

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

LEAD CITY AGENCY City of Los Angeles	COUNCIL DISTRICT CD 3 - BOB BLUMENFIELD
--	---

PROJECT TITLE ENV-2014-3869-MND	CASE NO. APCSV-2014-3868-ZC
---	---------------------------------------

PROJECT LOCATION
18529 W CALVERT ST

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
 The project includes a request for a Zone Change to the R3-1-K-RIO zone and the development of a four-story, 45-foot height, apartment building with 24 residential units and subterranean parking on an approximately 16,561 square foot site. One single-family residence is to be demolished.

NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT IF OTHER THAN CITY AGENCY
 Armin Gahari
 19562 Ventura Blvd. Suite 230
 Los Angeles, CA 91356

FINDING:
 The City Planning Department of the City of Los Angeles has Proposed that a mitigated negative declaration be adopted for this project because the mitigation measure(s) outlined on the attached page(s) will reduce any potential significant adverse effects to a level of insignificance

(CONTINUED ON PAGE 2)

SEE ATTACHED SHEET(S) FOR ANY MITIGATION MEASURES IMPOSED.

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

THE INITIAL STUDY PREPARED FOR THIS PROJECT IS ATTACHED.

NAME OF PERSON PREPARING THIS FORM	TITLE	TELEPHONE NUMBER
MILENA ZASADZIEN	City Planning Associate	(818) 374-5054


ADDRESS	SIGNATURE (Official)	DATE
200 N. SPRING STREET, 7th FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA. 90012		MAY 13, 2015

EXHIBIT E-1:
Environmental Clearance
 APCSV-2014-3868-ZC
 Date: 6/11/2015

IV-70. Tree Removal (Non-Protected Trees)

- Environmental impacts from project implementation may result due to the loss of significant trees on the site. However, the potential impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level by the following measures:
- Prior to the issuance of any permit, a plot plan shall be prepared indicating the location, size, type, and general condition of all existing trees on the site and within the adjacent public right(s)-of-way.
- All significant (8-inch or greater trunk diameter, or cumulative trunk diameter if multi-trunked, as measured 54 inches above the ground) non-protected trees on the site proposed for removal shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio with a minimum 24-inch box tree. Net, new trees, located within the parkway of the adjacent public right(s)-of-way, may be counted toward replacement tree requirements.

IV-80. Tree Removal (Locally Protected Species)

- Environmental impacts may result due to the loss of protected trees on the site. However, these potential impacts will be mitigated to less than significant level by the following measures:
- All protected tree removals require approval from the Board of Public Works.
- A minimum of two trees (a minimum of 48-inch box in size if available) shall be planted for each protected tree that is removed. The canopy of the replacement trees, at the time they are planted, shall be in proportion to the canopies of the protected tree(s) removed and shall be to the satisfaction of the Urban Forestry Division.
- The location of trees planted for the purposes of replacing a removed protected tree shall be clearly indicated on the required landscape plan, which shall also indicate the replacement tree species and further contain the phrase "Replacement Tree" in its description.
- Bonding (Tree Survival):

VI 0. Liquefaction and Expansive Soils Area

-
- The project shall comply with all mitigation conditions contained in the January 23, 2015 Preliminary Soils Engineering Investigation by Subsurface Designs, Inc., and as it may be subsequently amended or modified by the Department of Building and Safety's Grading Division.

