surrounding areas. With respect to storm-caused flooding, the Project Site is not located within a designated floodplain or area subject to flood hazards. The Project Site is located in a dense urban area that is completely

surrounded by existing urban uses. The proposed storm drainage facilities to be constructed on the Project Site as part of the Project would provide sufficient capacity to convey the excess street flow from Western Avenue resulting from the undersized reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) conveying drainage from Watershed A onto the site.

Implementation of the best management practices (BMPs) in the Project's Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and compliance with the City's discharge requirements (listed as Compliance Measures) would ensure that the Project construction would not violate any water quality standards or discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Thus, Project impacts would be less than significant.

Based on the incorporation of site design, source control and treatment control/low impact design (LID) BMPs as required under the City of Los Angeles' Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) and as identified as Compliance Measures and Project Design Features, water quality standard exceedances are not anticipated, and pollutants are not expected in Project runoff in amounts that would adversely affect beneficial uses in downstream receiving waters. Thus, Project impacts would be less than significant. With respect to groundwater, proposed LID BMPs and treatment control BMPs would not cause or contribute to impairments to groundwater quality. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

Although the overall imperviousness of the Project Site would increase due to higher density development as compared to existing conditions, the increase would be offset by the implementation of LID features for water quality. No groundwater wells are proposed nor would the Proposed Project affect any existing wells. Therefore, redevelopment of the Project Site is not anticipated to reduce groundwater recharge opportunities or lower groundwater tables as compared to existing conditions, and may in fact slightly increase groundwater recharge throughout the area with the implementation of LID features for water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.

Therefore, Project impacts and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with respect to hydrology and water quality, prior to mitigation.

F. Land Use and Planning (Land Use Consistency)

The Project would require a General Plan amendment to change the land use designation in the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan for the Project Site from Low Residential and Open Space to Low Medium II Residential. The Project would also require a zone change to change the zoning designation for the Project Site from R1-1XL and OS-1XL to a new Specific Plan Zone. The Project's density would range from 8 units per acre to 23 units per acre, with the average density being 11.4 DU/acre (gross). Also, the Project would locate a range of new housing options proximate to the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, which are major employment centers within southern California.

The Project is consistent with and would assist in the implementation of applicable regional plans and policies; specifically those which encourage the reduction of regional congestion through infill housing

development (e.g., AQMP, Compass Growth Vision, Regional Transportation Plan [RTP], Regional Housing Needs Assessment [RHNA], etc.), as well as policies to address the community's and City's housing crisis. The Project's proposed 700 dwelling units would provide 57 percent of the units forecast to be needed in the Wilmington-Harbor City CPA by 2017. The Project also represents 1.1 percent of the growth in SCAG's household forecast for the City of Los Angeles Subregion between 2010 and 2017. The Project's provision of housing units would occur without the displacement of any existing households and without the demolition of any existing housing stock.

The Project Site is currently served by public transit (buses) and is immediately adjacent to a public transit route along Western Avenue. The Project would incorporate sidewalks on primary streets and would provide a network of pathways throughout the master-planned community that would create opportunities for residents to walk to local destinations and transit stops. In addition, the Project would provide bike parking for residents and visitors, thereby promoting alternate transportation. Further, the Project incorporates urban design standards that would make Western Avenue a more attractive street, which could promote its use by pedestrians, bicyclists with bike parking amenities, and users of public transit. The Project would be consistent with applicable portions of the City's Urban Design Principles and elements of the Walkability Checklist. The Project is consistent with and would assist in the implementation of relevant Air Quality Management Plan and Regional Transportation Plan strategies to attain and maintain compliance with federal and state ambient air quality and greenhouse gas standards.

The Project would be consistent with the goals, policies, and objectives of the Noise Element, Housing Element, Air Quality Element, Transportation Element, and Conservation Element of the General Plan. The Project would comply with applicable hillside area grading regulations. The Project Site contains no trees subject to the City's Protected Tree Ordinance. The Project would be required to comply with the Methane Mitigation Standards in LAMC section 91.7102 and as directed and approved by LADBS and the LAFD as they apply to the portion of the site that is included within a City-identified Methane Buffer Zone.

Therefore, Project impacts and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with respect to land use and planning (land use consistency), prior to mitigation.

G. Land Use and Planning (Divide Established Community/Land Use Compatibility)

The Project would not physically divide an established community, 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 or a specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan. While functional compatibility is a subjective matter, the Project, as a residential use, is compatible with the existing uses in the vicinity since similar land uses exist immediately to the east, west, and south of the Project Site, including higher density developments to the south. The Project's proposed residential uses would be compatible with and largely buffered from adjacent residential uses by proposed

landscaping. The Project would not create any significant land use and planning impacts and therefore no mitigation measures are necessary.

Therefore, Project impacts and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with respect to land use and planning (divide established community/land use compatibility), prior to mitigation.

H. Noise (Off-Site Operational)

Upon buildout of the Project, new periodic sources of noise would consist of stationary sources (such as rooftop heating, ventilation, and air conditioning [HVAC] systems for the proposed uses). The design of these on-site HVAC units and exhaust fans would be required to comply with the regulations under Section 112.02 of the LAMC, which prohibits noise from air conditioning, refrigeration, heating, pumping, and filtering equipment from exceeding the ambient noise level on the premises of other occupied properties by more than five decibels. Thus, the on-site equipment would be designed such that it would be shielded and appropriate noise muffling devices would be installed on the equipment to reduce noise levels that affect nearby noise-sensitive uses. Implementation of Compliance Measures would ensure that all new mechanical equipment associated with the Project would adhere to Section 112.02 of the LAMC. This impact would be less than significant.

Operational noise would also result from vehicular traffic utilizing local roadways. The Project's maximum local noise increase level at any off-site roadway segment would be 0.7 dBA CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level). Because this maximum and all lesser noise increases are below the 3 dBA threshold, this impact would be less than significant.

Therefore, Project impacts and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with respect to noise (off-site operational), prior to mitigation.

I. Population and Housing

Due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California and the operation of the market for construction labor, construction workers are not likely, to any significant degree, to relocate their households as a consequence of the job opportunities presented by the Project. Thus, there would not be any adverse housing impacts associated with construction of the Project.

The Project's direct impact would be a maximum of 700 housing units. The total households/housing unit impact of the Project at the Subregion level would be 938 households/housing units (i.e., 700 direct + 238 indirect/induced). The Project's direct plus indirect/induced households would represent about 0.06% to 0.07% of the households estimated for 2010 and forecasted for 2017 and 2027 in the City of Los Angeles Subregion, about 1.1 percent of 2010-2017 household growth, and about 0.5 percent of 2010-2027 household growth. Within the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan area, the Project would represent about 2.5 to 3.5 percent of households in 2010, 2017 and 2027; about 57 percent of 2010-2017 household growth; and about 25 percent of 2010-2027 household growth. When cumulative projects are

added, the total cumulative impact of the Project would constitute about 102 percent of 2010-2017 household growth, which can be considered a temporary exceedance as the Project's cumulative impact would only constitute about 46 percent of 2010-2027 household growth within the Wilmington-Harbor City CPA. Therefore, the Project would not induce substantial housing growth, because it would meet a portion of forecasted housing need rather than exceed the housing growth forecast for the City of Los Angeles Subregion by 2017.

The "jobs-housing balance" in the City of Los Angeles Subregion -- i.e., the numerical ratio of 1.34 jobs to households -- was very close to the ratio for the SCAG region as a whole in 2010 (1.37), and is therefore considered close to "balance." By adding 413 indirect/induced jobs related to Project household spending and 700 direct households, the Project would have no impact on the Subregion's 2010 jobs-housing balance in that it would not change its 1.34 ratio estimated for that year.

Overall, the Project would assist the City in meeting its fair share of regional housing need, provide new housing opportunities a broad range of potential residents, and conform with new City policy direction supporting higher density, compact, infill housing development that adds to the City's housing supply and encourages the improvement of air quality and the reduction of regional congestion. Impacts would be less than significant.

The 700 dwelling units would accommodate a population of 2,079 persons. Assuming further that the indirect dwelling units associated with the Project, are occupied at the same persons-per-household factor as for the City of Los Angeles Subregion as a whole in 2010 (i.e., 2.99), this implies Subregion-level indirect/induced population impact of 763 persons, for a total population impact of 2,842 persons. The Project's direct plus indirect/induced population would represent about 0.065% of the population estimated for 2010 and forecasted for 2017 and 2027 in the City of Los Angeles Subregion, about 2.8 percent of 2010-2017 population growth, and about 1.1 percent of 2010-2027 population growth. Within the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan area, the Project would represent about 2.6 percent of population in 2010, 2017 and 2027; about 107 percent of 2010-2017 population growth (which can be considered a temporary exceedance); and about 43 percent of 2010-2027 population growth. When cumulative projects are added, the total cumulative impact of the Project would constitute about 190 percent of 2010-2017 population growth, which can be considered a temporary exceedance as the Project's cumulative impact would only constitute about 80 percent of 2010-2027 population growth within the Wilmington-Harbor City CPA.

The Project would not induce substantial population growth in this area, because it would meet a portion of forecasted population rather than exceed the population growth forecast in the Subregion by 2017 and, in the case of the Wilmington-Harbor City CPA, by 2027.

For the reasons described above with respect to housing, no adverse population impacts are predicted as a result of Project construction, since construction workers would not be expected to relocate their households as a consequence of working at the Project.

In addition to being generally consistent with applicable growth forecasts, the Project would also be consistent with housing policies in the City's General Plan Framework, Housing Element, and Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan. For example, by adding new units to the City's housing supply, the Project would make an important incremental contribution to meeting the City's "fair share" of regional housing need in the new RHNA that would apply to the next update of the City's Housing Element. Impacts would be less than significant.

Therefore, Project impacts and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with respect to population and housing, prior to mitigation.

J. Public Services (Fire Protection)

Construction and operation-related impacts of the Project on fire protection and emergency services would be less than significant. Specifically, with regard to response distance, the Project would not be within the LAFD's required response distance of 1.5 miles for residential land uses, with the closest responder to the Project Site at Station No. 36, approximately two miles driving distance away. Thus, the installation of automatic fire sprinkler systems is required pursuant to LAMC Section 57.09.07, and the proposed structures would be equipped with sprinklers.

Upon completion of the Project and implementation of the proposed traffic mitigation measures, potential impacts to all studied intersections, including the intersections of Western Avenue/Pacific Coast Highway and Western Avenue/Palos Verdes Drive North would be mitigated to a less than significant level, even taking into account cumulative growth.

With regard to access, it is anticipated that the Project's proposed access plan would provide adequate access to and from the Project Site in the event of an emergency. Nonetheless, as a Compliance Measure, the Applicant is required to submit the proposed plot plan for the Project to the LAFD for review for compliance with applicable Los Angeles Fire Code, California Fire Code, City of Los Angeles Building Code, and National Fire Protection Association standards, thereby ensuring that the Proposed Project would not create a fire hazard. Project impacts would be less than significant.

Therefore, Project impacts and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with respect to public services (fire protection), prior to mitigation.

K. Public Services (Police Protection)

The Project is expected to generate a direct population of 2,079 persons plus the indirect/induced population of 763 persons, yielding a total Project generated population of 2,842 persons. As a result, an increase in the number of police service calls from the Project Site would be expected. Although the LAPD does not maintain minimum officer-to-population ratio objectives, the data is a useful metric for gauging the effect a Proposed Project might have on service levels and response times. The increase in population created by the Project, corresponding to an approximately two percent increase in LAPD

Harbor Area residents, would reduce existing officer-to-population ratios in the Harbor Area to 1.76 officers per 1,000 residents, a change of 0.03 officers as compared to existing conditions, which would be a minimal decrease. This analysis is likely conservative, as a substantial percentage of future Project residents may already be living elsewhere in the Harbor Area. The Proposed Project's impact on the officer-to-population ratio at the Harbor Area would not be substantial and the impact would be less than significant.

The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives of the LAPD, and impacts associated with Project operation would be less than significant.

Therefore, Project impacts and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with respect to public services (police protection), prior to mitigation.

L. Public Services (Schools)

Taper Elementary, Dodson Middle, and Narbonne High Schools serve the Project Site. The Project would increase the number of school-aged children living within the jurisdictional boundaries of the abovementioned schools. Based on Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) demographic analysis, there would be approximately 91 elementary students, 44 middle school students, and 55 high school students living at the Project at any one time. With the addition of Project-generated students to existing school enrollments, Taper Elementary School would operate under capacity by 133 students, Dodson Middle School would operate under capacity by 346 students, and Narbonne High School would operate under capacity by 172 students.

As a Compliance Measure, the Project would be required to pay school facilities fees pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 50, which would be used to construct facilities which, according to LAUSD, are necessary to serve overall student enrollment growth district-wide associated with new development. Payment would provide "full and complete mitigation of the impacts of any legislative or adjudicative act . . . on the provision of adequate school facilities." Impacts would be less than significant.

Therefore, Project impacts and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with respect to public services (schools), prior to mitigation.

M. Public Services (Parks and Recreation)

Approximately 39 percent of the Project's post-development acreage (or 24.15 acres) would consist of a combination of open space, landscaped common areas, recreational amenities, and parks. The majority of this acreage would be accessible to the general public. The Project includes a 2.42-acre publically

accessible park, within which various recreational activities could occur. Thus, the Project would exceed its generated neighborhood park demand.

The Project is required to comply with the City's Quimby Ordinance and Dwelling Unit Construction Tax (DUCT) payment requirements. If the park and recreational facilities proposed by the Project do not fully meet the requirements of these ordinances, the fees paid would make up the difference. As a result, the Project would not require the construction or expansion of additional off-site recreational facilities, the construction of which might have an adverse physical environmental effect. In addition, the provision of on-site park and recreational amenities would reduce the likelihood that future Project residents would travel to other existing parks and recreational facilities in the area, thus increasing usage to the point that substantial physical deterioration of those facilities would occur or be accelerated. When all of this is combined with recognition of the existing extent of parks and recreational facilities available within the Project area and region, the Project would have a less than significant impact upon park and recreational facilities.

Therefore, Project impacts and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with respect to public services (parks and recreation), prior to mitigation.

N. Public Services (Libraries)

Development of the Project would increase demand for library services by directly increasing the permanent residential population in the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan Area by approximately 2,079 persons. Given that the San Pedro Regional Branch Library would continue to meet its service population criteria per the Los Angeles Public Library (LAPL) standards and the lack of any current capacity problems at this facility, it is expected that an increase of approximately three percent in its service population could be accommodated without the need for new or physically altered library facilities. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the Project would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered library facilities, or need for new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for library services, and impacts to library service would be less than significant.

Therefore, Project impacts and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with respect to public services (libraries), prior to mitigation.

O. Utilities and Service Systems (Wastewater)

The majority of the Project Site is currently located within the boundaries of LACSD District No. 5. A portion of the site is located within the sewer service area boundaries of the City's Bureau of Sanitation system. Thus, the Project would have two ultimate sewer service connection options: (1) service by the City's Bureau of Sanitation; or (2) service by the LACSD. Under the first option, the Project would connect to the existing City sewer facility located in Taper Avenue, adjacent and to the east of the Project's eastern property boundary. Under the second option, the Project would connect via a new sewer

lateral to the existing LACSD facilities located across and adjacent to the site's southwest corner, within the Western Avenue right-of-way.

The Project Applicant's preferred option is to deliver all Project wastewater to the City Bureau of Sanitation's sewer system for conveyance and treatment. However, in order to connect to the City's sewer system, the Project Applicant must first pursue and perfect a de-annexation from the LACSD service area for the majority of the Project Site and, subsequently, annexation to the City Bureau of Sanitation service area. This process requires approval by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) as well as by the two wastewater service agencies. Although the Project Applicant has initiated this process, it is not estimated to be completed until late 2013. Both the LACSD and City Bureau of Sanitation have opined that adequate conveyance and treatment capacity exists with which to serve the Proposed Project.

Assuming that Project wastewater is delivered to the City's system, wastewater would be generated at the Project by long-term operation of the single-family residential units, townhomes, condominiums, and apartments. The Project would generate approximately 137,908 gallons per day (gpd) of wastewater. Sufficient wastewater treatment capacity to serve the anticipated Project sewage generation exists at the Terminal Island Wastewater Treatment Plant. Therefore, impacts with respect to wastewater treatment capacity would be less than significant.

The City Department of Public Works analyzed the existing sewer system and determined that sufficient residual conveyance and treatment capacity exists in the sewer lines to which the Project is proposing to discharge. Consequently, the City issued a SCAR response in essence committing to serve the Project. Therefore, Project impacts with regard to wastewater conveyance would be less than significant.

Construction impacts resulting from wastewater infrastructure installation/improvement would be less than significant as no impacts to existing traffic flow on streets surrounding the site would occur.

Therefore, Project impacts and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with respect to utilities and service systems (wastewater), prior to mitigation.

P. Utilities and Service Systems (Solid Waste)

The Project is predicted to generate a total of approximately 33,982 tons of solid waste over the five-year construction period, including approximately 31,428 tons of demolition waste generated during the first year of construction and 2,555 tons of construction waste generated during the subsequent four years. With Compliance Measures, approximately 16,991 tons of the demolition/construction waste would be disposed of in Sunshine Canyon or Chiquita Canyon Landfills, including 15,714 tons of demolition waste and 1,277 tons of construction waste. Assuming that construction of the Project would occur 22 days each month for five years and that demolition activities would be completed within the first year, the Project would dispose of an average of 8.5 tons of solid waste per day during the first year of the construction phase, and an average of 0.69 tons of solid waste per day during each year thereafter. As

such, the landfills would have adequate capacity to accommodate the average daily construction waste generated by the Project over its multi-year construction period, and construction-related solid waste impacts would be less than significant.

