MASTER APPEAL FORM

WITH ATTACHMENTS
This application is to be used for any appeals authorized by the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) for discretionary actions administered by the Department of City Planning.

1. APPELLANT BODY/CASE INFORMATION
   - Appellant Body:
     - [ ] Area Planning Commission
     - [ ] City Planning Commission
     - [x] City Council
     - [ ] Director of Planning
   - Regarding Case Number: ZA 2015-1936 (CUW)
   - Project Address: 7900-7910 South La Tijera Blvd. / 8124 S. Airport Blv.
   - Final Date to Appeal: April 1, 2016
   - Type of Appeal:
     - [ ] Appeal by Applicant
     - [x] Appeal by a person, other than the applicant, claiming to be aggrieved
     - [ ] Appeal from a determination made by the Department of Building and Safety

2. APPELLANT INFORMATION
   - Appellant's name (print): John Birkett / Cory Birkett
   - Company: ____________________________
   - Mailing Address: 7900 Flight Avenue
   - City: Los Angeles State: CA Zip: 90045
   - Telephone: (310) 254-8644 (310) 874-2909
   - E-mail: birkettca.rr.com birkettecory@gmail.com
   - Is the appeal being filed on your behalf or on behalf of another party, organization or company?
     - [ ] Self
     - [ ] Other: ____________________________
   - Is the appeal being filed to support the original applicant's position?
     - [ ] Yes
     - [x] No

3. REPRESENTATIVE/AGENT INFORMATION
   - Representative/Agent name (if applicable): ____________________________
   - Company: ____________________________
   - Mailing Address: ____________________________
   - City: ____________________________ State: ________ Zip: ________
   - Telephone: ____________________________ E-mail: ____________________________
4. JUSTIFICATION/REASON FOR APPEAL

Is the entire decision, or only parts of it being appealed?  
☑ Entire  ☐ Part

Are specific conditions of approval being appealed?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

If Yes, list the condition number(s) here:

Attach a separate sheet providing your reasons for the appeal. Your reason must state:

- The reason for the appeal
- How you are aggrieved by the decision
- Specifically the points at issue
- Why you believe the decision-maker erred or abused their discretion

5. APPLICANT'S AFFIDAVIT

I certify that the statements contained in this application are complete and true:

Appellant Signature:  

Date: 3/31/16

6. FILING REQUIREMENTS/ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- Eight (8) sets of the following documents are required for each appeal filed (1 original and 7 duplicates):
  - Appeal Application (form CP-7769)
  - Justification/Reason for Appeal
  - Copies of Original Determination Letter
- A Filing Fee must be paid at the time of filing the appeal per LAMC Section 19.01 B.
  - Original applicants must provide a copy of the original application receipt(s) (required to calculate their 85% appeal filing fee).
- Original Applicants must pay mailing fees to BTC and submit a copy of receipt.
- Appellants filing an appeal from a determination made by the Department of Building and Safety per LAMC 12.26 K are considered original applicants and must provide noticing per LAMC 12.26 K.7.
- A Certified Neighborhood Council (CNC) or a person identified as a member of a CNC or as representing the CNC may not file an appeal on behalf of the Neighborhood Council; persons affiliated with a CNC may only file as an individual on behalf of self.
- Appeals of Density Bonus cases can only be filed by adjacent owners or tenants (must have documentation).
- Appeals to the City Council from a determination on a Tentative Tract (TT or VTT) by the Area or City Planning Commission must be filed within 10 days of the date of the written determination of said Commission.
- A CEQA document can only be appealed if a non-elected decision-making body (ZA, APC, CPC, etc.) makes a determination for a project that is not further appealable. (CA Public Resources Code § 21151 (c)). CEQA Section 21151 (c) appeals must be filed within the next 5 meeting days of the City Council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Fee:</th>
<th>Reviewed &amp; Accepted by (DSC Planner):</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 89.00</td>
<td>Maidel Luevanco</td>
<td>4/1/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipt No:</th>
<th>Deemed Complete by (Project Planner):</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0201306848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☒ Determination authority notified  ☐ Original receipt and BTC receipt (if original applicant)
4/1/2016

Appeal to Case # ZA 2015-1936(CUW)
CONDITIONAL USE
7900-7910 South La Tijera Boulevard
8124 South Airport Boulevard
Westchester-Playa Del Ray Planning Area
Zone: C2-1VL, R2-1

Response to Terms and Conditions

#11 – Co-location requirement
We strongly oppose any suggestion that this site can support additional monopoles as it is clearly debatable that it can safely support a single monopole.