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

LEAD CITY AGENCY: City of Los Angeles	COUNCIL DISTRICT: CD 3 - BOB BLUMENFIELD	DATE:
RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES: Department of City Planning		
ENVIRONMENTAL CASE: ENV-2014-3869-MND	RELATED CASES: APCSV-2014-3868-ZC	
PREVIOUS ACTIONS CASE NO.:	<input type="checkbox"/> Does have significant changes from previous actions. <input type="checkbox"/> Does NOT have significant changes from previous actions	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW 24 UNIT APARTMENT BUILDING, WITH 52 VEHICLE PARKINGS WITH ONE LEVEL OF SUBTERRANEAN PARKING.		
ENV PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project includes a request for a Zone Change to the R3-1-K-RIO zone and the development of a four-story, 45-foot height, apartment building with 24 residential units and subterranean parking on an approximately 16,561 square foot site. One single-family residence is to be demolished.		
ENVIRONMENTAL SETTINGS: The rectangular site consists of a level lot totaling 16,561 square feet of lot area with 144 feet of frontage along the north side of Calvert Street (a designated Local Street). A 20-foot wide western portion of the lot will be dedicated for a length of 145-feet to construct and continue an existing alleyway. The site is zoned RA-1-K-RIO and is designated for Medium Residential land uses within the Reseda - West Van Nuys Community Plan area. The project is subject to the horsekeeping standards of the Equinekeeping (K) District which allows for reduced distances between equine uses and habitable rooms, and is subject to the River Improvement Overlay (RIO) District (Ordinances 183,144 and 183145) which sets standards for landscaping and design. The site is located within a liquefaction zone and 12.3 kilometers from the nearest fault (Northridge Fault). An airport hazard zone also applies to the site and general area, which sets a 250-foot height limit above Elevation 790. The site is not otherwise located within any other special hazard or land-use zones. There are no schools or parks within 500 feet of the project site. Properties to the north and east of the site, which are located along Reseda Boulevard, are developed with apartment buildings within the R3-1-RIO zone and Medium Residential land use designation. Properties to the west and south are developed with single-family residences in the RA-1-K-RIO zone and Very Low I land use designation. The Orange Line busway and Reseda Metro Station are located approximately 500-feet south of the site and the Los Angeles River is located approximately 1/2 mile north of the site.		
PROJECT LOCATION: 18529 W CALVERT ST		
COMMUNITY PLAN AREA: RESEDA - WEST VAN NUYS STATUS: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Conform to Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Does NOT Conform to Plan	AREA PLANNING COMMISSION: SOUTH VALLEY	CERTIFIED NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL: TARZANA
EXISTING ZONING: RA-1-K-RIO	MAX. DENSITY/INTENSITY ALLOWED BY ZONING: 1 d.u. / 17,500 sq-ft	

GENERAL PLAN LAND USE: MEDIUM RESIDENTIAL	MAX. DENSITY/INTENSITY ALLOWED BY PLAN DESIGNATION: 1 d.u. / 800 sq-ft	LA River Adjacent: NO
	PROPOSED PROJECT DENSITY: 1 d.u. / 690 sq-ft	

Determination (To Be Completed By Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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



City Planning Associate

(818) 374-5054

Signature

Title

Phone

Evaluation Of Environmental Impacts:

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

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A sources list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

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

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

Background

PROPONENT NAME:

Armin Gahari

PHONE NUMBER:

(818) 758-0018

APPLICANT ADDRESS:

19562 Ventura Blvd. Suite 230
Los Angeles, CA 91356

AGENCY REQUIRING CHECKLIST:

Department of City Planning

DATE SUBMITTED:

10/17/2014

PROPOSAL NAME (if Applicable):

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

I. AESTHETICS

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

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

a.	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?				✓
b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				✓
c.	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				✓
d.	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				✓
e.	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				✓

III. AIR QUALITY

a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			✓	
b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		✓		
c.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			✓	
d.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			✓	
e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			✓	

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

a.	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				✓
b.	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				✓
c.	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				✓
d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				✓
e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		✓		
f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				✓

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

a.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				✓
b.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Strong seismic ground shaking?			✓	
c.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	✓			
d.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Landslides?				✓
e.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				✓
f.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	✓			
g.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	✓			
h.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				✓

VII. GREEN HOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				✓
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	✓			
c.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	✓			
d.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				✓
e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				✓
f.	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				✓
g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				✓

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

h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				✓
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY					
a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			✓	
b.	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			✓	
c.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				✓
d.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				✓
e.	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			✓	
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			✓	
g.	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				✓
h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				✓
i.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				✓
j.	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				✓
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING					
a.	Physically divide an established community?				✓
b.	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				✓
c.	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				✓
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES					
a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				✓
b.	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				✓
XII. NOISE					
a.	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			✓	
b.	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			✓	
c.	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			✓	
d.	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			✓	