The Project would generate approximately 2.1 tons (4,265 pounds) of solid waste per day during its operation. Assuming that at least 30 percent of the solid waste generated by the Project would be diverted from the landfill waste stream, the Project would result in a net generation of 1.5 tons (2,986 pounds) of solid waste per day. The remaining combined daily intake capacity of the Sunshine Canyon City/County Landfill and the Chiquita Canyon Landfill is 7,329 tons per day. As such, these facilities would have adequate capacity to accommodate the daily operational waste generated by the Project. Compliance Measures and Project Design Features would further reduce the Project's contribution to landfills. The Project's impact on solid waste and disposal would be less than significant.

Therefore, Project impacts and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with respect to utilities and service systems (solid waste), prior to mitigation.

Q. Utilities and Service Systems (Energy)

The LADWP would supply the entire Project Site from the existing 34.5-kV (kilovolt) system. Electrical conduits, wiring and associated infrastructure would be brought from existing LADWP lines in the surrounding streets to the Project Site during construction. The Project would require a line extension from the existing off-site lines to the premises, on-site transformation facilities, and conduit and cable throughout the property. The Project itself would not require new (off-site) energy supply facilities and distribution infrastructure. Rather, the on-site transformation is typical of new construction and changes in site layout.

The conservatively estimated Project-related annual electricity consumption of 3.94 MWh would represent a fraction of one percent of citywide forecasted electricity consumption in 2030. Therefore, it is anticipated that LADWP's existing and planned electricity capacity and electricity supplies would be sufficient to support the Project's electricity consumption. The Project would not require the acquisition of additional electricity resources beyond those that are anticipated by LADWP.

Further, the Project would be in compliance with the City's Green Building Code and would therefore exceed the energy efficiency standards in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR). Therefore, because of energy efficient design features, compliance with the Green Building Code, and the obligation and ability of LADWP to serve development within the City, impacts related to electricity would be less than significant.

The Project would also increase natural gas consumption over existing conditions at the site by approximately 3.27 million cubic feet per month, which is a fraction of the existing citywide demand served by SoCalGas. SoCalGas would provide natural gas service. Given the Project's energy efficient

design features, compliance with the Green Building Code, and the obligation and ability of SoCal Gas to serve the site, impacts related to natural gas would be less than significant.

Therefore, Project impacts and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with respect to utilities and service systems (energy), prior to mitigation.

V. POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVELS

A. Air Quality (Construction)

Description of Effects

Construction of the Project would result in daily air emissions, including but not limited to airborne dust from demolition, grading, and site preparation, as well as gaseous emissions from the use of heavy equipment, delivery and hauling trucks, employee vehicles, and paints and coatings. Specifically, the Project's unmitigated regional NO_x (nitrogen oxides) and ROG (reactive organic gases) construction emissions would exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) regional significance thresholds, resulting in a significant impact before mitigation. In addition, the Project's unmitigated on-site NO_x, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} (particulate matter) construction emissions would exceed the SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds, resulting in a significant impact before mitigation. Unmitigated construction-related SO_x (sulfur oxides) and CO (carbon monoxide) emissions would not exceed regional or localized significance thresholds and would therefore constitute a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

AQ-1 The following equipment specifications shall be implemented for construction activity, consistent with recent SCAQMD recommendations.¹ If these exact specifications cannot be feasibly attained, the Project Applicant shall include a comparable measure demonstrating an equivalent effectiveness at reducing construction related air quality emissions.

- Three excavators shall meet Tier 3 off-road emissions standards;
- One grader shall meet Tier 3 off-road emissions standards;
- Two scrapers shall meet Tier 3 off-road emissions standards; and
- Six rubber-tired dozers shall meet Tier 3 off-road emissions standards and Diesel Particulate Filters (DPF) Level 2.²

AQ-2 The Project Applicant shall ensure that construction contractors use super-compliant architectural coatings as defined by the SCAQMD (VOC standard of less than ten grams per liter).³

¹ Based on a review of SCAQMD Project-level comment letters published in 2011; <http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/letters.html>, accessed April 13, 2011.

² SCAQMD off-road mitigation measures; <http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/mitigation/offroad/TableII.xls>; and <http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/mitigation/offroad/TableIII.doc>; accessed April 13, 2011.

³ SCAQMD, Super-Compliant Architectural Coatings Manufacturers and Industrial Maintenance Coatings List, <http://www.aqmd.gov/prdas/Coatings/super-compliantlist.htm>.

Findings

The City adopts CEQA Finding A, which states that “[c]hanges or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subd. (a)(1))

Rationale for Findings

Implementation of Compliance Measures and Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 would reduce the Project’s construction-related regional and localized air quality emissions to a less than significant level.

Reference

For a complete discussion of Air Quality impacts, see Section IV.C of the Draft EIR.

B. Biological Resources

Description of Effects

No known populations of special-status plant species have been reported at the site or were encountered in systematic surveys and no such populations are suspected to occur on the site. Therefore, the Project would not result in adverse impacts to special-status plant species.

Protocol surveys during 2009 did not observe the California Gnatcatcher (CAGN) at the Project Site. The Project would re-engineer the slope along the site’s northern boundary, as required by City of Los Angeles grading standards, removing approximately 0.09 acres of existing disturbed coastal sage scrub (CSS) vegetation. However, the disturbed CSS does not represent high value for the CAGN, due to the species composition, and the large component of non-native grassland (NNG) and invasive ornamentals displacing the small patches of CSS. Although site preparation work would involve the temporary removal of existing vegetation on the slope, the Project Applicant proposes to re-vegetate the re-engineered slope in part with CSS appropriate to the site, including species favored by the CAGN, as a Project Design Feature. Upon successful revegetation of this slope, the existing vegetation, which is poorly suited for CAGN, would be replaced with more extensive and higher functioning CSS habitat for both CAGN and the Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly (PVB). Thus, impacts to the CAGN would be less than significant.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) concluded that the Project Site does not support sufficient stands of *Lotus scoparius* or *Astragalus trichopodus* to support any population of the PVB and that the remaining PVB occurrences on the adjacent DFSP are sufficiently remote from the Project Site that PVB is unlikely to occur even casually on the Project Site. This conclusion is further supported by the lack of PVB observations on southern portions of the adjacent U.S. Navy Defense Fuel Support Point (DFSP) generally during base-wide surveys – in spite of some *Lotus* presence in these areas. Although *Lotus*

retains a token presence on the Project Site, an additional (year 2011) survey for the PVB was not deemed warranted. Thus, impacts to the PVB would be less than significant.

Several species of birds occupy the Project Site. All nesting birds are protected under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (*Title 33, United States Code, Section 703 et seq., see also Title 50, Code of Federal Regulation, Part 10*) and Section 3503 of the California Fish and Game Code. Thus, Project impacts on nesting birds associated with tree removal would be potentially significant.

Eleven of the existing buildings on-site were given a high potential to support roosting bats, 60 buildings were given a moderate potential to support roosting bats, and 55 buildings are unlikely to support roosting bats. Additionally, it is possible that bats could roost in some of the palm trees located on the site. Thus, it is possible that roosting bats could exist at the Project Site. As a result, demolition activities at the Project Site could potentially result in a significant impact on roosting bats.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) jurisdiction associated with the Project Site totals approximately 0.25 acre of waters of the United States, none of which consists of jurisdictional wetlands. All areas of Corps jurisdiction are associated with the open water channel that traverses the southwest corner of the site. The boundaries of Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) jurisdiction under Section 401 are the same as depicted for Corps jurisdiction under Section 404. Also, California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) jurisdiction associated with the Project Site totals 0.86 acre of jurisdictional streambed, of which 0.37 acre consists of native riparian species associated with the bed, banks, and terraces of the open channel.

The Project would require that the existing drainage channel crossing the southern portion of the site be replaced and covered. However, due to the need to reconfigure the site plan to allow for the seismic setback, no opportunity to re-create riparian habitat along the channel would exist. Thus, impacts associated with the Project would be significant before mitigation. In addition, the Project Applicant would be required to enter into a Streambed Alteration Agreement with the CDFG under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code. As a Compliance Measure, the Project Applicant must provide evidence of the required authorization from the USFWS, RWQCB, and the Corps, as required by federal and state law, relating to the proposed relocation and modification of these jurisdictional resources prior to the issuance of a grading permit for the Project.

Proposed development would alter existing wildlife habitat values of the Project Site and opportunities for wildlife movement in the vicinity. Smaller resident mammals, reptiles, amphibians, and insects would be eliminated from the approximately 61.5-acre Project Site by grading, and birds and larger mammals would be at least temporarily displaced as development plans are implemented. Species that are highly sensitive to human activity and disturbance, particularly predatory mammals and birds, would avoid the developed portion of the Project Site even after construction. The previously disturbed Project Site contains no on-site waterways capable of supporting migratory fish. The closest native wildlife nursery to the Project Site is located in the DFSP to the north, where CSS habitat has been restored for the PVB and CAGN. The Project would not impede the use of this site. Further, the Project Site does not connect two

otherwise natural areas. Therefore, no substantial impediment to wildlife movement or gene flow could occur as a result of Project implementation and impacts would be less than significant.

No trees protected under the City of Los Angeles' Protected Tree Ordinance are present on the Project Site. The Project would remove all of the 330 trees on the Project Site that meet City of Los Angeles reporting criteria, and would replace the removed trees with approximately 3,500 new trees. Therefore, Project impacts to trees, including protected trees, would be less than significant.

Proposed development on the Project Site would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policies or ordinances. Thus, the Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, and no impact would occur. The previously disturbed Project Site is zoned for residential use and is not located within an area covered by an adopted habitat conservation plan (HCP), natural community conservation plan (NCCP), or other approved HCP. Therefore, no impact would occur to adopted conservation plans.

Mitigation Measures

BIO-1 Potential impacts to nesting birds, migratory birds, and raptors shall be avoided either by scheduling grading, vegetation removal and demolition during the non-nesting period (August 30th through February 14th), or if this is not feasible, by conducting a pre-construction survey for raptor nests and avoiding disturbance of active nests. Provisions of the pre-construction survey and nest avoidance, if necessary, shall include the following:

- If grading or vegetation removal is scheduled during the active nesting period (February 15th through August 31st), a qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct a pre-construction raptor and nesting bird survey no more than 30 days prior to initiation of grading to provide confirmation on presence or absence of active nests in the vicinity.
- If active nests are encountered, species-specific measures shall be prepared by a qualified biologist in consultation with the CDFW and implemented to prevent abandonment of the active nest. At a minimum, grading in the vicinity of the nest shall be deferred until the young birds have fledged. A nest-setback zone of at least 300 feet for all raptors and 100 feet for loggerhead shrike and other non-raptors shall be established within which all construction-related disturbances shall be prohibited. The perimeter of the nest-setback zone shall be fenced or adequately demarcated with staked flagging at 20-foot intervals, and construction personnel restricted from the area.
- If permanent avoidance of the nest is not feasible, impacts shall be minimized by prohibiting disturbance within the nest-setback zone until a qualified biologist verifies that the birds have either a) not begun egg-laying and incubation, or b) that the juveniles from the nest are foraging independently and capable of independent survival at an earlier date.

- A survey report by the qualified biologist verifying that the young have fledged shall be submitted to the City prior to initiation of grading in any nest-setback zone.

BIO-2 Prior to issuance of a demolition or grading permit, the Project Applicant shall have a qualified biologist conduct Phase 3 entry surveys within the interior of all buildings at the Project Site identified as having a high to moderate potential to provide bat roost habitat. These surveys shall involve accessing the attic and other areas (if warranted) to look for evidence of bats and utilizing heterodyne-style bat detectors to aid in the acoustic detection and identification of potentially roosting bats.

If bats or bat sign are not encountered during the Phase 3 surveys, the buildings shall be daylighted prior to demolition. Daylighting includes removal of substantial portions of the roof to create a well-lit, well-ventilated attic preventing bats from establishing in these buildings. Daylighting shall occur under the supervision of a qualified biologist at least 48 hours prior to building demolition. If bats are encountered during daylighting, all disturbance activities within the structure and within 200 feet shall be halted until: (a) the roost is vacated, or (b) a qualified biologist has coordinated with CDFW to develop alternative impact avoidance measures, up to and including bat removal.

If bats or bat sign are encountered during Phase 3 Surveys, the qualified biologists shall leave the building immediately to avoid further disturbance to roosting bats and conduct an emergence survey. Emergence surveys shall be conducted at dusk to determine where bats are exiting the building. Emergence surveys shall be conducted to determine the ingress/egress location, estimate the approximate number of bats using the roost, and identify the species occupying the roost using an ultrasonic bat detector. Demolition of occupied roosts shall be postponed until appropriate exclusion and mitigation measures have been determined in consultation with CDFW. Examples of exclusion measures include one-way barriers installed at the ingress/egress site that allow bats to exit the roost but not return.

BIO-3 Palm trees at the Project Site shall have the dead frond skirts removed between October 1 and March 31 before being felled to avoid impacts to roosting Southwestern Yellow Bats. A qualified arborist shall supervise removal of palm frond skirts in a systematic manner beginning with the top fronds and working towards the base of the tree. If bats are encountered during this process, trimming should halt and remain halted until (a) the roost is confirmed to have been vacated by a qualified biologist, or (b) a qualified biologist has coordinated with CDFW to develop alternative measures up to and including bat removal from the trees.

BIO-4 Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the Project Applicant shall enter into a Streambed Alteration Agreement or other documentation (satisfactory to CDFW) with CDFW to provide a 1:1 replacement of 0.86 acre of suitable streambed and associated riparian habitat either on-site as additional habitat creation, off-site either through habitat creation or purchase of credits in an approved mitigation bank in the Los Angeles Basin, or via a combination of these approaches.

Findings

The City adopts CEQA Finding A, which states that “[c]hanges or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subd. (a)(1))

Rationale for Findings

With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, requiring either pre-construction nesting bird surveys or construction outside of the nesting season, impacts related to nesting birds would be less than significant. With implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2 and BIO-3, requiring pre-demolition bat presence entry surveys in the existing structures on-site and palm frond removal from the on-site palm trees, impacts related to bats would be less than significant. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4 and the Compliance Measures, requiring the replacement of jurisdictional waters and habitat area pursuant to CDFG and Corps permit conditions, impacts related to jurisdictional waters would be less than significant.

Reference

For a complete discussion of Biological Resources impacts, see Section IV.D of the Draft EIR.

C. Cultural Resources (Archaeological and Paleontological Resources)

Description of Effects

Although no cultural resources were identified during the archaeological field survey of the Project Site, the literature search indicates that the site is situated in a geographic location that was sensitive for prehistoric human occupation. Fifteen prehistoric sites have been previously recorded within one mile of the Project Site in all directions. The preliminary geotechnical report indicates that the original ground level of the site was graded and leveled to accommodate the existing buildings. Fill was placed in the central portion of the site and cuts were made along the north-northeast sides of the property. Although there are no surface indicators of cultural resources, it is possible that intact archaeological deposits are present below the original layer of fill material. However, the depth at which the strata with the potential to contain archaeological material varies greatly across the property and could be found as shallow as two feet below the current grade. For these reasons, the Project Site should be treated as potentially sensitive for cultural resources.

No human remains are known to occur at the Project Site. However, given the cultural resources sensitivity of the Project Site, it is possible that human remains could occur at the site and Project impacts could be potentially significant.

Geologic units at the Project Site are considered paleontologically sensitive. If proper care is not taken during any ground-disturbing activities of the Project, paleontological resources at the site could be damaged or destroyed. Thus, Project impacts are considered to be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measures

- CULT-1:** A qualified archaeologist shall be present to monitor all ground-disturbing activities associated with the Project.
- CULT-2:** Prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities, the archaeological monitor shall conduct a brief awareness training session for the benefit of all construction workers and supervisory personnel. The training, which could be held in conjunction with the Project's initial on-site safety meeting, shall explain the importance of and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. Each worker shall also learn the proper procedures to follow in the event that cultural resources or human remains/burials are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities. These procedures include work curtailment or redirection and the immediate contact of the site supervisor and the archaeological monitor. It is recommended that this worker education session include visual images of artifacts that might be found in the Project vicinity.
- CULT-3:** In the event that cultural resources are exposed during construction, work in the immediate vicinity of the find shall stop until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the significance of the find. Construction activities may continue in other areas.
- CULT-4:** Prior to ground disturbance, the vertebrate fossils observed at locality JLD102210-02 (see Draft EIR Appendix IV.E-2) shall be collected. A bulk sample of the matrix (approximately 2,000 pounds) containing the invertebrate specimens shall also be collected and screened. Following matrix sampling, this area shall be closely monitored during construction grading to ensure the recovery of any additional scientifically significant fossil specimens.
- CULT-5:** Prior to ground disturbance, a qualified paleontologist shall be retained to produce a Paleontological Monitoring and Mitigation Plan for the Project and to supervise monitoring of construction excavations. Paleontological resource monitoring shall include inspection of exposed rock units during active excavations within sensitive geologic sediments. The monitor shall have authority to temporarily divert grading away from exposed fossils to professionally and efficiently recover the fossil specimens and collect associated data.
- CULT-6:** All Project-related ground disturbance that could potentially affect the San Pedro Sand and Palos Verdes Sand shall be monitored by a qualified paleontological monitor on a full-time basis. Part-time monitoring shall be conducted in all Project-related ground disturbances affecting younger Quaternary alluvium.