#14 – RF Certification
All residents, schools and businesses within 500 feet should receive the RF Certification showing actual RD emissions.

#17a – Aesthetics
We disagree that the proposed facility at 45 feet in height can possibly be disguised so as to blend into the surrounding neighborhood.

There are many statements throughout the finding that this facility is not diminishing the aesthetic of this lot. Based not only on our opinions of how this will look, but the feedback of other community members who attended the Neighborhood Council meeting addressing this, we could not disagree more. The most consistent theme of comments from the community was “we do not need more visual blight at this corner.”

#17c.1 – Increased Noise Levels (Demolition, Grading and Construction Activities)
We request a start time of 8am M-F and 10am Saturday, no activity on holidays.

Response to Findings

#1 – The project will enhance the built environment in the surrounding neighborhood or will perform a function or provide a service that is beneficial to the community, city or region.

That is a mighty ‘or’. It is absolutely without question that this structure will not enhance the built environment in the surrounding neighborhood. Based on statements from Verizon customers who are neighbors including the President of our Neighborhood Council, they do not experience dropped calls or service issues wherever they are in Westchester. The benefit to the community is definitely open to debate.
Paragraph #4 – Rejection of Height Variance

We completely agree with the determination that the proposed height of 54 feet will negatively affect the surrounding area in every way described by Mr. Chiang.

However, the approved height limit of 45 feet will still have many of the same affects for those located close to the tower. We are particularly concerned that the 45-foot tower will be located roughly 45 feet from the living space of the adjacent residential property. This certainly introduces a significant safety hazard to the adjacent residents in the event of a natural disaster, structural failure, or other unexpected event that could cause the structure to collapse.

Paragraph #6 – facility will be unmanned, will not have an impact on circulation systems, and will not generate noise, odor, smoke or any other adverse impacts.

The requirement for a diesel back-up power generator is in direct conflict with this finding. These generators are extremely noisy and do emit noticeable odor and in many cases visible exhaust.

Response to Additional Required Findings

#4 – The project is consistent with the general requirements of the Wireless Telecommunications Facilities standards set forth in Section 12.21-A.20 of this code.
#4a – The site is of a size and shape sufficient to provide the following setbacks:

1) For a monopole or tower, the tower setbacks requirement of Subparagraph (2) (Antenna Setback) or Paragraph (a) of Section 12.21-A.20 are met as to those portions of the property abutting the residential or public uses.

The proposal provided by Verizon shows the center of the monopole will be 27 feet 8 inches from the residential property line. We measured the area using a spot close to 25 feet from the sidewalk on Airport.

We found the location to be 20 feet 9 inches from the closest residential property.
We found the largest distance to the other property line, 24 feet 5 inches. It seemed impossible to keep the monopole location close to 25 feet from the Airport sidewalk and achieve 27 feet distance from the residential property lines.

To further illustrate how close this monopole will be to the adjacent residential property we have our display of how an 8-foot statue might look at the suggested location.

The location of that roof should be a bit alarming once you multiply the statue by 5.5. We must insist that the City visit this site in order to verify the measurements.

#4d – An effort in good faith was made by the applicant to locate on existing sites or facilities.

We are aware of Verizon’s effort to co-locate with the AT&T rooftop antennae at 8110 Airport which is located across the street from the proposed location. We would strongly encourage Verizon to re-engage with the owner of 8110 Airport, allowing us time to ask our city representatives to assist in mediating a solution. This is the ideal location for adding wireless capacity in this neighborhood.

Verizon did not perform any community outreach when considering locations in this neighborhood which deprived them of valuable feedback and possible assistance.

Verizon is also asking to install a monopole tower at 7600 S. Sepulveda which is 7/10 of a mile from the 7900 La Tijera location. Case # ZA 2015-2428(CUW), CEQA # ENV 2015-2429-MND.
We firmly believe this is a duplicative effort to alleviate the same coverage gap presented by Verizon. Only one of these facilities should move forward in the event they are both approved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>And Occupants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Within a 100-Foot Radius</td>
<td>☐ Within a 100-Foot Radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Within a 600-Foot Radius</td>
<td>☐ Within a 600-Foot Radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Abutting a Proposed Development Site</td>
<td>☐ Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice is sent to you because you own property within a 100-foot radius of the proposed development of City Planning. All interested parties are invited to attend the public hearing at which you may ask questions or present testimony regarding the project.