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

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

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

a.	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			✓	
b.	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			✓	
c.	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			✓	

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a.	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection?			✓	
b.	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Police protection?			✓	
c.	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Schools?			✓	
d.	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Parks?			✓	
e.	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Other public facilities?			✓	

XV. RECREATION

a.	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			✓	
b.	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			✓	

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

a.	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			✓	
----	--	--	--	---	--

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

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

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		✓	
b.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?		✓	
c.	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		✓	

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

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

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

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

The project as identified in the project description may cause potentially significant impacts on the environment without mitigation. Therefore, this environmental analysis concludes that a Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be issued to avoid and mitigate all potential adverse impacts on the environment by the imposition of mitigation measures and/or conditions contained and expressed in this document; the environmental case file known as **ENV-2014-3869-MND** and the associated case(s), **APCSV-2014-3868-ZC**. Finally, based on the fact that these impacts can be feasibly mitigated to less than significant, and based on the findings and thresholds for Mandatory Findings of Significance as described in the California Environmental Quality Act, section 15065, the overall project impact(s) on the environment (after mitigation) **will not:**

- Substantially degrade environmental quality.
- Substantially reduce fish or wildlife habitat.
- Cause a fish or wildlife habitat to drop below self sustaining levels.
- Threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community.
- Reduce number, or restrict range of a rare, threatened, or endangered species.
- Eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory.
- Achieve short-term goals to the disadvantage of long-term goals.
- Result in environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable.
- Result in environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

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

For City information, addresses and phone numbers: visit the City's website at <http://www.lacity.org> ; City Planning - and Zoning Information Mapping Automated System (ZIMAS) cityplanning.lacity.org/ or EIR Unit, City Hall, 200 N Spring Street, Room 763. Seismic Hazard Maps - <http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/> Engineering/Infrastructure/Topographic Maps/Parcel Information - <http://boemaps.eng.ci.la.ca.us/index01.htm> or City's main website under the heading "Navigate LA".

PREPARED BY:	TITLE:	TELEPHONE NO.:	DATE:
MILENA ZASADZIEN	City Planning Associate	(818) 374-5054	03/02/2015

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

APPENDIX A: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS EXPLANATION TABLE

I. AESTHETICS

a.	NO IMPACT	The project is not located near a Scenic Vista.	
b.	NO IMPACT	No existing scenic resources or historic buildings exist on-site or in the vicinity.	
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project proposes a new four-story apartment building taller than the surrounding one- to three-story residential developments. However, the project incorporates a compatible architectural style with articulated facades and recessed elements to reduce the appearance of massing. Therefore the project is not expected to degrade the existing neighborhood character.	
d.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project will increase lighting on the site compared to existing levels, but the limited exterior lighting will not substantially impact day or nighttime views in the area.	

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

a.	NO IMPACT	The project site is not used or designated as farmland of importance.	
b.	NO IMPACT	The site is not zoned for agricultural uses and does not hold a Williamson Act contract.	
c.	NO IMPACT	The project site is not zoned for forest land or timberland.	
d.	NO IMPACT	The project site does not contain or impact any forest land.	
e.	NO IMPACT	The project would not result in a conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use, or forest to a non-forest use.	

III. AIR QUALITY

a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed project for the development of 24 residential units would constitute a negligible percentage of the City's forecasted growth through 2020. Therefore the project will not generate population, housing, or employment growth exceeding the forecasts used in the development of the latest 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the South Coast Air Basin, and air quality impacts would be less than	
----	------------------------------	---	--