- CULT-7:** At each fossil locality, field data forms shall be used to record pertinent geologic data, stratigraphic sections shall be measured, and appropriate sediment samples shall be collected and submitted for analysis.
- CULT-8:** Recovered fossils shall be prepared to the point of curation, identified by qualified experts, listed in a database to facilitate analysis, and repositied in a designated paleontological curation facility.
- CULT-9:** The qualified paleontologist shall prepare a final monitoring and mitigation report to be filed with the City, the Project Applicant, and the repository.

Findings

The City adopts CEQA Finding A, which states that “[c]hanges or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subd. (a)(1))

Rationale for Findings

With implementation of Mitigation Measures CULT-1 through CULT-3, ensuring the monitoring, identification, recovery, and analysis of any archaeological resources encountered during site preparation work and further ensuring that important history regarding California history or prehistory would not be lost, impacts related to archaeological resources would be less than significant.

With implementation of the Compliance Measure, ensuring the identification, recovery, and appropriate treatment of any human remains encountered during site preparation work, impacts related to human remains would be less than significant.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures CULT-4 through CULT-9, ensuring that any paleontological resources encountered at the Project Site during site preparation work are properly identified, recovered, evaluated, and curated, Project impacts related to paleontological resources would be less than significant.

Reference

For a complete discussion of Cultural Resources impacts, see Section IV.E of the Draft EIR.

D. Geology and Soils

Description of Effects

The Project Site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or a fault zone mapped by the State Geologist pursuant to the Seismic Hazard Mapping Act. However, the Preliminary Geotechnical

Report concluded that, due to the lack of definitive evidence of the date of the last movement of the identified Palos Verdes Fault A trace, the EIR analysis treats the fault trace crossing the Project Site as a potentially active fault for the purpose of development planning.

Although the Project Applicant would be required to design and construct the Project in conformance to the most recently adopted building code design parameters in the 2011 Los Angeles Building Code, the presence of the potentially active Palos Verdes Fault trace on the Project Site means that the Project could potentially expose people or structures to adverse effects associated with fault rupture or displacement. Accordingly, impacts related to fault rupture and displacement would be significant.

Based on the active and potentially active faults in the region and on-site, it is likely that future earthquakes produced in southern California will shake the Project Site. However, the Project Site is not exposed to a greater seismic risk than other areas of southern California where active and potentially active faults are located. Furthermore, the Project would be designed and constructed to withstand ground motions by adhering to the most recent version of Los Angeles Building Code Section 1613, which contains provisions relating to earthquake loads, and the Project Applicant would be required to design and construct the Project in conformance to the design parameters contained in the most recent version of the Los Angeles Building Code. Modern, well-constructed buildings are designed to resist ground shaking through the use of shear panels and reinforcement. Thus, impacts would be considered less than significant.

The liquefaction potential at the Project Site is very low and represents no constraint on development. As part of site preparation, the fill and recent alluvium present on the Project Site would be removed and recompacted. Pursuant to existing law and applicable regulations, design and construction of the Project would be required to incorporate measures to protect against liquefaction risks. These measures include compliance with the most recent version of the Los Angeles Building Code, the Rules of General Application of the Grading Division of the Department of Building and Safety, the City's building permit requirements, and site-specific engineering recommendations based upon the recommendations of a licensed geotechnical engineer and a geotechnical report approved by the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety. These general site grading and earthwork recommendations are listed as Compliance Measures.

The Preliminary Geotechnical Report concluded that the liquefaction potential at the site is very low based on the site-specific conditions revealed through on-site boring investigations. Because there are no continuous liquefiable soils underlying the site, lateral spreading is not a hazard at the Project Site and impacts related to lateral spreading would not occur.

While the Project Site is characterized by hillside terrain and is located within a Hillside Area as defined in the Seismic Safety Plan for the City of Los Angeles, the majority of the site is relatively gentle in slope, and no significant landslide hazards have been found to exist on-site. Therefore, the potential for landslides is considered low, and there are no landslide risks that cannot be mitigated by compliance with the above-referenced engineering and construction requirements.

The Project Site is not located where oil-drilling activities presently occur, or have occurred in the past. The proposed improvements associated with the Project would not require the withdrawal of oil or water, and the Project is not located in an area where such activity is occurring. Further, based on the preliminary Project schemes, no significant dewatering is anticipated during construction to the extent where subsidence would pose a substantial risk.

Based on the results of soil testing, the expansive potential of the soil at the site is low. In addition, as part of site preparation, the fill and recent alluvium present on the Project Site would be removed and recompacted. Pursuant to existing law and applicable regulations, design and construction of the Project would be required to incorporate the above-referenced Compliance Measures to protect against risks associated with expansive soils.

The Project Site is not located in an area of Los Angeles that has been identified by the City as being susceptible to inundation due to water storage facility failure. However, the Palos Verdes Reservoir Dam, a regulating reservoir operated by the Metropolitan Water District, is located approximately 0.75 miles northwest of the Project Site. Storing an average of 1,100 acre-feet of water, it is the second smallest reservoir in the Metropolitan Water District. The potential for complete and instantaneous failure of the Palos Verdes Reservoir is considered to be remote. However, if it were to occur, flooding could result across portions of the Project Site. If a seiche were to be generated in the Palos Verdes Reservoir, it could breach the confines of the reservoir. Given the intervening distance between the dam and the Project Site, partial releases of reservoir water associated with seiche would not likely reach the site but instead would infiltrate en route and/or pond in the vicinity of culvert inlets along the west side of Western Avenue. The Project Site is not located in an area of Los Angeles susceptible to inundation by tsunami. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

In contrast to the majority of the Project Site, the cut slope along the northern boundary of the site is steeply sloping and could potentially produce mudflows; however, the trajectory of such flows would only affect other areas on the Project Site as opposed to off-site locations. In addition, this slope would be completely reconfigured and reengineered as part of the Project. Therefore, the potential for mudflows is considered low, and there are no mudflow risks that cannot be mitigated by compliance with the above-referenced Compliance Measures. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

A total of approximately 1,225,000 cubic yards of earth would be moved at the site in the course of site preparation work. Cut and fill material would be balanced on-site, with no soil import or export anticipated. The Project could result in increased levels of erosion and sedimentation that could include transport of soil materials off-site. However, required compliance with the BMPs prescribed in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared prior to the start of site-disturbing activities would serve to reduce this impact to the maximum extent practicable. Compliance with applicable City and State regulations would ensure that this impact is less than significant.

The southern portion of the Project Site contains a 940-foot-long, channelized drainage. This manmade drainage ditch is not a natural landform and is in a degraded state, and as such, does not constitute a

significant water body or streambed for purposes of assessing landform alteration impacts. Even so, this drainage is associated with jurisdictional biological resources that are protected by the Corps, the RWQCB, and the CDFG (see above discussion under “Biological Resources”). There are no wetlands on the Project Site. Therefore, the Project would not destroy, permanently cover, or materially and adversely modify any distinct or prominent land features and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

GEO-1 A 50-foot wide structural setback zone shall be designated on each side of the interpreted centerline of the surface projection of Fault A (100-foot total width), as shown in Figure IV.F-4 of the Draft EIR. No habitable structures shall be located within this setback zone.

Findings

The City adopts CEQA Finding A, which states that “[c]hanges or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subd. (a)(1))

Rationale for Findings

Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1, which has already been incorporated into the Project site plan, is required to reduce the significant impact of the Proposed Project related to surface rupture to a less than significant level.

Reference

For a complete discussion of Geology and Soils impacts, see Section IV.F of the Draft EIR.

E. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Description of Effects

The Project would entail demolition of all existing structures and improvements, excavation and grading, and construction of new buildings, improvements, utilities, and landscaping. Asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paint (LBP) have been identified in the structures currently located on-site. Without oversight, approval, and follow-up, implementation of the Project could result in potentially significant impacts from the potential exposure of construction workers involved in the demolition and removal of these structures from the site to ACMs and LBP.

No soil gas or groundwater samples from the site were found to contain any hydrocarbon contaminants above laboratory detection limits. No gasoline-range hydrocarbons were detected in any of the soil samples taken from the site. Low-level heavier-range petroleum impacts in the diesel fuel and oil range were detected in soil in four of the five borings taken at the site in 2011. These petroleum products were

likely present in the fill soil imported to the site prior to the construction of the Navy housing complex in the early 1960s, or were the result of oil production and storage activities historically conducted in the vicinity. Without oversight, approval, and follow-up, implementation of the Project could result in potentially significant impacts from potential chemical exposures to construction workers and nearby residents and workers during soil grading and excavation activities.

The mandatory utilization of Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel in all Project construction equipment would reduce diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions to a level that is consistent with that permissible for construction equipment operation under the current regulatory framework. In addition, the short-term and sporadic, episodic nature of DPM emissions at the site during Project construction would not result in the exposure of nearby residents to the type of concentrated, long-term elevated levels of DPM that characterize operations at the nearby Ports and industrial facilities within the Project vicinity. Thus, Project impacts would be less than significant.

A small portion of the Project Site is located within a City of Los Angeles Methane Buffer Zone. Without oversight, approval, and follow-up, implementation of the Project could result in potentially significant impacts from the potential accumulation of methane above explosive concentrations in structures to be constructed as part of the Project. Compliance with the City's Methane Ordinance (2004), which requires compliance with the Methane Mitigation Standards in Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 91.7102, and as directed and approved by the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety (LADBS) and Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD), would ensure that potential risks from methane accumulation are reduced to a less than significant level within the portion of the site designated as a Methane Buffer Zone.

The types of hazardous materials associated with routine, day-to-day operation of the Proposed Project would include landscaping chemicals that would be used in quantities typical for landscaped residential developments and typical cleaning solvents used for janitorial purposes. The transport, use, and disposal of these materials would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Estimated levels of cancer risk that would be experienced at the Project Site by future Project residents as a result of toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions from the ConocoPhillips refinery, DFSP, and Rancho LPG (formerly Amerigas) facilities were evaluated and were determined to present a less than significant risk, well below any applicable regulatory threshold.

The Project Site is not identified in any existing emergency response plan as a physical evacuee location or other location of public congregation or equipment/personnel mobilization. The Project's emergency response plan, required as a Project Design Feature, would address the occupancy, number, location, and design of the structures approved for the Project and would require mapping of emergency exits, evacuation routes for vehicles and pedestrians within and from the Project Site, and location of nearest hospitals and fire departments. The Project Applicant must also consult with neighboring land uses, including but not limited to the DFSP and the ConocoPhillips Refinery. The plan must be completed and approved based on final building plans before building permits for the Project's structures are issued.

Once completed and approved by the Fire Department, this required plan would be integrated with the regional emergency response plans by the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) and LAFD and the other agencies responsible for emergency response measures. All of these requirements, policies, and mitigation measures provide a mechanism for developing an integrated emergency response plan for the Project and the surrounding community. Project impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

- HAZ-1** Hydrocarbon-impacted soils encountered during grading and excavation work at the Project Site shall be characterized. Any soils containing hydrocarbons at levels of concern shall be either remediated on-site prior to reuse or removed and disposed of in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations, including those promulgated by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). All necessary approvals shall be obtained from the lead enforcement agency including, but not limited to, the Los Angeles County Fire Department Health and Hazardous Materials Division.
- HAZ-2** Prior to demolition activities, an investigation for asbestos containing materials (ACMs) shall be conducted and identified asbestos shall be abated in accordance with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)'s Rule 1403, as well as all other applicable City, state, and federal regulations.
- HAZ-3** Prior to demolition activities, an investigation for lead-based paint (LBP) shall be conducted and identified LBP shall be abated in accordance with applicable City, State, and federal regulations. Construction workers shall be properly trained in lead-related construction in order to avoid exposure of such workers to lead-containing material.

Findings

The City adopts CEQA Finding A, which states that “[c]hanges or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subd. (a)(1))

Rationale for Findings

Implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-2 and HAZ-3 will assure that ACMs and LBP in the existing on-site structures are properly abated and that potential risks from ACMs and LBP are reduced to a less than significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 is required to ensure that petroleum-impacted soils are characterized during Project excavation and grading activities and are either remediated on-site or, if necessary, transported to an appropriate facility for disposal, thus reducing the Project impact to a less than significant level.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-3, in conjunction with the Compliance Measures and Project Design Features presented in the Draft EIR, would reduce all Project-specific

impacts related to human health hazards, the release of hazardous materials, and risk of upset to a less than significant level.

With respect to cumulative impacts, cumulative projects may also present dangers associated with hazards and hazardous materials. However, each cumulative project would also be required to evaluate for potential threats and impose mitigation necessary to reduce impacts to the extent feasible. Further, local municipalities are required to follow local, state, and federal laws regarding hazardous materials and other hazards. Therefore, with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures both Project-specific and cumulative impacts for hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant.

Reference

For a complete discussion of Hazards and Hazardous Materials impacts, see Section IV.H of the Draft EIR.

F. Transportation/Traffic (City of Los Angeles)

Description of Effects

The Project's construction-related traffic would cause a less than significant impact at all of the 56 study intersections during the weekday morning peak hour, weekday afternoon peak hour, and the Saturday mid-day peak hour. Application of the threshold criteria to the Near-Term-Cumulative-With-Project-Construction and Future-Cumulative-With-Project-Construction scenarios yields the same conclusion. Based on the results of the impact analyses, traffic impacts associated with construction of the Project would be less than significant, and mitigation is not required.

The Project is expected to generate 76 inbound trips and 296 outbound trips during the weekday AM peak hour. During the weekday PM peak hour, the Project is expected to generate 304 inbound trips and 162 outbound trips. Over a 24-hour period, the Project is forecast to generate 2,425 inbound trips and 2,425 outbound trips during a typical weekday. The Project is expected to generate 227 inbound trips and 197 outbound trips during the Saturday mid-day peak hour. Over a 24-hour period, the Project is forecast to generate approximately 2,444 inbound trips and 2,443 outbound trips during a typical Saturday.

Traffic impact analyses were prepared for the 56 study intersections using the LADOT CMA methodology and application of the City of Los Angeles significant traffic impact criteria. The traffic impact analyses were prepared for the Existing With Project, Near-Term Cumulative With Project, and Future Cumulative With Project conditions. Summaries of the traffic impact analyses for the Project are provided below:

- *Existing With Project Condition:* Application of the City's threshold criteria to the "Existing With Project" condition indicates that the Project is expected to create a significant impact at 12 of the 56 study intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, weekday PM peak hour and/or the Saturday mid-day peak hour:

- Western Avenue/Lomita Boulevard
- Western Avenue/Pacific Coast Highway
- Western Avenue/Palos Verdes Drive North
- Western Avenue/Peninsula Verde Drive
- Western Avenue/Westmont Drive
- Vermont Avenue/Palos Verdes Drive North/Gaffey Street/Anaheim Street
- Gaffey Street/Westmont Drive
- Gaffey Street/Summerland Avenue
- Figueroa Place/Anaheim Street
- Figueroa Street/Pacific Coast Highway
- Figueroa Street/I-110 Freeway NB On-Ramp (north of Anaheim Street)
- Figueroa Street/Anaheim Street

Incremental but not significant impacts are noted at the remaining study intersections.

- *Near-Term Cumulative With Project Condition:* Application of the City’s threshold criteria to the “Near-Term Cumulative With Project” scenario indicates that the Project is expected to create a significant impact at 11 of the 56 study intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, weekday PM peak hour and/or the Saturday mid-day peak hour:

- Western Avenue/Lomita Boulevard
- Western Avenue/Pacific Coast Highway
- Western Avenue/Palos Verdes Drive North
- Western Avenue/Peninsula Verde Drive
- Western Avenue/Westmont Drive
- Vermont Avenue/Palos Verdes Drive North/Gaffey Street/Anaheim Street
- Figueroa Place/Anaheim Street
- Figueroa Street/I-110 Freeway NB On-Ramp (north of Pacific Coast Highway)
- Figueroa Street/Pacific Coast Highway
- Figueroa Street/I-110 Freeway NB On-Ramp (north of Anaheim Street)
- Figueroa Street/Anaheim Street

Incremental but not significant impacts are noted at the remaining study intersections.

- *Future Cumulative With Project Condition:* Application of the City’s threshold criteria indicates that the Project is expected to create a significant impact at 16 of the 56 study intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, weekday PM peak hour and/or the Saturday mid-day peak hour:
- Crenshaw Boulevard/Palos Verdes Drive North
 - Western Avenue/Lomita Boulevard
 - Western Avenue/Pacific Coast Highway

- Western Avenue/Palos Verdes Drive North
- Western Avenue/Peninsula Verde Drive
- Western Avenue/Westmont Drive
- Western Avenue/Capitol Drive
- Vermont Avenue/Palos Verdes Drive North/Gaffey Street/Anaheim Street
- Gaffey Street/Westmont Drive
- Gaffey Street/Summerland Avenue
- Vermont Avenue/Pacific Coast Highway
- Figueroa Place/Anaheim Street
- Figueroa Street/I-110 Freeway NB On-Ramp (north of Pacific Coast Highway)
- Figueroa Street/Pacific Coast Highway
- Figueroa Street/I-110 Freeway NB On-Ramp (north of Anaheim Street)
- Figueroa Street/Anaheim Street

Incremental but not significant impacts are noted at the remaining study intersections.