Filing: Office of Zoning Administration
Date: Thursday, January 7, 2016
Time: 1:00 p.m.
Place: West Los Angeles Municipal Building
Second Floor Hearing Room
1645 Corbin Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Staff Contact: Kristas Gardner
Phone No.: (213) 978-1340
Kristas.Gardner@lacity.org

PROJECT LOCATION: 7600 South Sepulveda Boulevard

REQUESTED ACTION: The Zoning Administrator will consider:

1. A Conditional Use, pursuant to the provisions of Section 12.24.N.49 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, to permit the installation, use, and maintenance of an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility consisting of a 85-foot tower with an antenna system and associated equipment, cabinets, and backup generator will be required and maintained within a 276-square-foot ground area and a 79-square-foot tower area, all on an approximately 30,834-square-foot lot in the [Q]C-1 Zone.

General Comments

We did not see any mention of the findings or positions of our elected representatives. Their positions:

The Westchester-Playa Del Rey Neighborhood Council Planning and Use Committee voted unanimously to deny this application. The full council voted unanimously against this application.

Both Mike Bonin and Maxine Waters opposed this installation.

The petition against this site that is quoted in Cory Birkett(e)'s comments from the public hearing received 247 signatures.
Verizon Wireless (A)  
c/o Eukon Group  
3905 State Street, Ste 7-188  
Santa Barbara, CA 93105  

CASE NO. ZA 2015-1936(CUW)  
CONDITIONAL USE  
7900-7910 South La Tijera Boulevard,  
8124 South Airport Boulevard  
Westchester–Playa Del Rey Planning Area  
Zone : C2-1VL, R2-1  
D. M. : 099B169  
C. D. : 11  
CEQA : ENV 2015-1937-MND  
Legal Description: FR Lot 5 Arb 3,  
Subdivision of Section 30 T2S R14W  
and Lots 12 Arb 1, 13 Arb 1, 40 Arb 1,  
Tract 11729

March 17, 2016

Pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.24-W,49, I hereby APPROVE:

a conditional use to permit the installation, use, and maintenance of an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility, having a maximum height of 45 feet,

upon the following additional terms and conditions:

1. All other use, height and area regulations of the Municipal Code and all other applicable government/regulatory agencies shall be strictly complied with in the development and use of the property, except as such regulations are herein specifically varied or required.

2. The use and development of the property shall be in substantial conformance with the plot plan submitted with the application and marked Exhibit "A", except as may be revised as a result of this action.

3. The authorized use shall be conducted at all times with due regard for the character of the surrounding district, and the right is reserved to the Zoning Administrator to impose additional corrective Conditions, if, in the Administrator's opinion, such Conditions are proven necessary for the protection of persons in the neighborhood or occupants of adjacent property.
4. All graffiti on the site shall be removed or painted over to match the color of the surface to which it is applied within 24 hours of its occurrence.

5. A copy of the first page of this grant and all Conditions and/or any subsequent appeal of this grant and its resultant Conditions and/or letters of clarification shall be printed on the building plans submitted to the Development Services Center and the Department of Building and Safety for purposes of having a building permit issued.

6. Authorized herein is the construction, installation, use, and maintenance of an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility ("WTF"), consisting of the following:
   a. A monopole, disguised as a faux pine tree (monopine) having a maximum height of 45 feet to the top-most branches.
   b. A total of 12 panel antennas, and 12 remote radio units (RRUs), divided between 3 sectors, mounted to the monopole.
   c. The maximum height of the facility shall not exceed 45 feet.
   d. Related supported equipment cabinets, and a diesel back-up generator within a ground level 18' 4" x 9' 4" square-foot lease area.

7. The entirety of the wireless facility lease area shall be screened from view by a minimum 8-foot in height solid block wall.

8. The faux pine tree shall include branches which extend beyond the antenna so that no antenna protrudes past the branches. The monopole shall be textured with simulated bark and the applicant shall be responsible for the maintenance of the faux pine tree so that it is retained in its original state with attention given to color and wear.

9. The pad on which the back-up generator is placed shall be constructed of impermeable concrete with a lip or curb sufficient height to contain any leaks in case of equipment failure.