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

b.	<p>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED</p>	<p>significant.</p> <p>The project will produce fugitive dust and mobile sources emissions as a result of construction activities, which should be partially controlled on-site by existing regulations. The SCAQMD handbook states that if a proposed project is five acres or less and does not require additional construction activities such as major cut-and-fill, or excavation for sub-grade levels or parking, or demolition of a structure taller than 50 feet, the lead agency can use the applicable sample construction scenario to represent the emissions and impacts from the proposed project. However, since the project involves excavation for subterranean parking, localized air quality impacts during construction may exceed applicable Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs) and therefore may result in construction-related air quality impacts. The project is also expected to generate operational emissions from energy use and mobile source emissions from additional vehicle trips, but the project's operational emissions would not be considered potentially significant.</p>	<p>III-10 Additional controls for the wetting, tarping, and vegetative covering of exposed unpaved areas will reduce particulate matter exposure during the grading and exportation of soil from the site, and will ensure compliance with AQMD air quality standards.</p>
c.	<p>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</p>	<p>The project will produce fugitive dust and mobile sources emissions as a result of construction activities, as well as mobile source emissions from additional vehicle trips. These emissions will be controlled on-site by Mitigation Measure III-10, existing AQMD regulations (Rule 403), and CARB standards for vehicle emissions. The project would be consistent with the AQMP, which is intended to bring the Basin into attainment for all criteria pollutants. As such, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.</p>	
d.	<p>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</p>	<p>Nearby sensitive receptors include residences within the vicinity of the project site. Construction and operation of the project would result in a less than significant impact for both localized and regional air pollution emissions with the implementation of Mitigation Measure III-10.</p>	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures	
e.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	SCAQMD Rule 1113 limits the amount of VOCs from architectural coatings and solvents, so construction activities or materials are not expected to create significant objectionable odors. The residential land uses proposed for the project would not otherwise be expected to create or emit objectionable odors. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.	
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
a.	NO IMPACT	The site is located in a built-up residential area and does not support any known protected or special-status species.	
b.	NO IMPACT	The site is located in a built-up residential area and does not support any significant riparian or special status habitats.	
c.	NO IMPACT	The site does not contain any federally protected wetlands.	
d.	NO IMPACT	The site is located in a built-up residential area and does not support any known wildlife corridor or designated migration path.	
e.	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	The project will require the removal of several non-protected trees and two protected Live Coast Oaks, in conflict with the City's policy of tree preservation.	IV-70, IV-80 Tree replacement will be required on a 1:1 basis for non-protected trees and a 2:1 basis for protected trees to mitigate the loss of trees on-site.
f.	NO IMPACT	The project will not conflict with any conservation plans.	
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES			
a.	NO IMPACT	No historic resources are known to exist on-site or in the vicinity, per City of LA's Environmental and Public Facilities Maps (Historic-Cultural Monuments & Historic Preservation Overlay Zones). No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.	
b.	NO IMPACT	No archeological resources have been identified on-site or in the vicinity, per City of LA's Environmental and Public Facilities Maps (Prehistoric & Historic Archeological Sites & Survey Areas). No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.	
c.	NO IMPACT	No paleontological resources have been identified on-site or in the vicinity, per City of LA's Environmental and Public Facilities Maps (Vertebrate Paleontological Resources). No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.	

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

d.	NO IMPACT	No archeological resources have been identified on-site or in the vicinity of the site, per City of LA's Environmental and Public Facilities Maps (Prehistoric & Historic Archeological Sites & Survey Areas). The project is not within the immediate surroundings of a known burial site. If human remains are found during excavation, the project will need to follow procedure as detailed in the California Health and Safety Code Sections 7000 et seq. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.	
----	-----------	---	--

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

a.	NO IMPACT	The site is not located within the Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.	
----	-----------	--	--

b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The site is located in a seismically active area approximately 12.3 kilometers from the nearest fault, but the project is not expected to cause or accelerate any geological hazards. The project is also subject to the seismic standards of the Department of Building and Safety's Uniform Building Code, thereby reducing possible seismic hazard impacts to a less than significant level.	
----	------------------------------	---	--