As discussed above, the Project is expected to create a significant impact at 16 of the 56 study intersections during the weekday AM peak hour, weekday PM peak hour and/or the Saturday mid-day peak hour in the year 2017 Future With Project condition. All 12 study intersections forecast to be significantly impacted by the Project under the “Existing With Project” scenario are included in the intersections forecast to be significantly impacted in the year 2017 Future With Project conditions based on City of Los Angeles threshold criteria. Thus, the Existing With Project analysis did not result in the identification of any impacts that were not previously disclosed. All 11 study intersections forecast to be significantly impacted by the Proposed Project under the “Near-Term Cumulative With Project” scenario also are included in the intersections forecast to be significantly impacted in the year 2017 Future With Project conditions based on City of Los Angeles threshold criteria. In summary, the Near-Term With Project analysis did not result in the identification of any impacts that were not previously disclosed.

Based on the results of travel time studies, Project-generated motorists would likely travel along major arterials rather than cut through local neighborhood roadways. Thus, impacts related to neighborhood intrusion would be less than significant. The intersections that would provide primary access to the Project Site are Western Avenue and Northerly Project Access-Green Hills Drive and Western Avenue and Southerly Project Access-Avenida Aprenda. Both of these intersections would operate at least at LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS B during the PM peak hour under the Cumulative-Plus-Project (2017) condition. The proposed enhanced vehicular access connecting Fitness Drive through Seaport Homes to the Project Southerly Access Road is expected to create incremental but not significant impacts at the Western Avenue/Avenida Aprenda-Southerly Access Road intersection during the weekday AM, weekday PM, and the Saturday midday peak hours. Therefore, impacts related to access would be less than significant. Through coordination with City departments and compliance with requirements City department requirements/standards, the Project would not result in any significant impacts related to bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicular safety. Given the relatively few number of transit trips generated during the peak hours using the CMP methodology, no significant impacts on existing or future transit

services in the Project area would occur. Impacts associated with the construction of off-site traffic mitigation and roadway improvements would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

TRANS-8 Prior to the generation of 151 PM peak hour trips at the site, the Project Applicant shall widen the south side of Anaheim Street west of Vermont Avenue by approximately 12 feet to accommodate a 180-foot long turn pocket and install a right-turn only lane at the eastbound approach to the intersection.

TRANS-9 Prior to the generation of 151 PM peak hour trips at the site, the Project Applicant shall do the following:

- a. Widen Gaffey Street north of Westmont Drive to accommodate installation of a right-turn only lane at the southbound approach to the intersection;
- b. Relocate the existing southbound near-side Metro bus stop on Gaffey Street to the far side of the intersection (i.e., south of the intersection) where a full bus pad is to be installed in the street;
- c. Modify the existing traffic signal to provide a southbound right-turn signal phase on Gaffey Street that would overlap with the eastbound left-turn signal phase on Westmont Drive at the Gaffey Street intersection; and
- d. Enhanced signage shall be provided as needed to guide the right-turn motorists from the eastbound Anaheim Street approach to Gaffey Street and Palos Verdes Drive North.

It is noted that the southbound approach on Gaffey Street can be modified to include continuation of the existing bicycle lane and the southbound right-turn only lane.

TRANS-10 Prior to the generation of 301 PM peak hour trips at the site, the Project Applicant shall do the following:

- a. Restripe the southbound approach on Gaffey Street at Summerland Avenue to accommodate the installation of a right-turn only lane, and
- b. Modify the existing traffic signal to provide a southbound right-turn signal phase on Gaffey Street that would overlap with the eastbound left-turn signal phase on Summerland Avenue at the Gaffey Street intersection.

- TRANS-16** Prior to the generation of 301 PM peak hour trips at the site, the Project Applicant shall widen the westbound approach on Anaheim Street at Figueroa Street by approximately 10 feet to accommodate a 120-foot long turn pocket and install a right-turn-only lane.
- TRANS-20** Prior to the issuance of Building Permits for each residential building within the Project, the Project Applicant shall perform, to the satisfaction of LADOT, a trip generation analysis for the units to be constructed. The results of these studies shall indicate which of the intersection improvements shown above in Mitigation Measures TRANS-1 through TRANS-16 must be operational prior to the occupancy of the subject residential units.
- TRANS-21** The Project Applicant shall coordinate with local and regional transit operators, including Metro and LADOT, to develop and implement strategies to increase transit utilization by Project residents. These transportation demand management (TDM) strategies could include, but would not be limited to, providing bus schedules and transit route information to residents, providing bicycle racks and information regarding optimal bike routes to local destinations to residents, and a carpooling information exchange.
- TRANS-22** In conjunction with the street widening of Western Avenue adjacent to the Project Site, the Applicant shall provide a bus turnout lane and bus stop facilities (shelter, bench and schedule information) at bus stops adjacent to the Site.
- TRANS-23** The Project Applicant shall coordinate with LADOT to potentially extend the existing San Pedro DASH route northerly on Western Avenue to serve the Project Site. If deemed necessary, the Project Applicant shall provide appropriate turnaround facilities to allow the DASH vehicles to utilize the Project Site as an end point on the route.

Findings

The City adopts CEQA Finding A, which states that “[c]hanges or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subd. (a)(1))

Rationale for Findings

The recommended transportation mitigation measures for the Proposed Project would mitigate the forecast Project impacts based on the CMA intersection analysis methodology and significance thresholds of the Lead Agency (City of Los Angeles), as well as using the ICU intersection analysis methodology and the significance thresholds of the nearby adjacent jurisdictions, as applicable. Further, the recommended mitigation measures would mitigate the forecast Project-related traffic impacts for each of the three analysis conditions: Existing With Project, Near-Term With Project, and Future With Project. As a result of implementing the above-listed mitigation measures, Project impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Reference

For a complete discussion of Transportation – Traffic impacts, see Section IV.N of the Draft EIR.

G. Transportation/Traffic (Other Jurisdictions)

Description of Effects

Several study intersections that are forecast to be significantly impacted by Project-generated traffic are within other jurisdictions, as detailed below. All of these intersections are included in the list presented above under Transportation/Traffic (City of Los Angeles).

Mitigation Measures

- TRANS-1** Prior to the generation of 301 PM peak hour trips at the site, the Project Applicant shall modify the existing traffic signal at the intersection of Crenshaw Boulevard and Palos Verdes Drive North to provide a northbound right-turn signal phase on Crenshaw Boulevard that would overlap with the westbound left-turn signal phase on Palos Verdes Drive North. To accommodate this signal phasing, U-turn movements on the westbound approach of Palos Verdes Drive North shall become prohibited.
- TRANS-2** Prior to the generation of 151 PM peak hour trips at the site, the Project Applicant shall do the following:
- a.** Restripe the southbound approach on Western Avenue at Lomita Boulevard to accommodate installation of a right-turn only lane; and
 - b.** Modify the existing traffic signal at Western Avenue and Lomita Boulevard to provide a southbound right-turn signal phase on Western Avenue that would overlap with the eastbound left-turn signal phase on Lomita Boulevard.
- TRANS-3** Prior to the generation of 1 PM peak hour trip at the site, the Project Applicant shall do the following:
- a.** Modify the southbound approach on Western Avenue at Pacific Coast Highway to install a second left-turn lane and a third through lane; and
 - b.** Modify the existing traffic signal at the intersection of Western Avenue and Pacific Coast Highway to accommodate the modification to the southbound approach.

- TRANS-4** Prior to the generation of 1 PM peak hour trip at the site, the Project Applicant shall do the following:
- a.** Modify the westbound approach on Palos Verdes Drive North at Western Avenue to install a second left-turn lane;
 - b.** Modify the existing median on Palos Verdes Drive North and the existing traffic signal at the intersection of Palos Verdes Drive North and Western Avenue to accommodate the modification to the westbound approach;
 - c.** Modify the existing median and restripe the northbound approach on Western Avenue at Palos Verdes Drive North to install a right-turn only lane;
 - d.** Restripe the southbound approach on Western Avenue at Palos Verdes Drive North to install a right-turn lane.
- TRANS-5** Prior to the generation of 1 PM peak hour trip at the site, the Project Applicant shall install a traffic signal at the intersection of Western Avenue and Peninsula Verde Drive.
- TRANS-6** Prior to the generation of 151 PM peak hour trips at the site, the Project Applicant shall do the following:
- a.** Modify the northbound approach on Western Avenue at Westmont Drive to install a right-turn only lane; and
 - b.** Restripe the eastbound approach on Westmont Drive at Western Avenue to provide one left-turn lane.
- TRANS-7** Prior to the generation of 301 PM peak hour trips at the site, the Project Applicant shall restripe the northbound approach on Western Avenue at Capitol Drive and modify the raised median to install a right-turn only lane.
- TRANS-11** Prior to the generation of 301 PM peak hour trips at the site, the Project Applicant shall do the following:
- a.** Widen the north and south sides of Pacific Coast Highway east and west of Vermont Avenue to provide up to a 42-foot half roadway on the 50-foot half right-of-way;

- b. Install a second left-turn lane at the westbound approach; and
- c. Modify the existing traffic signal and roadway striping at the intersection as needed.

TRANS-12 Prior to the generation of 1 PM peak hour trip at the site, the Project Applicant shall do the following:

- a. Modify the existing traffic signal at Figueroa Place/Anaheim Street to provide a southbound right-turn signal phase on Figueroa Place that would overlap with the eastbound left-turn and through phase sufficiently long enough to accommodate the southbound right-turn volumes; and
- b. Install a new traffic signal at Figueroa Place/I-110 Southbound Off-ramp (north of Anaheim Street).

TRANS-13 Prior to the generation of 301 PM peak hour trips at the site, the Project Applicant shall do the following:

- a. Modify the southbound approach on Figueroa Street at the Harbor Freeway Northbound On-ramp (north of Pacific Coast Highway) to accommodate the installation of a right-turn-only lane;
- b. Adjust the median to accommodate the right-turn-only lane; and
- c. Modify the traffic control equipment as needed.

TRANS-14 Prior to the generation of 301 PM peak hour trips at the site, the Project Applicant shall modify the westbound approach on Pacific Coast Highway at Figueroa Street to accommodate a fourth through lane.

TRANS-15 Prior to the generation of 1 PM peak hour trip at the site, the Project Applicant shall install a traffic signal at the Figueroa Street/Harbor Freeway Northbound On-ramp intersection (north of Anaheim Street). In addition, the existing roadway striping at the northbound approach to the intersection would be adjusted based on direction from LADOT.

TRANS-17 Prior to the occupancy of the first residential unit within the Project, the Project Applicant shall, in accordance with applicable County protocols for calculating fair-share traffic improvement fees and based upon the assumption that all of the Related Projects affecting this intersection will be completed, make a fair-share payment toward the

installation of the County's traffic signal synchronization system for the Normandie Avenue/Sepulveda Boulevard intersection.

TRANS-18 Prior to the occupancy of the first residential unit within the Project, the Project Applicant shall, in accordance with applicable County protocols for calculating fair-share traffic improvement fees and based upon the assumption that all of the Related Projects affecting this intersection will be completed, make a fair-share payment toward the following:

- a. Modify the northbound approach on Normandie Avenue to accommodate the installation of a second left-turn lane at the Lomita Boulevard intersection; and
- b. Remove the raised median island on Normandie Avenue, south of Lomita Boulevard, to accommodate the installation of the second northbound left-turn lane.

It is noted that the northbound approach on Normandie Avenue can be modified to include continuation of the existing bicycle lane and the second northbound left-turn lane.

TRANS-19 Prior to the occupancy of the first residential unit within the Project, the Project Applicant shall, in accordance with applicable County protocols for calculating fair-share traffic improvement fees and based upon the assumption that all of the Related Projects affecting this intersection will be completed, make a fair-share payment toward the following improvements:

- a. Modify the eastbound approach on Lomita Boulevard, west of Vermont Avenue, to accommodate the installation of a second left-turn lane;
- b. Remove the existing raised median island on Lomita Boulevard, west of Vermont Avenue, and modify the striping on the east leg of the intersection as needed; and
- a. Modify the traffic signal to accommodate the installation of the second southbound left-turn lane.

Findings

The City adopts CEQA Finding B, which states that “[s]uch changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subd. (a)(2))

Rationale for Findings

Mitigation Measure TRANS-1 would reduce the significant impact identified at the Crenshaw Boulevard/Palos Verdes Drive North intersection to less than significant. However, this intersection is located in the City of Rolling Hills Estates and therefore, is outside the jurisdiction of the Lead Agency.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-2 would reduce the significant impact identified at the Western Avenue/Lomita Boulevard intersection to less than significant. This mitigation measure is consistent with the recommended transportation improvements outlined in the Western Corridor Improvement Project report issued by Caltrans for the Western Avenue Task Force. However, it is noted that Western Avenue is within Caltrans' jurisdiction and therefore, implementation of the traffic mitigation would be outside the jurisdiction of the Lead Agency.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-3 would reduce the significant impact identified at the Western Avenue/Pacific Coast Highway intersection to less than significant. This mitigation measure is consistent with the recommended transportation improvements outlined in the Western Corridor Improvement Project report issued by Caltrans for the Western Avenue Task Force. However, it is noted that Western Avenue and Pacific Coast Highway are within Caltrans' jurisdiction and therefore, implementation of the traffic mitigation would be outside the jurisdiction of the Lead Agency.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-4 would reduce the significant impact identified at the Western Avenue/Palos Verdes Drive North intersection to less than significant. This mitigation measure is consistent with the recommended transportation improvements outlined in the Western Corridor Improvement Project report issued by Caltrans for the Western Avenue Task Force and would be implemented by the Project Applicant as a condition of Project approval. However, it is noted that a portion of this intersection is located in the City of Lomita and is, therefore, outside the jurisdiction of the Lead Agency. Also, it is noted that Western Avenue is within Caltrans' jurisdiction and is therefore outside the jurisdiction of the Lead Agency.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-5 would reduce the significant impact identified at the Western Avenue/Peninsula Verde Drive intersection to less than significant. However, it is noted that the Western Avenue/Peninsula Verde Drive intersection is located within Caltrans' and City of Rancho Palos Verdes jurisdiction and therefore, implementation of the traffic mitigation would be outside the jurisdiction of the Lead Agency.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-6 would reduce the significant impact identified at the Western Avenue/Westmont Drive intersection to less than significant. This mitigation measure is consistent with the recommended transportation improvements outlined in the Western Corridor Improvement Project report issued by Caltrans for the Western Avenue Task Force and would be implemented by the Project Applicant as a condition of Project approval. However, it is noted that a portion of this intersection is located in the City of Rancho Palos Verdes and therefore, is outside the jurisdiction of the Lead Agency. Also, Western Avenue is situated within Caltrans' jurisdiction and therefore, is outside the jurisdiction of the Lead Agency.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-7 would reduce the significant impact identified at the Western Avenue/Capitol Drive intersection to less than significant. This mitigation measure is consistent with the recommended transportation improvements outlined in the Western Corridor Improvement Project report issued by Caltrans for the Western Avenue Task Force and would be implemented by the Project Applicant as a condition of Project approval. However, it is noted this intersection is located in the City of Rancho Palos Verdes and therefore, is outside the jurisdiction of the Lead Agency. Also, Western Avenue is situated within Caltrans' jurisdiction and is therefore outside the jurisdiction of the Lead Agency.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-11 would reduce the significant impact identified at the Vermont Avenue/Pacific Coast Highway intersection to less than significant. However, it is noted that Pacific Coast Highway is within Caltrans' jurisdiction and therefore, implementation of the traffic mitigation would be outside the jurisdiction of the Lead Agency.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-12 would reduce the significant impact identified at the Figueroa Place/Anaheim Street intersection to less than significant. However, it is noted that the Harbor Freeway Southbound Off-Ramp intersection at Figueroa Place is within Caltrans' jurisdiction and therefore, implementation of the voluntary installation of a traffic signal at the Figueroa Place/Harbor Freeway Southbound Off-Ramp intersection could be outside the jurisdiction of the Lead Agency.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-13 would reduce the significant impact identified at the Figueroa Street/Harbor Freeway Northbound On-Ramp intersection to less than significant. However, it is noted that the Harbor Freeway Northbound On-Ramp at Figueroa Street (north of Pacific Coast Highway) is within Caltrans' jurisdiction and therefore, implementation of the traffic mitigation would be outside the jurisdiction of the Lead Agency.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-14 would reduce the significant impact identified at the Figueroa Street/Pacific Coast Highway intersection to less than significant. However, it is noted that Pacific Coast Highway is within Caltrans' jurisdiction and therefore, implementation of the traffic mitigation would be outside the jurisdiction of the Lead Agency.

Mitigation Measure TRANS-15 would reduce the significant impact identified at the Figueroa Street/I-110 Northbound On-Ramp intersection to less than significant. However, it is noted that the Harbor Freeway Northbound On-Ramp at Figueroa Street (north of Anaheim Street) is within Caltrans' jurisdiction and therefore, implementation of the traffic mitigation would be outside the jurisdiction of the Lead Agency.

Mitigation Measures TRANS-17 through TRANS-19 (respectively) would reduce the significant impacts at the following intersections to less than significant:

Intersection No. 32: Normandie Avenue/Sepulveda Boulevard
Intersection No. 33: Normandie Avenue/Lomita Boulevard
Intersection No. 45: Vermont Avenue/Lomita Boulevard

These intersections are within the jurisdiction of Los Angeles County and thus implementation of the traffic mitigation would be outside the jurisdiction of the Lead Agency.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-3, Project impacts related to CMP freeway monitoring stations would be less than significant. As discussed previously, Mitigation Measure TRANS-3 is consistent with the recommended transportation improvements outlined in the Western Corridor Improvement Project report issued by Caltrans for the Western Avenue Task Force. However, it is noted that Western Avenue and Pacific Coast Highway are within Caltrans' jurisdiction and therefore, implementation of the traffic mitigation would be outside the jurisdiction of the Lead Agency.

Reference

For a complete discussion of Transportation /Traffic impacts, see Section IV.N of the Draft EIR.

H. Utilities and Service Systems (Water)

Description of Effects

The Project would generate a net demand for approximately 143 acre-feet per year (AFY) of water (approximately 127,160 gpd). The Water Supply Assessment (WSA) prepared for the Project and adopted by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) on September 20, 2011 concluded that the water demand generated by the Project falls within the available and projected water supplies for normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry years through 2025, and within the water demand growth projected in LADWP's Year 2010 Urban Water Management Plan. As a result, the LADWP found that it would be able to meet the water demand of the Project, in addition to existing and planned future uses of LADWP's system. As such, no new or expanded water entitlements or resources would be necessary for the operation of the Project and a less than significant impact would occur.

The Los Angeles Aqueduct Filtration Plant (LAAFP) has the ability to treat an additional 125 million gallons per day (mgd) of water. As such, it has adequate capacity to treat the water needed for the Project and no new or expanded water treatment plant facilities would be required. Impacts to water treatment capacity would therefore be less than significant.

The Project Applicant would fund the replacement of the existing on-site water system with new water lines that would be built to LADWP, Los Angeles City Plumbing Code, and LAFD fire flow standards. Construction of this infrastructure could adversely impact the flow of traffic on Western Avenue during the required water main upgrade activities.

Mitigation Measures

UTIL-1 In the event of full or partial public street closures, the Project Applicant shall employ flagmen during the construction of new water lines, to facilitate the flow of traffic.

Findings

The City adopts CEQA Finding A, which states that “[c]hanges or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subd. (a)(1))

Rationale for Findings

Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 is required in order to reduce the potential construction-related impact associated with the extension of the LADWP water infrastructure in Western Avenue to a less than significant level.

Reference

For a complete discussion of Utilities and Service Systems – Water impacts, see Section IV.O.1 of the Draft EIR.

VI. SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WHICH REMAIN SIGNIFICANT AFTER MITIGATION MEASURES

A. Air Quality (Operations)

Description of Significant Effects

Implementation of the Compliance Measures, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures would reduce the Proposed Project's operational air quality emissions. Specifically, these measures would reduce the emissions associated with energy use as a result of the Proposed Project. Nonetheless, the regional operational emissions associated with Project-generated traffic under the 2010 Traffic Study Scenario would exceed the established SCAQMD threshold levels for ROG, NO_x and CO during the summertime (smog season) and wintertime (non-smog season). Additionally, the regional operational emissions associated with Project-generated traffic under the 2017 Traffic Study Scenario would exceed the established SCAQMD threshold levels for ROG and NO_x during both the summertime (smog season) and wintertime (non-smog season). The regional operational emissions associated with the Project would not exceed the established SCAQMD threshold levels for SO_x, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5} during either the summer (smog season) or winter (non-smog season).

Although the Project would exceed certain SCAQMD thresholds, it is consistent with and would further the policies of the AQMP, which assume emissions from housing and employment operations within the Basin, while guiding the Basin into compliance with State and federal air quality standards. These emissions are primarily associated with the operation of mobile vehicles, are typical for a residential project of this size, and there is no feasible mitigation to reduce these emissions to a less than significant level. It is neither within the Project Applicant's nor the City's authority to impose vehicle performance restrictions on vehicles producing on-road NO_x and ROG emissions; such restrictions on vehicle emissions are governed by the state. As such, even with the implementation of the Compliance Measures, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures, regional operational emissions due to mobile sources would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

AQ-3 The Project shall provide electric outlets on residential balconies and common areas for electric barbeques to the extent that such uses are permitted on balconies and common areas per the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions recorded for the property.

AQ-4 The Project shall use electric lawn mowers and leaf blowers, and electric or alternatively fueled sweepers with HEPA filters, for maintenance of the Project.

Findings

The City adopts CEQA Finding C which states that "specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make

infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subd. (a)(3))

Rationale for Findings

Although Mitigation Measures AQ-3 and AQ-4 will be required and would reduce the Project’s operational air emissions, they would not have any effect on the mobile air emissions that would be created by Project-generated traffic. Mitigation Measures TRANS-25 through TRANS-28 (see discussion under Transportation/Traffic [City of Los Angeles]) would require the Project Applicant to coordinate with local and regional transit operators to develop and implement strategies to increase transit utilization by future Project residents. A bus turnout lane and bus stop facilities (shelter, schedule information) would also be installed to serve the Project. Reducing the number of vehicle trips generated by the Project as well as mitigating the Project’s significant impacts on roadway congestion would reduce the amount of CO emissions generated by Project traffic. However, although these mitigation measures will be required, there is no guarantee that such reductions would be sufficient to bring Project-associated regional mobile air emissions below applicable SCAQMD significance thresholds. No other mitigation measures to reduce regional mobile air emissions from Project-generated traffic are feasible.

Reference

For a complete discussion of Air Quality impacts, see Section IV.C of the Draft EIR.

B. Noise (Construction)

Description of Significant Effects

During Project construction, three basic types of activities would be expected to occur and generate noise at the Project Site: demolition and removal of the existing vacant residential uses; preparation, excavation, and grading to accommodate building foundations and infrastructure; and construction of the proposed structures. Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would comply with the noise regulations established in Sections 41.40 and 112.05 of the LAMC. Nevertheless, because construction noise levels associated with the Proposed Project are likely to exceed the existing ambient noise levels at all of the identified off-site sensitive locations by more than 10 dBA for more than one day, Project construction activities would generate a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity and these construction noise impacts would be potentially significant. Similarly, the vibration levels forecasted to occur at the off-site sensitive receptors would exceed the Federal Transportation Administration’s (FTA) threshold for residences during construction of the Proposed Project. As such, vibration impacts associated with human annoyance would be potentially significant. Vibration impacts associated with building damage at sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

- NO-1** Noise and groundborne vibration construction activities whose specific location on the Project Site may be flexible (e.g., operation of compressors and generators, cement mixing, general truck idling) shall be conducted as far as possible from the nearest noise- and vibration-sensitive land uses.
- NO-2** When possible, construction activities shall be scheduled so as to avoid operating several pieces of equipment simultaneously, which causes high noise levels.
- NO-3** Flexible sound control curtains shall be placed around all drilling apparatuses, drill rigs, and jackhammers when in use.
- NO-4** The Project contractor shall use power construction equipment fitted with the best available technology in noise shielding and muffling devices.
- NO-5** Barriers such as plywood structures or flexible sound control curtains extending eight-feet high shall be erected around the Project Site boundary to minimize the amount of noise on the surrounding noise-sensitive receptors to the maximum extent feasible during construction.
- NO-6** All construction truck traffic shall be restricted to truck routes approved by the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety, which shall avoid residential areas and other sensitive receptors to the extent feasible. Prior to the commencement of construction at the Project Site, a meeting shall be held with appropriate representatives of the Cities of Rancho Palos Verdes, Torrance, and Lomita. The purpose of the meeting will be to designate truck routes for off-site load hauling vehicles and other construction-related vehicles.
- NO-7** Two weeks prior to the commencement of construction at the Project Site, notification shall be provided to the immediate surrounding cities and off-site residential, school, and memorial park properties that discloses the construction schedule, including the various types of activities and equipment that would be occurring throughout the duration of the construction period.
- NO-8** Equipment warm-up areas, water tanks, and equipment storage areas shall be located a minimum of 45 feet from abutting sensitive receptors.

Findings

The City adopts CEQA Finding C which states that “specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subd. (a)(3)).

Rationale for Findings

With implementation of the Compliance Measures and Mitigation Measures NO-1 through NO-8 listed

above, which would require the implementation of noise reduction devices and techniques during construction at the Project Site, construction-related noise impacts associated with the Proposed Project would be reduced to the maximum extent feasible. Nevertheless, because construction noise levels are likely to exceed existing ambient noise levels by more than 10 dB(A) for more than one day at the identified noise-sensitive receptors, construction noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Further reductions in construction related noise levels are considered technically infeasible.

With implementation of the Compliance Measures and Mitigation Measures NO-1 through NO-8 listed above, groundborne vibration impacts associated with the Proposed Project would be reduced to the maximum extent feasible. Nevertheless, because construction vibration levels at the identified residences located south of the Project Site would exceed the FTA's 72 VdB threshold for residences during construction of the proposed Project, construction groundborne vibration impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Further reductions in construction related vibration levels are considered technically infeasible.

With implementation of the Compliance Measures and Mitigation Measures NO-1 through NO-8 listed above, off-site sources of noise and groundborne vibration impacts associated with the Proposed Project would be reduced to the maximum extent feasible. With respect to Mitigation Measure NO-2, implementation may not always be possible, depending upon the specific activity occurring at the site. Nevertheless, because off-site construction noise and vibration sources could exceed the identified thresholds at or near noise-sensitive uses, off-site construction noise and groundborne vibration impacts would be significant and unavoidable. With respect to Mitigation Measure NO-6, while the Project Applicant proposes the least impactful haul route possible, the final haul route is subject to the approval of the Department of Building and Safety. Thus, the final haul route may result in significant and unavoidable short-term impacts on sensitive uses located along and adjacent to the route.

Although Mitigation Measures NO-1 through NO-8 will be required of the Project, no additional mitigation measures are available that could feasibly avoid or further reduce these significant Project impacts.

Reference

For a complete discussion of Noise impacts, see Section IV.K of the Draft EIR.

C. Noise (On-Site Operational)

Description of Significant Effects

With respect to future Project residences fronting Western Avenue, future roadway noise levels at distances of 50 feet from the Western Avenue centerline could reach up to 73.1 dBA CNEL. While most residential uses would be at least 75 feet from the Western Avenue centerline, proposed residential uses may be exposed to noise levels that exceed 70.0 dBA CNEL, which falls within the City of Los Angeles Noise Element's normally unacceptable category for residential and open spaces uses. Thus, the Project

would result in generally unacceptable exterior noise levels for the proposed residential units fronting Western Avenue. It should be noted that while the Proposed Project is not generating excessive roadway noise levels, the Project would result in the placement of noise sensitive land uses in an area with generally unacceptable existing ambient noise levels. Implementation of Compliance Measures would require that interior residential noise levels would be below a CNEL of 45 dBA in any habitable room. As such, impacts associated with interior noise levels at these proposed residential units on-site would be reduced to a less than significant level. However, exterior noise levels (e.g., at balconies and patios) would remain unacceptable at Project residential units adjacent to the Western Avenue frontage and these impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

None.

Findings

The City adopts CEQA Finding C which states that “specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subd. (a)(3)).

Rationale for Findings

Implementation of the Compliance Measures would require that interior residential noise levels be below a CNEL of 45 dB(A) in any habitable room. As such, impacts associated with interior noise levels at the proposed residential uses on-site would be reduced to a less than significant level. Construction of a sound wall along the Project’s Western Avenue frontage would not appreciably reduce noise levels at exterior living spaces in these future residential units and would degrade the Project’s visual appearance along Western Avenue. No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce exterior noise levels on-site to acceptable levels along the Western Avenue frontage.

Reference

For a complete discussion of Noise impacts, see Section IV.K of the Draft EIR.

VII. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

State CEQA Guideline Section 15126.6(a) requires an EIR to: (1) describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project; and (2) evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. Sections II.E and VI of the Draft EIR describe the objectives that have been identified for the Project, which are also listed in detail below:

1. To remove the abandoned improvements currently present on the site, in accordance with the contractual conditions of sale required by the U.S. Navy.
2. To provide new housing on unutilized land that will meaningfully contribute to meeting the projected 2017 and 2027 housing need in the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan area, as projected by the City's General Plan Framework and Southern California Association of Governments, without requiring the demolition of existing market-rate or rent-controlled housing stock.
3. To provide new housing that meets the housing needs of a broad spectrum of persons who desire to live in the San Pedro community.
4. To provide a residential project with substantial common amenities, landscaping, and open space for the use of its residents.
5. To provide a project that will invigorate the local economy, employment, and business opportunities through project construction, and through the expenditures of its future residents.
6. To mitigate potential significant environmental impacts, to the extent feasible.
7. To develop a project that fiscally benefits the City of Los Angeles.
8. To provide a project that ensures high-quality development and maintenance through the creation and adoption of a specific plan that will set land use, architectural, landscaping, streetscaping, and lighting standards.

Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, the EIR evaluated a reasonable range of six alternatives to the Project: four in the Draft EIR and two additional alternatives in the Final EIR. The six alternatives analyzed in the EIR include a variety of uses and would reduce some, but not all, significant impacts of the Project. Since publication of the Draft EIR, Alternative C has replaced the original Proposed Project as the Project Applicant's preferred alternative.

The Alternatives discussed in detail in the Draft EIR include:

- Alternative A: No Project Alternative/No Development
- Alternative B: Single-Family Homes

- Alternative C: Staff Recommendation/Reduced Density
- Alternative D: Revised Site Plan

The Alternatives discussed in the Final EIR are:

- Existing Zoning Alternative Site Plan
- Mixed Use Alternative Site Plan

In accordance with CEQA requirements, the alternatives to the Project include a No Project alternative and alternatives capable of eliminating most of the significant adverse impacts of the Project. These alternatives and their impacts, which are summarized below, are more fully described in Section VI of the Draft EIR and in Section III.A of the Final EIR.

A. Alternative A: No Project Alternative/No Development

Description of the Alternative

Under Alternative A, the Project would not be developed on the Project Site. However, the Project Site would not remain in its current condition. Under the conditions of the ownership transfer from the U.S. Department of Defense to the previous owner of the Project Site, all existing improvements on the Project Site must be removed. Accordingly, the existing vacant former Navy housing complex and associated roadways and other infrastructure would be demolished and all debris removed from the Project Site under this alternative. Under the current land use designation in the *Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan*, the Project Site is designated for Low Density Residential (4 to 9 dwelling units per acre) and Open Space land uses. The Planning and Zoning Code (Los Angeles Municipal Code [LAMC], Chapter 1), zones the Project Site R1-1XL (One-Family Zone, Extra Limited Height District No. 1) and OS (Open Space). Single-family dwellings, among other specified land uses, are permitted within the R1 zone. The Extra Limited Height District No. 1 limits the height of buildings to two stories or 30 feet. Duplex dwelling units, such as those that presently exist on the Project Site, are not consistent with the current R1 zoning of the site.

Alternative A assumes that the Project Site would remain undeveloped following the demolition and removal of existing structures. In addition, the access road across the southern portion of the Project Site connecting Western Avenue to the Mary Star of the Sea High School campus would not be provided under this alternative. Alternative A assumes that Mary Star of the Sea High School would take vehicular access from Taper Avenue, which fronts the Mary Star of the Sea High School site. As Mary Star of the Sea High School is a separate property owned by the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, responsibility for modifying the development permits of the High School in order to obtain vehicular access from Taper Avenue would belong to the Archdiocese.

Impact Summary of the Alternative

Because no development of the site would occur, Alternative A has the potential to reduce or avoid the following significant impacts of the Proposed Project:

- Regional and local construction-associated air emissions
- Regional operational air emissions
- Potential impacts on nesting birds during construction
- Impacts to jurisdictional waters
- Potential impacts to archaeological resources/human remains
- Potential impacts to paleontological resources
- Impacts associated with fault rupture and displacement and other seismic related ground failure at the Project Site
- Potential impacts relating to hydrocarbon-impacted soils which may be present on-site
- Exterior noise at Project units fronting Western Avenue associated with street traffic
- Project-related traffic impacts at intersections within the Project area
- Traffic impacts associated with installation of water service infrastructure

Alternative A does not have the potential to reduce or avoid potential impacts to roosting bats which may be present within the existing abandoned structures on the site. Similarly, Alternative A does not have the potential to avoid the disturbance of asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paint (LBP) that are present in the existing abandoned structures. Noise and vibration impacts associated with the Proposed Project would be reduced but not avoided due to the demolition of existing abandoned structures that would occur under Alternative A. Due to the elimination of access to Mary Star of the Sea High School through the Project Site, Alternative A would produce residual traffic impacts within the Taper Avenue neighborhood to the southeast of the site resulting from traffic utilizing Taper Avenue as the sole means of access to the school.

Findings

Some, though not all, of the significant impacts that would occur with the Project would not occur with Alternative A. However, it is found pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the California Public Resources Code that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section X (Statement of Overriding Considerations), below, make infeasible Alternative A.

Rationale for Findings

With Alternative A, many, although not all, of the environmental impacts projected to occur in connection with the Project would be avoided. However, Alternative A would fully attain only one of the Project objectives – removal of the existing buildings on the Project Site. Alternative A would not fully or partially attain any of the other seven Project objectives because it would involve no economic use of the Project Site.

Reference

For a complete discussion of Alternative A, see Section VI of the Draft EIR.