c.	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	The site is located in a designated liquefaction hazard zone as shown on the City of LA's Environmental and Public Facilities Maps (Areas Susceptible to Liquefaction). Based on the January 23, 2015 Preliminary Soils Engineering Investigation by Subsurface Designs, Inc., the report found that soil underlying the subject property may be subject to liquefaction.	<p>VI 0</p> <p>The geological report, dated January 2015, found that project site was suitable for the proposed development granted that the project comply with all the listed recommendation of the report. The report found that liquefaction is not considered to be a significant life and safety hazard to the proposed development, however, the project structural engineer should consider the calculated settlement when designing the proposed structure. Therefore, the project as mitigated by the conditions of the soils report would result in a less than significant impact in terms of liquefaction hazard.</p>
----	--	---	---

d.	NO IMPACT	The project site is not located within an area of historically earthquake-induced landslides, and landslides on the site are not anticipated based on the area's flat terrain.	
----	-----------	--	--

e.	NO IMPACT	The site is not located in an area of known or suspected erosion hazard.	
----	-----------	--	--

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

f.	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	The site is located in a designated liquefaction hazard zone, with potentially unstable soils, as shown on the City of LA's Environmental and Public Facilities Maps (Areas Susceptible to Liquefaction). Based on the January 23, 2015 Preliminary Soils Engineering Investigation by Subsurface Designs, Inc., the report found that soil underlying the subject property may be subject to liquefaction.	VI 0 The geological report, dated January 2015, found that project site was suitable for the proposed development granted that the project comply with all the listed recommendation of the report. The report found that liquefaction is not considered to be a significant life and safety hazard to the proposed development, however, the project structural engineer should consider the calculated settlement when designing the proposed structure. Therefore, the project as mitigated by the conditions of the soils report would result in a less than significant impact in terms of unstable soils and liquefaction hazard.
g.	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	Based on the January 23, 2015 Preliminary Soils Engineering Investigation by Subsurface Designs, Inc., the subject site is underlain by soil in the low to very low expansive range, and noted that all foundations and slabs should be designed for expansive conditions.	VI 0 The geological report, dated January 2015, found that project site was suitable for the proposed development granted that the project comply with all the listed recommendation of the report. The report found that the site is underlain by soil in the very low to low expansive range, and that all foundations and slabs should be designed for expansive conditions. To mitigate the effects of expansive soils, good site drainage should be maintained at all times. Therefore, the project as mitigated by the conditions of the soils report would result in a less than significant impact in terms of expansive soils.
h.	NO IMPACT	The proposed project would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The project site is located in an urbanized area served by existing sewer infrastructure.	

VII. GREEN HOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The most common contributors to GHG emissions result from transportation and the consumption of fossil fuels. The project is expected to consume additional fossil fuel resources through electrical and natural gas usage, as well as generate additional mobile source emissions by introducing new vehicle trips. However, it is not possible to predict the impact on global climate change resulting from this specific and relatively small incremental increase in emissions due to the project's operation. Additionally, the proposed project	
----	------------------------------	--	--

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	includes features which will reduce the consumption of fossil fuels, such as compliance with the Los Angeles Green Building Program and the California Building Code, and as an in-fill development near transit. Therefore, the project is expected to have a less than significant impact on the effect of GHGs on the environment.	
b. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project is expected to consume additional fossil fuel resources through electrical and natural gas usage, as well as generate additional mobile source emissions by introducing new vehicle trips. However, the project is consistent with existing greenhouse gas reduction plans or policies which support AB 32 (California Global Warming Solutions Act), including the California Building Code, the Los Angeles Green Building Program, and as an in-fill housing project near transit. Since the project is consistent with these GHG reduction policies, it is expected to have a less than significant impact.	
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS		
a. NO IMPACT	The proposed residential use of the site is not expected to require the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	
b. POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	The project includes the demolition of one existing structure (built in 1948) which may contain lead paint or asbestos-containing materials that can be hazardous to the health of workers and neighbors during demolition activities.	VIII-10 Abatement of any lead and asbestos-containing materials during demolition will ensure lower exposure to workers and the public.
c. POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	The project site is located less a quarter-mile to the nearest school (Sequoia Junior High School), and may emit lead or asbestos-containing materials into the air during demolition activities.	VIII-10 Abatement of any lead and asbestos-containing materials during demolition will ensure lower exposure to workers and the public.
d. NO IMPACT	No hazardous sites are identified on the subject site or vicinity, per the Envirostor database (California Department of Toxic Substances Control).	
e. NO IMPACT	The site is not located within the vicinity of an airport.	
f. NO IMPACT	The site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures	
g.	NO IMPACT	The project will not interfere with any emergency response plans, and will be subject to applicable Building and Fire Code regulations to ensure adequate emergency response and access.	
h.	NO IMPACT	The site is not located within a fire hazard zone.	

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Construction of the project would require earthwork activities, including grading of the project site, and the construction and operation of the project may result in run-off from the site impacting water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. However, the project will be required to comply with existing City regulations regarding construction, grading and dust control measures, including Low Impact Development (LID), Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements to reduce the discharge of polluted runoff from the project site. Therefore, any impact should be less than significant.	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project will reduce the current permeable area of the project site, but is expected to provide pervious surfaces in the landscaped areas of the site and comply with LID and SUSMP regulations for groundwater infiltration and recharge. Therefore, construction activities and operation of the building would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.	
c.	NO IMPACT	No rivers or streams exist on the site. Minimal changes to the existing drainage patterns would occur on-site and no erosion impact is expected.	
d.	NO IMPACT	No rivers or streams exist on the site. Minimal changes to the existing drainage patterns would occur on-site and no additional runoff or impact due to flooding is expected.	
e.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project will not result in a measurable increase in stormwater run-off, and the project would include appropriate on-site drainage improvements and water quality control measures to accommodate anticipated runoff or storm water flows. Therefore, the project would not create or contribute substantial runoff or contamination of runoff.	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures	
f.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Construction of the project would require earthwork activities, including grading of the project site, and the construction and operation of the project may result in run-off from the site impacting water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. However, the project will be required to comply with existing City regulations regarding construction, grading and dust control measures, including Low Impact Development (LID), Best Management Practices (BMPs) and SUSMP requirements to reduce the discharge of polluted runoff from the project site. Therefore, any impact should be less than significant.	
g.	NO IMPACT	The project site is located outside of any designated flood hazard area.	
h.	NO IMPACT	The project site is located outside of any designated flood hazard area.	
i.	NO IMPACT	The project site is located outside of any designated flood hazard area, and is not located within an area identified as at-risk for inundation, per the City of LA Environmental and Public Facilities Map, 1996.	
j.	NO IMPACT	The site is not within a tsunami, seiche, or mudflow area, per the City of LA Environmental and Public Facilities Map, 1996 and LA Flood Hazard Map, 1998.	
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING			
a.	NO IMPACT	The project will not physically divide a community; it will provide a compatible land use neighboring a mix of residential uses.	
b.	NO IMPACT	The project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation and horse-keeping and river improvement standards for the site. The project does not conflict with any other City environmental plans or policies, in that any adverse impacts related to the project requests should be properly mitigated by conditions already identified in the MND.	
c.	NO IMPACT	The project site is located in an urbanized area of Los Angeles, and no conservation plans apply to the project site or area.	
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES			
a.	NO IMPACT	The site is not located in a known mineral resource area, per the City of LA Environmental and Public Facilities Maps, 1996. No mineral extraction operations occur on the project site or in the vicinity.	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures	
b.	NO IMPACT	The site is not located in a known mineral resource area, per the City of LA Environmental and Public Facilities Maps, 1996. No mineral extraction operations occur on the project site or in the vicinity.	
XII. NOISE			
a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project will be constructed using typical construction techniques. Construction noise for the project will cause a temporary increase in the ambient noise levels, but will be subject to the LAMC Sections 112.05 and 41.40 regarding construction hours and construction equipment noise thresholds.	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project would be constructed using typical construction techniques. Construction equipment would generate a limited amount of groundborne vibration during construction activities at short distances away from the source, but will be subject to LAMC Sections 112.05 and 41.40 regarding construction hours and construction equipment noise thresholds.	
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project will not result in a significant permanent increase in noise levels.	
d.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Construction noise for the project will cause a temporary increase in the ambient noise levels, but will be subject to LAMC Sections 112.05 and 41.40 regarding construction hours and construction equipment noise thresholds. Additionally, the use of the site, vehicular driveways, and mechanical equipment on-site will also generate periodic noise, but is not expected to cause substantial increase in noise levels.	
e.	NO IMPACT	The site is not located within the vicinity of an airport.	
f.	NO IMPACT	The site is not located within the vicinity of an airstrip.	
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING			
a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project will accommodate residential population growth in-keeping with the Community Plan land use and density designations, and proposes a net increase of 23 residential units. The physical secondary or indirect impacts of population and housing growth such as increased traffic or noise have been adequately mitigated or addressed in other portions of this document, and therefore the increase of population will have a less than significant effect.	