B. Alternative B: Single-Family Homes

Description of the Alternative

Under Alternative B, the Project would not be developed on the Project Site. However, the Project Site would not remain in its current condition. Under the conditions of the ownership transfer from the U.S. Department of Defense to the previous owner, all existing improvements on the Project Site must be removed. Accordingly, the existing vacant former Navy housing complex and associated roadways and other infrastructure would be demolished and all debris removed from the Project Site under this alternative. Under the current land use designation in the *Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan*, a majority of the Project Site is designated for Low Density Residential (4 to 9 dwelling units per acre) land uses. The Planning and Zoning Code (Los Angeles Municipal Code [LAMC], Chapter 1), zones all but 9.3 acres of the Project Site R1-1XL (One-Family Zone, Extra Limited Height District No. 1). Single-family dwellings, among other specified land uses, are permitted within the R1 zone. The Extra Limited Height District No. 1 limits the height of buildings to two stories or 30 feet. The remaining 9.3 acres of the site is zoned and designated Open Space.

If a Zone Change and General Plan Amendment were approved to remove the 9.3 acres of Open Space zoning from the Project Site, the land use and zoning designations of the Project Site would permit up to 429 single-family homes. In addition, if a single-family project were to include below-market (moderate, low, and very-low income units), a potential density bonus of 35 percent under the City's existing rules and regulations, or 579 single-family units, might be developed on the Project Site. Because of the significant site acquisition and site preparation costs related to the Project, the Applicant indicates that it is unlikely that a single-family project with below-market units would be developed.

Under City of Los Angeles zoning criteria, R1 zoning requires that each lot have a minimum area of 5,000 square feet, a minimum width of 50 feet, front yards of not less than 20 percent of the depth of the lot, and rear yards of not less than 15 feet, with resulting dwelling unit densities of approximately six units per acre (taking streets into account). Due to high land prices in infill locations within the City of Los Angeles, fewer and fewer new subdivisions are being developed in accordance with R1 zoning. Instead, homebuilders seeking to develop single-family homes in infill locations routinely propose homes on smaller lots at significantly higher densities.

In addition, the requirement to incorporate a seismic setback zone across the site would eliminate approximately 44 potential lots from a single-family residential site plan, reducing the total number of potential home lots from 429 to 385.

While infill housing in areas like the Project Site is not typically being developed in accordance with traditional R1 zoning criteria, this alternatives analysis assumes that, under Alternative B, the Project Site would be developed as a single-family home project in accordance with R1 zoning with approximately 385 single-family homes and that a Zone Change and General Plan Amendment would be approved to remove the current Open Space zoning/land use designation from the northerly 9.3 acres of the site. The number of homes in Alternative B is below the maximum density that could be developed under the R1 zoning in order to provide a street and lot plan consistent with a move-up/high-end home plan as well as to, as described above, incorporate the required seismic setback zone.

All of the homes under Alternative B would be developed for sale at market rates. Due to the same significant site acquisition and site preparation costs discussed previously, the Project Applicant indicates that it would be necessary to develop the Project Site with the maximum reasonable number of move-up/high-end single-family homes at the highest supportable prices in the market area (Los Angeles/Wilmington-Harbor City/San Pedro) that could be achieved. The Project Applicant estimates that such homes would range between 2,000 and 3,000 square feet and would need to sell for an average price approaching \$1 million. Given the current housing market and state of the local and regional economy, there is uncertainty that such prices could be realized. However, retaining the existing 9.3 acres of zoned Open Space on the site under Alternative B would eliminate approximately 81 additional single-family home lots from the site plan, which would likely make the alternative development economically infeasible to develop. For this reason, Alternative B proposes to eliminate the 9.3 acres of Open Space zoning from the Project Site.

The access road across the southern portion of the Project Site connecting Western Avenue to the Mary Star of the Sea High School campus would not be provided under this alternative due to the additional number of home lots that would be lost through the provision of this access. Instead, the area comprising the park and road would be used to accommodate the reduced number of single-family homes to be developed under Alternative B. Alternative B would satisfy public recreation requirements through the payment of Quimby Fees in accordance with the City's existing policies and regulations, but would not include the dedication of public park area. Alternative B assumes that Mary Star of the Sea High School would take vehicular access from Taper Avenue, which fronts the school site. As Mary Star of the Sea High School is a separate property owned by the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, responsibility for modifying the development permits of the High School in order to obtain vehicular access from Taper Avenue would belong to the Archdiocese.

Under Alternative B, all access to the Project Site would be taken from Western Avenue, as with the Project. Site access would be provided by two intersections at Western Avenue located at Green Hills Drive and John Montgomery Drive.

Impact Summary of the Alternative

Alternative B has the potential to reduce or avoid the following significant impacts of the Proposed Project:

- Regional operational air emissions
- Impacts associated with fault rupture and displacement at the Project Site
- Project-related traffic impacts at intersections within the Project area

Alternative B does not have the potential to reduce or avoid the Proposed Project's potential impacts involving regional and local construction-associated air emissions, potential impacts on nesting birds and/or roosting bats during construction, impacts to jurisdictional resources on-site, potential impacts to archaeological and/or paleontological resources, potential impacts relating to hydrocarbon-impacted soils, disturbance of asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paint (LBP) that are present in the existing abandoned structures on-site, construction-related noise and groundborne vibration, exterior noise at homes fronting Western Avenue, and potential traffic impacts associated with the installation of water service infrastructure. Due to the elimination of access to Mary Star of the Sea High School through the Project Site, Alternative B would produce residual traffic impacts within the Taper Avenue neighborhood to the southeast of the site resulting from traffic utilizing Taper Avenue as the sole means of access to the school.

Findings

It is found, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the California Public Resources Code, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section X (Statement of Overriding Considerations), below, make infeasible Alternative B.

Rationale for Findings

This alternative would not decrease all of the significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the Project to a less than significant level. While most of the significant and unavoidable regional air quality impacts would be avoided, significant and unavoidable NO_x emissions will remain. Moreover, significant and unavoidable noise (construction and on-site operational) impacts would remain.

Alternative B would achieve six of the Project objectives, although some would be achieved to a lesser extent than with the Proposed Project. Alternative B would remove the existing buildings on the Project Site; provide new housing on unutilized land that would contribute to meeting the projected 2017 housing need in the area; provide a project that would invigorate the local economy; mitigate its environmental impacts to the extent feasible; and provide a high-quality development. Alternative B would not provide new housing to meet the housing needs of a broad spectrum of persons desiring to live in the San Pedro community due to the economic imperative to develop high-end, large-lot single-family homes having a price well above the median for the region. Although each home would have a larger amount of private

open space (such as yards), Alternative B would not provide substantial common landscaped open space or recreational amenities due to the need to develop the maximum number of allowable homes on the site. While Alternative B would fiscally benefit the City, it would likely do so to a somewhat lesser degree than the Proposed Project due to the reduced number of homes, even though the tax assessments would most likely be greater on a per unit average basis. Similarly, Alternative B would not contribute to meeting the anticipated need for housing in the San Pedro area to the same degree as the Proposed Project due to the reduced number of homes that would be developed and the prices they would likely command.

The City finds that this alternative would not reduce all of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project and would not meet the Project objectives to the same extent as the Project. On that basis, the City rejects Alternative B.

Reference

For a complete discussion of Alternative B, see Section VI of the Draft EIR.

C. Alternative C: Reduced Density

Description of the Alternative

At the time the City Planning Department reviewed a previous development project proposal for the Project Site in 2008, Department staff recommended establishment of a Specific Plan to develop the site at a Low Medium I Residential density, which allows for densities of 9-18 dwelling units per acre. Under such a Specific Plan, approximately 775 to 886 units could be built at the site if it were to be developed to the maximum allowable density of 18 units per net acre. For purposes of evaluating this alternative, a site plan containing 830 units (in a combination of single- and multi-family product types) has been prepared to serve as Alternative C. When the City Planning Commission considered the previous project proposal for the Project Site, it endorsed the preparation of a Specific Plan and advised the previous Applicant to evaluate this Staff Recommendation as a project alternative in a new or recirculated EIR.

Alternative C would involve development of a project similar to the original Proposed Project on the site, however the total number of residential units would be reduced from 1,135 to 830. A total of six different housing product types would be included under Alternative C. Gross residential densities developed within the Alternative C project would range from 5.5 units per acre to 55.9 units per acre. The average density for the Alternative C project would be 13.5 DU/acre (gross).

As with the original Proposed Project, Alternative C would comprise a combination of for-sale and rental dwelling units within the following categories:

- Two- and three-story detached single-family homes with street- and alley-loaded private garages
- Three-story buildings containing townhomes and flats with and without elevators and motor-court and alley-loaded private garages
- Three-story townhomes in row house buildings with alley-loaded private garages

- Four- and five-story buildings with elevators over a secured common basement garage containing rental apartments

The dwelling units would range in size from approximately 600 to 2,800 square feet and would be housed within Mediterranean, Tuscan, and contemporary-style buildings built over and/or adjacent to residential parking garages. Residential buildings along Western Avenue would be two to three stories in height (between 30 and 48 feet) and would be buffered by trees and landscaping and set back from the street by approximately 18-80 feet, depending on the location and product type. Residential buildings throughout the rest of the Project Site would vary in height, with buildings averaging three stories, but not exceeding five stories (approximately 65 feet) in the interior of the site along its southern boundary (apartment buildings). Based on data provided by the Project Applicant, the weighted average sale price for all for-sale units under Alternative C would be \$489,474 (2011 dollars). Within the multi-family structures to be developed under Alternative C, the number of dwelling units per building would range from 5.9 to 43.5.

Vehicular access to the Alternative C project would be from Western Avenue at the two existing signalized intersections with Green Hills Drive and Avenida Aprenda on the north and south, respectively. The proposed southerly Project entrance at the Western Avenue/Avenida Aprenda intersection would feed into a new east-west road crossing the southern portion of the Project Site that would provide access to the Mary Star of the Sea High School campus adjacent to the Project Site on the east.

With the exception of the east-west road described above providing access across the Project Site to Mary Star of the Sea High School, all other streets would be private and vehicular access would be provided through two gated entrances: one from Western Avenue at Green Hills Drive and a second off of the new public east-west road near the southerly boundary line of the Project Site that would intersect Western Avenue at Avenida Aprenda. The new access road for Mary Star of the Sea High School would terminate at the eastern edge of the Project Site in a cul-de-sac, from which a private driveway would extend off-site to the east providing access to the Mary Star of the Sea campus.

When completed, Alternative C would redevelop 100 percent of the Project Site. Alternative C would incorporate a seismic setback area along the fault splay crossing the center of the site. Alternative C would not include the 2.8-acre public community park that is included in the original Proposed Project. However, Alternative C would incorporate approximately 20 acres of total open space, consisting of approximately one acre of outdoor recreational amenity space (including a recreation center with adjacent community clubhouse and pool/event lawn area in the central portion of the site), approximately 7.1 acres of dedicated park area (including the open space/trail network around the perimeter of the Project Site), 10.2 acres of landscaped common area throughout the Project, and an additional 2.1 acres of general open space, resulting in a total amount of open space similar to that provided by the Proposed Project (20.5 acres versus 20.6 acres). Additional indoor recreational amenities (e.g., rec rooms, fitness centers, etc.) would be distributed across the site and are not included in the acreages above. The walking/jogging path surrounding the perimeter of the Project and extending through the landscaped open space surrounding the Site would be open to the general public, and the other open space areas of the Project would be accessible to pedestrians.

As with the Proposed Project, a Specific Plan is proposed for Alternative C to provide zoning, architectural, landscape, and streetscape standards to guide the Project's development. At residential densities ranging from 5.5 dwelling units per acre to approximately 55.9 dwelling units per acre, Alternative C would fall within the City of Los Angeles' Low, Low-Medium I, Low-Medium II, and Medium General Plan Land Use Designations.

Construction of Alternative C would proceed similarly to the Proposed Project and would be estimated to begin in late 2013 and continue over a five-year period. The existing slope along the northeastern boundary of the Project Site would be modified to support the construction of the residential dwelling units along its toe. However, following completion of construction and landscaping, the re-engineered slope would be fully vegetated with a variety of native plant and tree species. As noted above, the entire Project Site would be densely landscaped with a variety of ornamental and native plant and tree species. As individual phases of the development are completed, associated landscaping would be installed on an incremental basis.

As part of Alternative C construction, the existing surface drainage course crossing the southwestern corner of the Project Site would be removed and buried beneath this portion of the Project as a subterranean storm drain. This storm drain would serve the same purpose as the existing surface channel by conveying the off-site stormwater runoff from the culvert at Western Avenue across this portion of the Project Site. After accepting additional drainage from the Project Site, this storm drain would discharge runoff to the City storm drain system in the same general location as at present along the Project Site's southern boundary.

Site preparation for Alternative C would involve conventional cut and fill grading techniques and would be substantially similar to that needed for the original Proposed Project. A significant amount of existing fill is present on the Project Site and would be either removed or consolidated and recompacted prior to the grading of building pads. Site grading would be required to prepare the proposed building pads for construction. Grading would also be required in order to construct the proposed roads, parking areas, and drainage improvements, and to install utilities. The combined grading operations would affect the entire site (or approximately 61.5 acres) and would involve a total earthwork quantity of approximately 1,225,000 cubic yards (cy), including approximately 350,000 cy of cut and fill for surface grading and an additional 875,000 cy of remedial grading for over-excavation and other requirements. No fill material would be imported to or exported from the Project Site. However, the removal of debris resulting from the demolition of existing structures on the Project Site would be required.

As with the original Proposed Project, construction staging, laydown areas, and all construction equipment would be positioned on-site and would be moved from area to area on the Project Site, consistent with the sequence of construction.

Impact Summary of the Alternative

Alternative C has the potential to reduce or avoid the following significant impacts of the original Proposed Project:

- Regional operational air emissions
- Impacts associated with fault rupture and displacement at the Project Site
- Project-related traffic impacts at intersections within the Project area

Alternative C does not have the potential to reduce or avoid the Proposed Project's potential impacts involving regional and local construction-associated air emissions, potential impacts on nesting birds and/or roosting bats during construction, impacts to jurisdictional resources on-site, potential impacts to archaeological and/or paleontological resources, potential impacts relating to hydrocarbon-impacted soils, disturbance of asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paint (LBP) that are present in the existing abandoned structures on-site, construction-related noise and groundborne vibration, exterior noise at Project homes fronting Western Avenue, and potential traffic impacts associated with the installation of water service infrastructure.

Findings

It is found, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the California Public Resources Code, that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the alternative project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

Rationale for Findings

Of the alternatives analyzed in the Draft and Final EIR, Alternative C was considered the environmentally superior alternative, with the exception of the No Project Alternative (Alternative A, above), although it has now been superseded by the New Preferred Alternative (see below). Alternative C would not reduce all of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the original Proposed Project.

Alternative C would achieve all of the Project objectives, although some would be achieved to a lesser extent than with the original Proposed Project. Alternative C would remove the existing buildings on the Project Site; provide new housing on unutilized land that would meaningfully contribute to meeting the projected 2017 housing need in the area; provide housing to meet the needs of a broad spectrum of persons desiring to live in the San Pedro area; provide substantial common amenities including landscaping and open space for future residents; provide a project that would invigorate the local economy; mitigate its environmental impacts to the extent feasible; fiscally benefit the City; and provide a high-quality development through the creation of a specific plan that establishes development standards for the site. While Alternative C would fiscally benefit the City, it would do so to a lesser degree than the original Proposed Project due to the reduced number of homes. Similarly, Alternative C would not contribute to meeting the anticipated need for housing in the San Pedro area to the same degree as the

original Proposed Project due to the reduced number of homes that would be developed, but would still provide a range of housing opportunities.

Reference

For a complete discussion of Alternative C, see Section VI of the Draft EIR.

D. Alternative D: Revised Site Plan

Description of the Alternative

Alternative D would involve development of the site with the same 1,135 units as the Proposed Project; however, the site plan would be revised to accommodate the geotechnical constraints that were identified in the process of preparing the Draft EIR. In order to accommodate the required setbacks associated with these constraints, the mix of product types and their respective locations within the overall site design would be altered somewhat as compared to the original Proposed Project Site plan. In addition, the 2.8-acre public park would not be developed under this alternative, although a similar amount of total open space would be included in the overall development plan. The access road from Western Avenue to Mary Star of the Sea High School would be included in this alternative.

Alternative D would be similar to the Proposed Project. A total of six different housing product types would be included under Alternative D. Residential densities developed within the Alternative D project would range from 5.8 units per acre to 55.9 units per acre. The average density for the Alternative D project would be 18.5 DU/acre (gross) and 23.6 DU/acre (net), the same as for the original Proposed Project.

As with the original Proposed Project, Alternative D would be comprised of a combination of for-sale and rental dwelling units within the following categories:

- Two- and three-story detached single-family homes with street- and alley-loaded private garages
- Three-story buildings containing flats with elevators and motor-court and alley-loaded private garages
- Three-story townhomes (two-stories without elevators) in row house buildings with alley-loaded private garages
- Three- and four-story buildings with elevators containing flats over a secured common basement garage
- Four- and five-story buildings with elevators over a secured common basement garage containing rental apartments

The dwelling units would range in size from approximately 600 to 2,800 square feet and would be housed within Mediterranean, Tuscan, and contemporary-style buildings built over and/or adjacent to residential parking garages. Residential buildings along Western Avenue would be two to four stories in height (approximately 30 to 55 feet) and would be buffered by trees and landscaping and set back from the street by approximately 18-80 feet, depending on the location and product type. Residential buildings throughout the rest of the Project Site would vary in height, with buildings averaging three stories, but not exceeding five stories (approximately 65 feet) in the interior of the site along its southern boundary (apartment buildings). Based on data provided by the Project Applicant, the weighted average sale price for all for-sale units under Alternative D would be \$489,474 (2011 dollars). Within the multi-family structures to be developed under Alternative D, the number of dwelling units per building would range from 5.9 to 43.5.