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

b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project is displacing one residential unit, and will be providing greater housing capacity after the construction of the 24 residential units is complete.	
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project is displacing the residents of one residential dwelling, and will be providing greater housing capacity after the construction of the 24 residential units is complete.	

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The site is located approximately 1.4 miles travel distance from the nearest Fire Truck and Engine Company (#93), less than the maximum response distance preferred by the Los Angeles Fire Code (LAMC Sec. 57.09.07). The project is not located in any fire hazard zones.	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project is served by the West Valley Police Station, located approximately 1.5 miles from the subject site. The proposed development would result in a net increase of 23 residential units, which is less than a significance threshold of 75 residential units, as identified by the City of LA CEQA Thresholds Guide. Therefore the project would not have a significant impact on the City's police services.	
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed development would result in a net increase of 23 residential units, resulting in the addition of new students into the school system. However, this increase is less than the significance threshold of 75 residential units, as identified by the City of LA CEQA Thresholds Guide. In addition, per the Municipal Code, the development will be required to pay school fees to the Los Angeles Unified School District to offset some of the increased demand for school services. Therefore the project will have a less than significant impact on the City's school services.	
d.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed development would result in a net increase of 23 residential units, creating an additional need and usage of park facilities. However, this increase is less than the significance threshold of 50 residential units, as identified by the City of LA CEQA Thresholds Guide. In addition, the project will be providing private open space areas on-site. Therefore the project will have a less than significant impact on the City's park system.	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures	
e.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Potential project impacts on other City services, such as libraries or transportation improvements, are expected to be less than significant or have been addressed in other portions of this document.	
XV. RECREATION			
a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed development would result in a net increase of 23 residential units, creating an additional need and usage of park facilities. However, this increase is less than the significance threshold of 50 residential units, as identified by the City of LA CEQA Thresholds Guide. In addition, the project will be providing private open space areas on-site. Therefore the project will have a less than significant impact on the City's park system.	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed development will provide some private open space areas on-site. Construction-related impacts on the project site have been addressed or mitigated to a less-than significant levels through the implementation of measures identified in the remainder of the document.	
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC			
a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project would result in less than 500 daily trips and less than 43 p.m. peak hour vehicle trips on the street system, as the threshold standard identified by the LA Department of Transportation (DOT). Therefore the project will not cause a significant or substantial increase in traffic. The project would not otherwise impact other transportation modes.	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project would result in less than 500 daily trips and less than 43 p.m. peak hour vehicle trips on the street system, as the threshold standard identified by the LA Department of Transportation (DOT). Therefore the project will not cause a significant or substantial increase in traffic. In addition, the project would not conflict with any existing congestion management plan.	
c.	NO IMPACT	The project will not alter air traffic patterns.	

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

d.	NO IMPACT	The project will be required to improve the adjacent right-of-way, including the construction of new sidewalks and the continuation of an existing alleyway. Therefore, the project will not increase any transportation hazards and will instead improve vehicular and pedestrian access.	
e.	NO IMPACT	The project is subject to all applicable Building and Fire Code standards for safety, which ensure adequate emergency access.	
f.	NO IMPACT	The project will not interfere with public transit plans or policies.	

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

a.	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	The City's Department of Public Works provides wastewater services for the site, and generated wastewater is transferred to the Tillman Treatment Plant, which is currently operating at 67 mgd, below a capacity of 80 mgd. The proposed project is also not located in any Sewer Capacity Threshold Area, per LA CEQA Thresholds Guide, Exhibits M.2-1 - M.2-12. However, full occupancy of the project would produce approximately 4,000 gpd in wastewater flows, equal to the 4,000 gpd threshold identified by the City's CEQA Thresholds Guide.	XVII-10, XVII-20, XVII-40 Requirements for more efficient landscaping and water-usage will reduce both water demand and wastewater production for the project. Additionally, the project-related increase in wastewater generation would represent a small fraction of the permitted annual flow increase for the Tillman Plant, which can accommodate approximately 13 mgd beyond current treated flow conditions. Therefore, the project would not be expected to exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB, and potential impacts should be reduced to less than significant levels through water-conservation measures.
b.	NO IMPACT	The project would result in increased water demand and wastewater generation. However, the project will not require the construction of additional water or wastewater facilities, as discussed in XVla. Therefore, no impact would occur.	
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Drainage patterns and post-development runoff quantities under the proposed project would be similar to the existing site conditions. If the project is required any additional construction of connections to the existing drainage system, the construction would be mitigated by other general construction mitigations already required for the project. Therefore any potential construction for sewage connections would be reduced to a less than significant level.	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures	
d.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project has adequate potable water supply access and LADWP currently expects to have adequate water supplies for all anticipated development identified in its 2010 Urban Water Management Plan. The project is additionally subject to water conservation measures of the Building Code and Mitigation Measures XVII-10, -20, -40 for water-efficient landscaping and fixtures.	
e.	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	The City's Department of Public Works provides wastewater services for the site, and generated wastewater is transferred to the Tillman Treatment Plant, which is currently operating at 67 mgd, below a capacity of 80 mgd. The proposed project is also not located in any Sewer Capacity Threshold Area, per LA CEQA Thresholds Guide, Exhibits M.2-1 - M.2-12. However, full occupancy of the project would produce approximately 4,000 gpd in wastewater flows, equal to the 4,000 gpd threshold identified by the City's CEQA Thresholds Guide.	XVII-10, XVII-20, XVII-40 Requirements for more efficient landscaping and water-usage will reduce both water demand and wastewater production for the project. Additionally, the project-related increase in wastewater generation would represent a small fraction of the permitted annual flow increase for the Tillman Plant, which can accommodate approximately 13 mgd beyond current treated flow conditions. Therefore, the project would not be expected to exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB, and potential impacts should be reduced to less than significant levels through water-conservation measures.
f.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project will generate waste due to the demolition, construction and operation of structures. The 2009 County of Los Angeles ColWMP report on landfill capacity also states that without changes in the status quo, a shortage of permitted solid waste disposal capacity at in-County Class III landfills is projected by 2014. However, the report also anticipates that future disposal needs can be adequately met through 2024 through landfill expansion, new technologies, and waste reduction programs. Estimated daily use of the residential buildings will contribute approximately 1.0 tons of waste a week, less than the City's operational threshold of 5 tons per week identified in the City's CEQA Thresholds Guide. In addition, the project would be required to comply with all applicable regulations and recycling programs, including the LA Green Building Code and California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB939) to reduce the amount of solid waste disposed of at local landfills. Therefore, waste generated by the construction and operation of the site would have a less than significant impact on local landfills.	

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

g.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project will generate waste due to the demolition, construction and operation of structures. The project would be required to comply with all applicable regulations, including the LA Green Building Code and the California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB939) to reduce the amount of solid waste disposed of at local landfills. Therefore, waste generated by the construction and operation of the site should be in compliance with all applicable regulations and would result in a less than significant impact.	
----	------------------------------	--	--

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project site does not contain any threatened or endangered species, sensitive habitats, or known historic resources. The project will not otherwise significantly degrade the environment or affect any plant or wildlife areas.	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project will not result in any cumulative effects.	
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Any potential substantial adverse effects on human beings have been addressed in other portions of this report (air quality, grading, traffic, hazardous materials, infrastructure impacts) and have been adequately mitigated to a less than significant level.	