Vehicular access to the Alternative D project would be from Western Avenue at the two existing signalized intersections with Green Hills Drive and Avenida Aprenda on the north and south, respectively. The proposed southerly Project entrance at the Western Avenue/Avenida Aprenda intersection would feed into a new east-west road crossing the southern portion of the Project Site that would provide access to the Mary Star of the Sea High School campus adjacent to the Project Site on the east.

With the exception of the east-west road described above providing access across the Project Site to Mary Star of the Sea High School, all other streets would be private and access would be provided through two gated entrances: one from Western Avenue at Green Hills Drive and a second off of the new public east-west road near the southerly boundary line of the Project Site. The new access road for Mary Star of the Sea High School would terminate at the eastern edge of the Project Site in a cul-de-sac, from which a private driveway would extend off-site to the east providing access to the Mary Star of the Sea campus.

When completed, Alternative D would involve redevelopment of 100 percent of the Project Site. Alternative D would incorporate the seismic setback area along the Palos Verdes Fault splay crossing the center of the site. Due to this, Alternative D would not include the 2.8-acre public community park that is included in the original Proposed Project. However, Alternative D would incorporate approximately 20 acres of total open space, consisting of approximately one acre of outdoor recreational amenity space (including a recreation center with adjacent community clubhouse and pool/event lawn area in the central portion of the site), approximately 7.1 acres of dedicated park area (including the open space/trail network around the perimeter of the Project Site), and 10.2 acres of landscaped common area throughout the Project, and an additional 2.1 acres of general open space. Additional indoor recreational amenities (e.g., rec rooms, fitness centers, etc.) would be distributed across the site and are not included in the acreages above. The walking/jogging path surrounding the perimeter of the Project and extending through the landscaped open space surrounding the Site would be open to the general public, and pedestrian access would be provided to the other Project open space areas.

As with the Proposed Project, a Specific Plan is proposed for Alternative D to provide zoning, architectural, landscape, and streetscape standards to guide development. At gross residential densities ranging from 5.8 dwelling units per acre to approximately 55.9 dwelling units per acre, Alternative D

would fall within the City of Los Angeles' Low, Low-Medium I, Low-Medium II, and Medium General Plan Land Use Designations.

Construction of Alternative D would proceed similarly to the Proposed Project and would be estimated to begin in late 2013 and continue over a five-year period. The existing slope along the northeastern boundary of the Project Site would be modified to support the construction of the residential dwelling units along its toe. However, following completion of construction and landscaping, the re-engineered slope would be fully vegetated with a variety of native plant and tree species. As noted above, the entire Project Site would be abundantly landscaped with a variety of ornamental and native plant and tree species. As individual phases of the development are completed, associated landscaping would be installed on an incremental basis.

As part of Alternative D construction, the existing surface drainage course crossing the southwestern corner of the Project Site would be removed and buried beneath this portion of the Project as a subterranean storm drain. This storm drain would serve the same purpose as the existing surface channel by conveying the off-site stormwater runoff from the culvert at Western Avenue across this portion of the Project Site. After accepting additional drainage from the Project Site, this storm drain would discharge runoff to the City storm drain system in the same general location as at present along the Project Site's southern boundary.

Site preparation for Alternative D would involve conventional cut and fill grading techniques and would be substantially similar to that needed for the Proposed Project. A significant amount of existing fill is present on the Project Site and would be either removed or consolidated and recompact prior to the grading of building pads. Site grading would be required to prepare the proposed building pads for construction. Grading would also be required in order to construct the proposed roads, parking areas, and drainage improvements, and to install utilities. The combined grading operations would affect the entire site (or approximately 61.5 acres) and would involve a total earthwork quantity of approximately 1,225,000 cubic yards (cy), including approximately 350,000 cy of cut and fill for surface grading and an additional 875,000 cy of remedial grading for over-excavation and other requirements. No fill material would be imported to or exported from the Project Site. However, the removal of debris resulting from the demolition of existing structures on the Project Site would be required.

As with the Proposed Project, construction staging, laydown areas, and all construction equipment would be positioned on-site and would be moved from area to area on the Project Site, consistent with the sequence of construction.

Impact Summary of the Alternative

Alternative D has the potential to reduce or avoid the following significant impacts of the original Proposed Project:

- Impacts associated with fault rupture and displacement at the Project Site

Alternative D does not have the potential to reduce or avoid the original Proposed Project's other potential impacts, which involve regional and local construction-associated air emissions, regional operational air emissions, potential impacts on nesting birds and/or roosting bats during construction, impacts to jurisdictional resources on-site, potential impacts to archaeological and/or paleontological resources, potential impacts relating to hydrocarbon-impacted soils, disturbance of asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paint (LBP) that are present in the existing abandoned structures on-site, construction-related noise and groundborne vibration, exterior noise at Project homes fronting Western Avenue, Project-related traffic impacts at intersections in the surrounding area, and potential traffic impacts associated with the installation of water service infrastructure.

Findings

It is found, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the California Public Resources Code, that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the alternative project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

Rationale for Findings

This alternative would not avoid any of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the original Proposed Project, with the exception of avoiding impacts associated with fault rupture and displacement through incorporation of a seismic setback zone.

Alternative D would achieve all of the Project objectives, although one would be achieved to a lesser extent than with the Proposed Project. Alternative D would remove the existing buildings on the Project Site, provide new housing on unutilized land that would meaningfully contribute to meeting the projected 2017 housing need in the area, provide housing to meet the needs of a broad spectrum of persons desiring to live in the San Pedro area, provide common amenities including landscaping and open space for future residents, provide a project that would invigorate the local economy, would mitigate its environmental impacts to the extent feasible, would fiscally benefit the City, and would provide a high-quality development through the creation of a specific plan that establishes development standards for the site. While Alternative D would provide common amenities, including open space and landscaping, the amount of open space to be included would be less than that contained within the original Proposed Project.

The City finds that this alternative does not reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project, and, on that basis, rejects Alternative D.

Reference

For a complete discussion of Alternative D, see Section VI of the Draft EIR.

E. Existing Zoning Alternative Site Plan**Description of the Alternative**

Multiple commenters on the Draft EIR requested that an alternative site plan that is fully consistent with the Project Site's existing zoning and General Plan land use designations be evaluated. Commenters have also requested that such an alternative site plan include the same public access roadway to Mary Star of the Sea High School that is proposed under the original Project and under Alternatives C and D in the Draft EIR. Commenters have also requested that this alternative site plan contain full-sized single-family home lots consistent with R1 zoning (5,000 square feet or 50 feet by 100 feet). Under these design constraints, a conceptual site plan was developed that would result in development of 169 single-family homes at the Project Site. This plan would also incorporate the required seismic setback zone across the center of the site and would include two recreation centers as well as landscaped common area. The northernmost 9.3 acres of the Project Site would remain as open space, consistent with the current zoning and land use designation of this portion of the property. This area could be developed to some extent with park and recreation facilities for the use of the general public, although its configuration and topography would likely limit its suitability for dedication to the City as a neighborhood park.

Impact Summary of the Alternative

To summarize the impacts of the "Existing Zoning" alternative site plan in comparison to those of the currently preferred alternative project (Alternative C in the Draft EIR), this alternative has the potential to reduce or avoid the following significant impacts:

- Regional operational air emissions
- Project-related traffic impacts at intersections within the Project area

The "Existing Zoning" alternative would not have the potential to reduce or avoid the Proposed Project's potential impacts involving regional and local construction-associated air emissions, potential impacts on nesting birds and/or roosting bats during construction, impacts to jurisdictional resources on-site, potential impacts to archaeological and/or paleontological resources, potential impacts relating to hydrocarbon-impacted soils, disturbance of asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paint (LBP) that are present in the existing abandoned structures on-site, construction-related noise and groundborne vibration, exterior noise at homes fronting Western Avenue, and potential traffic impacts associated with the installation of water service infrastructure. Other impacts associated with the Project, although less than significant, would be substantially reduced under this alternative due to the fewer number of residences that would be developed on-site.

Findings

It is found, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the California Public Resources Code, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in

Section X (Statement of Overriding Considerations), below, make infeasible the Existing Zoning Alternative Site Plan.

Rationale for Findings

With respect to being able to achieve most of the Project's objectives, the 169 single-family home "Existing Zoning" alternative site plan would achieve seven of the Project objectives, although some would be achieved to a substantially lesser extent than with the Proposed Project. The "Existing Zoning" alternative site plan would remove the existing buildings on the Project Site; provide new housing on unutilized land that would contribute to meeting the projected 2017 housing need in the area; provide a project that would invigorate the local economy; mitigate its environmental impacts to the extent feasible; provide substantial common open space along the site's northern boundary as well as two recreation centers for the use of residents, and provide a high-quality development. The "Existing Zoning" site plan would not provide new housing to meet the housing needs of a broad spectrum of persons desiring to live in the San Pedro community due to the economic imperative to develop high-end, large-lot single-family homes having a price well above the median for the region. While development of this "Existing Zoning" site plan would fiscally benefit the City, it would likely do so to a significantly lesser degree than the Proposed Project due to the reduced number of homes, even though the tax assessments would most likely be greater on a per unit average basis. Similarly, the "Existing Zoning" alternative site plan would not contribute to meeting the anticipated need for housing in the San Pedro area to the same degree as the Proposed Project due to the reduced number of homes that would be developed and the prices they would likely command.

With respect to the "Existing Zoning" alternative site plan that was requested by numerous commenters on the Draft EIR, nothing would physically prevent the alternative from being developed at the Project Site. Therefore, the determination of its feasibility is limited to its ability to produce a positive return on investment to the Applicant. In order to evaluate the economic feasibility of the "Existing Zoning" alternative, a study was prepared by The Concord Group in June 2013. The study concludes that the "Existing Zoning" alternative would be economically infeasible to develop due to the substantial level of fixed costs associated with infrastructure and land that remain largely the same irrespective of the total number of lots developed at the site. The "Existing Zoning" alternative could only become economically feasible (e.g., avoid an economic loss for the Applicant) if it could achieve a top line home sale price of \$1.57 million (\$525 per square foot of home), a level that is currently unsupported in the market. The nearest new home project, Harbor Highlands, generates an average home price of \$554,000 (\$300 per square foot) for a small-lot detached home. Nearby resales in Rancho Palos Verdes, across Western Avenue from the Project Site, generate an average sale price of \$721,000. In light of the comparables proximate to Ponte Vista, any development at the Project Site would not support home values in excess of \$1 million. Given the realities of the current residential real estate market, development of the "Existing Zoning" alternative at the Project Site would result in a loss of approximately \$87 million.

The "Existing Zoning" alternative would substantially reduce many of the Project's less than significant impacts and would avoid the Project's significant, unmitigated operational air quality impact and reduce the Project's significant but mitigated traffic impacts. Thus, an argument could be advanced that the

“Existing Zoning” alternative could be the environmentally superior alternative. However, CEQA requires that the range of alternatives evaluated in an EIR be feasible to develop. As has been shown above, the “Existing Zoning” alternative would not be economically feasible to develop at the Project Site.

Therefore, the City finds that this alternative would be infeasible to develop and, on that basis, rejects the Existing Zoning Alternative Site Plan.

Reference

For a complete discussion of the Existing Zoning Alternative Site Plan, see Section III.A of the Final EIR.

F. Mixed-Use Alternative Site Plan

Description of the Alternative

Several commenters on the Draft EIR requested that a mixed-use residential/commercial alternative site plan be evaluated. Commenters have also requested that such an alternative site plan include the same public access roadway to Mary Star of the Sea High School that is proposed under the original Project and under Alternatives C and D in the Draft EIR. Commenters have also requested that this alternative site plan contain neighborhood-serving retail space, limited office space intended to serve future Project residents, a six-acre public neighborhood park, and space for development of a neighborhood branch library. Under these design constraints, a conceptual site plan was developed that consists of 477 residential units in a mix of housing product types ranging from single-family homes to townhomes and flats. A total of 181 single-family homes and 296 condominium units could be developed under this alternative. In addition, 5,000 square feet of office space, 20,000 square feet of retail/commercial space, and a site for a 20,000 square foot public library, as well as a 6-acre central neighborhood park, are included in this alternative. This alternative would provide public access across the site to Mary Star of the Sea High School from Western Avenue. This plan would also incorporate the required seismic setback zone across the center of the site and would include a central recreation center as well as landscaped common area.

Impact Summary of the Alternative

The “Mixed Use” alternative site plan would generally result in similar impacts as the current preferred alternative (Alternative C in the Draft EIR), with the differences primarily due to the fewer number of homes that would be developed at the site and/or the addition of commercial/retail and public library and park uses.

This alternative has the potential to reduce or avoid the following significant impacts:

- Regional operational air emissions
- Exterior noise at some Project residences

- Traffic (daily vehicle trips only)

The “Mixed Use” alternative would not have the potential to reduce or avoid the currently preferred alternative’s potential impacts involving regional and local construction-associated air emissions, potential impacts on nesting birds and/or roosting bats during construction, impacts to jurisdictional resources on-site, potential impacts to archaeological and/or paleontological resources, potential impacts relating to hydrocarbon-impacted soils, disturbance of asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paint (LBP) that are present in the existing abandoned structures on-site, construction-related noise and groundborne vibration, significant traffic impacts at study intersections, and potential traffic impacts associated with the installation of water service infrastructure. Other impacts associated with the Project, although less than significant, would be either equivalent or reduced to some degree under this alternative due to the fewer number of residences that would be developed on-site.

Findings

It is found, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the California Public Resources Code, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section X (Statement of Overriding Considerations), below, make infeasible the Mixed-Use Alternative Site Plan.

Rationale for Findings

With respect to being able to achieve most of the Project’s objectives, the “Mixed Use” alternative site plan would achieve each of the Project objectives, although some would be achieved to a substantially lesser extent than with the Proposed Project. The “Mixed Use” alternative site plan would remove the existing buildings on the Project Site; provide new housing on unutilized land that would contribute to meeting the projected 2017 housing need in the area; provide a project that would invigorate the local economy; mitigate its environmental impacts to the extent feasible; provide substantial common open space and park area as well as a recreation center for the use of residents; and provide a high-quality development. The “Mixed Use” site plan would provide new housing to meet the housing needs of a broad spectrum of persons desiring to live in the San Pedro community but to a lesser degree than the Project due to the fewer number of units and housing product types to be developed. While development of this “Mixed Use” site plan would fiscally benefit the City, it would likely do so to a significantly lesser degree than the Proposed Project due to the reduced number of homes. Similarly, the “Mixed Use” alternative site plan would not contribute to meeting the anticipated need for housing in the San Pedro area to the same degree as the Proposed Project due to the reduced number of homes that would be developed.

With respect to the “Mixed Use” alternative site plan, nothing would physically prevent the alternative from being developed at the Project Site. Therefore, the determination of its feasibility is limited to its ability to produce a positive return on investment to the Applicant. In order to evaluate the economic feasibility of the “Mixed Use” alternative, a study was prepared by The Concord Group in June 2013. The study concludes that the “Mixed Use” alternative would be economically infeasible to develop due to the substantial level of fixed costs associated with infrastructure and land that remain largely the same

irrespective of the total number of lots developed at the site. In addition, the “Mixed Use” alternative would donate acreage on-site to the Los Angeles Public Library for construction of a neighborhood branch library and, thus, would return no economic value to the Applicant. Recently reviewed vacancy reports for the area surrounding the Project Site indicate that 1,073,992 square feet of available (vacant) office space exists within a five-mile radius of the Site and that 166,675 square feet of available (vacant) retail space exists within a two-mile radius of the Site. These figures represent a relatively large amount of vacant office and retail space and would likely present challenges to developing economically viable commercial and retail uses at the Project Site. Given the realities of the current residential, office, and retail real estate market, it is estimated that development of the “Mixed Use” alternative at the Project Site would result in a loss of approximately \$37 million.

The “Mixed Use” alternative would, as discussed above, marginally reduce some of the Project’s less than significant impacts and would reduce the Project’s significant, unmitigated operational air quality impact. Thus, an argument could be advanced that the “Mixed Use” alternative could be the environmentally superior alternative. However, as noted previously, CEQA requires that the range of alternatives evaluated in an EIR be feasible to develop. As has been shown above, the “Mixed Use” alternative would not be economically feasible to develop at the Project Site.

Therefore, the City finds that this alternative would be infeasible to develop and, on that basis, rejects the Mixed-Use Alternative Site Plan.

Reference

For a complete discussion of the Mixed-Use Alternative Site Plan, see Section III.A of the Final EIR.

G. New Preferred Alternative – Further Density Reduction

Description of the Alternative

Subsequent to publication of the Final EIR, the Project Applicant submitted a revised Project site plan to the City featuring a reduction in the number of residential units to be developed from 830 to a maximum of 700 units. The changes in the revised site plan are fully discussed in the document entitled “Supplemental Analysis of Project Revisions”, which is part of the Project’s CEQA document. However, for purposes of presenting the most current analysis within these Findings, the discussion below of the New Preferred Alternative reflects the current 700-unit revised site plan rather than the former 830-unit plan that was evaluated in both the Draft and Final EIR.

The New Preferred Alternative would involve development of a project similar to the original Proposed Project on the site, however the total number of residential units would be reduced from 1,135 to a maximum of 700. A total of six different housing product types would be included under the New Preferred Alternative. Gross residential densities developed within the New Preferred Alternative project would range from 8 units per acre to 23 units per acre. The average density for the New Preferred Alternative project would be 11.4 DU/acre (gross).

The New Preferred Alternative would be comprised of a combination of dwelling units within the following categories:

- Two- and three-story detached single-family homes with street-loaded private garages
- Two-story buildings containing townhomes with driveway-loaded private garages
- Three-story townhomes and flats with driveway-loaded private garages and elevators
- Four-story buildings containing flats with elevators over driveway-loaded garages

The dwelling units would range in size from approximately 600 to 2,800 square feet and would be housed within Mediterranean, Tuscan, and contemporary-style buildings built over and/or adjacent to residential parking garages. Residential buildings along Western Avenue would be two to three stories in height (between 30 and 48 feet) and would be buffered by trees and landscaping and set back from the street by approximately 18-80 feet, depending on the location and product type. Residential buildings throughout the rest of the Project Site would vary in height, with buildings averaging three stories, but not exceeding four stories (approximately 55 feet) in the interior of the site near its southern boundary. Based on data provided by the Project Applicant, the weighted average sale price for all for-sale units under Alternative C would be \$489,474 (2011 dollars).

Vehicular access to the New Preferred Alternative project would be from Western Avenue at the two existing signalized intersections with Green Hills Drive and Avenida Aprenda on the north and south, respectively. The proposed southerly Project entrance at the Western Avenue/Avenida Aprenda intersection would feed into a new east-west road crossing the southern portion of the Project Site that would provide access to the property currently occupied by the Mary Star of the Sea High School campus adjacent to the Project Site on the east. An access road would also be provided and maintained to the neighboring multi-family developments to the south (Seaport Homes and Casa Verde), to allow those residents to access to Western Avenue via the Project's new east-west road.

With the exception of the east-west road described above providing access across the Project Site to the property currently occupied by Mary Star of the Sea High School and the access road to the neighboring multi-family developments, both of which would be privately maintained but publicly accessible and not gated, all other streets within the Project would be private and vehicular access would be provided through two gated entrances: one from Western Avenue at Green Hills Drive and a second off of the new public east-west road near the southerly boundary line of the Project Site that would intersect Western Avenue at Avenida Aprenda. The new access road for Mary Star of the Sea High School would terminate at the eastern edge of the Project Site in a cul-de-sac, from which a private driveway would extend off-site to the east providing access to the Mary Star of the Sea campus.

When completed, the Project would redevelop 100 percent of the Project Site. The Project would incorporate a seismic setback area along a splay of the Palos Verdes Fault crossing the center of the site. The Proposed Project would incorporate over 24 acres of total open space, consisting of outdoor recreational amenity space (including primary and secondary recreation centers with adjacent community

clubhouses and pool/event lawn areas for project residents), dedicated park area (including an open space/trail network around the perimeter of the Project Site and a publically-accessible park near Western Avenue), landscaped common areas throughout the Project, and other open space. The open space/trail network and publically-accessible park areas would be accessible to both Project residents and the general public. Additional indoor recreational amenities (e.g., rec rooms, fitness centers, etc.) would be distributed across the site for the private use of residents.

A Specific Plan is proposed for the Project to provide zoning, architectural, landscape, and streetscape standards to guide the Project's development. At residential densities ranging from 8 dwelling units per acre to approximately 23 dwelling units per acre, the Project would fall within the City of Los Angeles' Low, Low-Medium I, and Low-Medium II General Plan Land Use Designations.

Although a maximum of 212 residential units would be permitted under the Specific Plan within Subarea 6, only 188 units are currently being proposed. In order to provide additional housing within Subarea 6 exceeding the currently proposed 188 units but not more than 212 units, a new subdivision map would be required, although no Specific Plan Amendment would be required.

Construction of the New Preferred Alternative would proceed similarly to the Proposed Project and would be estimated to begin in late 2013 and continue over a five-year period. The existing slope along the northeastern boundary of the Project Site would be modified to support the construction of the residential dwelling units along its toe. However, following completion of construction and landscaping, the re-engineered slope would be fully vegetated with a variety of native plant and tree species. As noted above, the entire Project Site would be densely landscaped with a variety of ornamental and native plant and tree species. As individual phases of the development are completed, associated landscaping would be installed on an incremental basis.

As part of New Preferred Alternative construction, the existing surface drainage course crossing the southwestern corner of the Project Site would be removed and buried beneath this portion of the Project as a subterranean storm drain. This storm drain would serve the same purpose as the existing surface channel by conveying the off-site stormwater runoff from the culvert at Western Avenue across this portion of the Project Site. After accepting additional drainage from the Project Site, this storm drain would discharge runoff to the City storm drain system in the same general location as at present along the Project Site's southern boundary.

Site preparation for the New Preferred Alternative would involve conventional cut and fill grading techniques and would be substantially similar to that needed for the original Proposed Project. A significant amount of existing fill is present on the Project Site and would be either removed or consolidated and recompact prior to the grading of building pads. Site grading would be required to prepare the proposed building pads for construction. Grading would also be required in order to construct the proposed roads, parking areas, and drainage improvements, and to install utilities. The combined grading operations would affect the entire site (or approximately 61.5 acres) and would involve a total earthwork quantity of approximately 1,225,000 cubic yards (cy), including approximately 350,000 cy of cut and fill for surface grading and an additional 875,000 cy of remedial grading for over-excavation and

other requirements. No fill material would be imported to or exported from the Project Site. However, the removal of debris resulting from the demolition of existing structures on the Project Site would be required.

As with the original Proposed Project, construction staging, laydown areas, and all construction equipment would be positioned on-site and would be moved from area to area on the Project Site, consistent with the sequence of construction.

Impact Summary of the Alternative

The New Preferred Alternative has the potential to reduce or avoid the following significant impacts of the original Proposed Project:

- Regional operational air emissions
- Impacts associated with fault rupture and displacement at the Project Site
- Project-related traffic impacts at intersections within the Project area

The New Preferred Alternative does not have the potential to reduce or avoid the Proposed Project's potential impacts involving regional and local construction-associated air emissions, potential impacts on nesting birds and/or roosting bats during construction, impacts to jurisdictional resources on-site, potential impacts to archaeological and/or paleontological resources, potential impacts relating to hydrocarbon-impacted soils, disturbance of asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paint (LBP) that are present in the existing abandoned structures on-site, construction-related noise and groundborne vibration, exterior noise at Project homes fronting Western Avenue, and potential traffic impacts associated with the installation of water service infrastructure.

Findings

It is found, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the California Public Resources Code, that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the alternative project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

Rationale for Findings

Of the alternatives analyzed in the Draft and Final EIR and Supplemental Analysis of Project Revisions, the New Preferred Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative, with the exception of the No Project Alternative (Alternative A, above), and is also the Project Applicant's current preferred alternative (replacing the original Proposed Project in the Draft EIR). However, the New Preferred Alternative would not reduce all of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the original Proposed Project.

The New Preferred Alternative would achieve all of the Project objectives, although some would be achieved to a lesser extent than with the original Proposed Project. The New Preferred Alternative would remove the existing buildings on the Project Site; provide new housing on unutilized land that would meaningfully contribute to meeting the projected 2017 housing need in the area; provide housing to meet the needs of a broad spectrum of persons desiring to live in the San Pedro area; provide substantial common amenities including landscaping and open space for future residents; provide a project that would invigorate the local economy; mitigate its environmental impacts to the extent feasible; fiscally benefit the City; and provide a high-quality development through the creation of a specific plan that establishes development standards for the site. While the New Preferred Alternative would fiscally benefit the City, it would do so to a lesser degree than the original Proposed Project due to the reduced number of homes. Similarly, the New Preferred Alternative would not contribute to meeting the anticipated need for housing in the San Pedro area to the same degree as the original Proposed Project due to the reduced number of homes that would be developed, but would still provide a range of housing opportunities.

Reference

For a complete discussion of the New Preferred Alternative, see Supplemental Analysis of Project Revisions.

VIII. FINDINGS REGARDING OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

A. Growth Inducing Impacts of the Project

The Project would contribute a total of approximately 2,079 net new residents to the Project area and the City of Los Angeles. Additional indirect/induced population growth caused by the economic activity created by the Project would be estimated to add 763 persons to the Project area, for a total population growth of 2,842 persons associated with the Project. This growth would be largely consistent with area-wide population and housing forecasts. The Project would foster economic growth by increasing the number of residents at the Project Site who could patronize local businesses and services in the area. In addition, short-term employment opportunities would be provided during the construction phases of the Project.

While the Project's addition of new housing units is consistent with various regional and local policies, it would not, in and of itself, foster new growth in the area by removing impediments to growth. The property surrounding the Project Site is already developed with single-family and multi-family homes, Mary Star of the Sea High School campus, or is reserved for uses by the federal government. All roads planned for the Project are for internal circulation only or Mary Star of the Sea High School access, and would not open undeveloped areas for new use. Similarly, all utility and other infrastructure upgrades planned for the Project are intended solely to meet Project-related demand and would not support development external to the Project Site. The Project households' demand for commercial goods and services would be met by existing retail, service, and other resources already located within about a five mile radius of the Project Site, and no new development specifically to meet the Project's scale of household demand would be needed. On the contrary, the Project's new household demand would help support the viability of existing businesses in the Project vicinity. The Project would redevelop a blighted site that currently contains abandoned buildings in a state of advancing disrepair.

B. Significant Irreversible Impacts

The CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR address any significant irreversible environmental changes that would be involved in a project should it be implemented (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126(c) and 15126.2(c)). CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c) indicates that "[u]ses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter likely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified."

The types and level of development associated with the Project would consume limited, slowly renewable and non-renewable resources. This consumption would occur during construction of

the Project and would continue throughout its operational lifetime. Committed resources would include: (1) building materials, (2) fuel and operational materials/resources, and (3) resources used in the transport of goods and people to and from the Project Site.

Construction of the Project would require consumption of resources that are not replenishable or which may renew slowly as to be considered non-renewable. These resources would include certain types of lumber and other forest products, aggregate materials used in concrete and asphalt (e.g., sand, gravel and stone), metals (e.g., steel, copper and lead), petrochemical construction materials (e.g., plastics), and water. Fossil fuels, such as gasoline and oil, would also be consumed in the use of construction vehicles and equipment. The consumption of these resources would be spread out over the phased five-year construction period.

The commitment of resources to the Project would limit the availability of these resources for future generations. However, insofar as the Project is consistent with, or brought into consistency with, applicable land use plans and policies, this resource consumption would be consistent with growth and anticipated change in the Los Angeles region. Consideration of all the foregoing factors supports the conclusion that the Project's use of resources is justified, and that the Project will not result in significant irreversible environmental changes that warrant further consideration.

IX. OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

- A.** The City of Los Angeles (the City), acting through the Planning Department, is the “Lead Agency” for the Project evaluated in the Final EIR. The City finds that the Final EIR was prepared in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The City finds that it has independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR for the Project, and that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City.
- B.** The City finds that the Final EIR provides objective information to assist the decision-makers and the public at large in their consideration of the environmental consequences of the Project. The public review period provided all interested jurisdictions, agencies, private organizations, and individuals the opportunity to submit comments regarding the Draft EIR. The Final EIR was prepared after the review period and responds to comments made during the public review period.
- C.** The Planning Department evaluated comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the Draft EIR. In accordance with CEQA, the Planning Department prepared written responses describing the disposition of significant environmental issues raised. The Final EIR and provides adequate, good faith and reasoned responses to the comments. The Planning Department reviewed the comments received and responses thereto and has determined that neither the comments received nor the responses to such comments add significant new information regarding environmental impacts to the Draft EIR. The lead agency has based its actions on full appraisal of all viewpoints, including all comments received up to the date of adoption of these findings, concerning the environmental impacts identified and analyzed in the Final EIR.
- D.** The mitigation measures, which have been identified for the Project, were identified in the text and summary of the Final EIR. The final mitigation measures are described in the Complete MMRP. Each of the mitigation measures identified in the Complete MMRP, and contained in the Final EIR, is incorporated into the Project with the exception of Draft EIR Mitigation Measures TRANS-1, TRANS-7, TRANS-10, TRANS-14, and TRANS-23, which are no longer necessary to mitigate significant Project impacts due to the reduction in the proposed number of residential units from 1,135 to a maximum of 700. The City finds that the impacts of the Project have been mitigated to the extent feasible by the Mitigation Measures identified in the Complete MMRP, and contained in the Final EIR.
- E.** Textual refinements and errata were compiled and presented to the decision-makers for review and consideration. The Planning Department staff has made every effort to notify the decision-makers and the interested public/agencies of each textual change in the various documents associated with the Project review. These textual refinements arose for a variety of reasons. First, it is inevitable that draft documents will contain

errors and will require clarifications and corrections. Second, textual clarifications were necessitated in order to describe refinements suggested as part of the public participation process.

- F.** CEQA requires the lead agency approving a project to adopt an MMRP for the changes to the project, which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to ensure compliance with project implementation. The mitigation measures included in the Final EIR as certified by the City and included in the Complete MMRP as adopted by the City serve that function. The Complete MMRP includes all of the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR, except as noted in par. D above, and has been designed to ensure compliance during implementation of the Project. In accordance with CEQA, the Complete MMRP provides the means to ensure that the mitigation measures are fully enforceable. In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, the City hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- G.** In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code §21081.6, the City hereby adopts each of the mitigation measures expressly set forth herein as conditions of approval for the Project.
- H.** The custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City's decision is based is the:
- Department of City Planning, City of Los Angeles
200 North Spring Street, Room 750
Los Angeles, CA 90012.
- I.** The City finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the Final EIR, which is incorporated herein by this reference, or is in the record of proceedings in the matter.
- J.** In light of the entire administrative record of the proceedings for the Project, the City determines that there is no significant new information (within the meaning of CEQA) that would have required a recirculation of the sections of the Draft EIR or Final EIR.
- K.** The "References" subsection of each impact area discussed in these Findings are for reference purposes only and are not intended to represent an exhaustive listing of all evidence that supports these Findings.
- L.** The City is certifying an EIR for, and is approving and adopting findings for, the entirety of the actions described in these Findings and in the Final EIR as comprising the Project. It is contemplated that there may be a variety of actions undertaken by other State and local agencies (who might be referred to as "responsible agencies" under CEQA). Because the City is the lead agency for the Project, the Final EIR is

intended to be the basis for compliance with CEQA for each of the possible discretionary actions by other State and local agencies to carry out the Project.

X. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The Final EIR has identified unavoidable significant impacts, which will result from implementation of the Project. Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15093(b) of the CEQA Guidelines provide that when the decision of the public agency allows the occurrence of significant impacts which are identified in the EIR but are not at least substantially mitigated to an insignificant level or eliminated, the lead agency must state in writing the reasons to support its action based on the completed EIR and/or other information in the record.

Article I of the City of Los Angeles CEQA Guidelines incorporates all of the State CEQA Guidelines contained in title 15, California Code of Regulations, section 15000 et seq. and hereby requires, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(b) that the decision-maker adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations at the time of approval of a project if it finds that significant adverse environmental effects have been identified in the EIR which cannot be substantially mitigated to an insignificant level or be eliminated. These findings and the Statement of Overriding Considerations are based on the record of proceedings, including but not limited to the Final EIR, and other documents and materials that constitute the record of proceedings.

The following impacts are not mitigated to a less than significant level for the Project: Air Quality and Noise, as identified in the Final EIR, and it is not feasible to mitigate such impacts to a less than significant level.

Accordingly, the City adopts the following Statement of Overriding Considerations. The City recognizes that significant and unavoidable impacts will result from implementation of the Project. Having (i) adopted all feasible mitigation measures, (ii) rejected as infeasible alternatives to the Projects discussed above, (iii) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts, and (iv) balanced the benefits of the Project against their significant and unavoidable impacts, the City hereby finds that the benefits outweigh and override the significant unavoidable impacts for the reasons stated below.

The below stated reasons summarize the benefits, goals and objectives of the Project, and provide the rationale for the benefits of the Project. Any one of the overriding considerations of economic, social, aesthetic and environmental benefits individually would be sufficient to outweigh the adverse environmental impacts of the Project and justify their adoption and certification of the Final EIR.

1. Implementation of the Project will create a high-quality residential development that increases density near major employment nodes and furthers sound planning goals, including goals set out by SCAG for addressing regional housing needs through the development of infill sites.
2. Implementation of the Project will create a vibrant residential project that responds to the growth of the Harbor region.
3. Implementation of the Project will maximize the development potential of the Project Site in context with the area through quality design and development controls that ensure a unified and cohesive development.

4. Implementation of the Project will support local and regional sustainability goals through urban infill.
5. Implementation of the Project will generate community benefits by maximizing land use opportunities and providing a vibrant residential environment with new amenities, public spaces and State-of-the-Art improvements.
6. Implementation of the Project will provide safe access for pedestrians and vehicles to Mary Star of the Sea High School from Western Avenue.
7. Implementation of the Project will reduce vehicular trips by creating a new residential community in close proximity to existing neighborhood-serving retail and commercial land uses and will work to promote alternative methods of transportation and create provisions for non-vehicular travel by providing pedestrian pathways/linkages within the Project Site and providing bicycle parking and storage.
8. Implementation of the Project would increase the amount of tax revenue generated by the Project Site.
9. Implementation of the Project would remove a blighted, abandoned development and would create a lushly landscaped residential neighborhood in its place.
10. Implementation of the Project will provide for logical, consistent planning within the Project Site.