10. All new utility lines that directly service the site shall be installed underground. If underground service is not currently available, then provisions shall be made for future underground service.

11. The subject grant shall not be exercised in a manner to conflict with the potential co-location of other carriers on the site.

12. The electronic equipment shall be installed and constructed with a valid City of Los Angeles building permit.

13. All applicable laws, regulations, and standards of all local, state, and federal government agencies shall be observed.
14. The facility shall not interfere with TV, radio, or cordless phone reception or exceed Radio Frequency (RF) limits established by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). Within 60 days after installation, a copy of the RF Certification Form, showing actual RD emissions shall be transmitted to the Office of Zoning Administration for placement in the case file.

15. Should the granted right cease more than 90 days, the antennas and equipment shall be removed to the satisfaction of the Department of Building and Safety.

16. Prior to the issuance of any permits relative to this matter, a covenant acknowledging and agreeing to comply with all the terms and conditions established herein shall be recorded in the County Recorder's Office. The agreement (standard master covenant and agreement form CP-6770) shall run with the land and shall be binding on any subsequent owners, heirs or assigns. The agreement with the conditions attached must be submitted to the Development Services Center for approval before being recorded. After recordation, a certified copy bearing the Recorder's number and date shall be provided to the Zoning Administrator for attachment to the subject case file.

17. The project shall comply with all the mitigation measures listed in the environmental document ENV 2015-1937-MND attached to the file and summarized below, unless otherwise noted:

a. Aesthetics (Unmanned Wireless Telecommunications Facility). The proposed facility shall be disguised so as to blend into the surrounding neighborhood to the satisfaction of the decision-maker. This may involve, but not be limited to one or more of the following: painting and texturing to match the existing surroundings, disguising the installation, concealment behind screen walls, incorporation into existing structures, and/or surrounding the installation with additional landscaping.

b. Aesthetics (Glare). The exterior of the proposed structure shall be constructed of materials such as, but not limited to, high-performance and/or non-reflective tinted glass (no mirror-like tints) and pre-cast concrete or fabricated wall surfaces to minimize glare and reflected heat.

c. Increased Noise Levels (Demolition, Grading, and Construction Activities).

1) Construction and demolition shall be restricted to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturday.

2) Demolition and construction activities shall be scheduled so as to avoid operating several pieces of equipment simultaneously which causes high noise levels.

3) The project contractor shall use power construction equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices.
18. Prior to the issuance of any permits relative to this matter, a covenant acknowledging and agreeing to comply with all the terms and conditions established herein shall be recorded in the County Recorder’s Office. The agreement (standard master covenant and agreement form CP-6770) shall run with the land and shall be binding on any subsequent owners, heirs or assigns. The agreement with the conditions attached must be submitted to the Development Services Center for approval before being recorded. After recordation, a certified copy bearing the Recorder’s number and date shall be provided to the Zoning Administrator for attachment to the subject case file.

19. INDEMNIFICATION AND REIMBURSEMENT OF LITIGATION COSTS.

Applicant shall do all of the following:

a. Defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City from any and all actions against the City relating to or arising out of, in whole or in part, the City’s processing and approval of this entitlement, including but not limited to, an action to attack, challenge, set aside, void or otherwise modify or annul the approval of the entitlement, the environmental review of the entitlement, or the approval of subsequent permit decisions or to claim personal property damage, including from inverse condemnation or any other constitutional claim.

b. Reimburse the City for any and all costs incurred in defense of an action related to or arising out of, in whole or in part, the City’s processing and approval of the entitlement, including but not limited to payment of all court costs and attorney’s fees, costs of any judgments or awards against the City (including an award of attorney’s fees), damages and/or settlement costs.

c. Submit an initial deposit for the City’s litigation costs to the City within 10 days’ notice of the City tendering defense to the Applicant and requesting a deposit. The initial deposit shall be in an amount set by the City Attorney’s Office, in its sole discretion, based on the nature and scope of action, but in no event shall the initial deposit be less than $25,000. The City’s failure to notice or collect the deposit does not relieve the Applicant from responsibility to reimburse the City pursuant to the requirement in paragraph (b).

d. Submit supplemental deposits upon notice by the City. Supplemental deposits may be required in an increased amount from the initial deposit if found necessary by the City to protect the City’s interests. The City’s failure to notice or collect the deposit does not relieve the Applicant from responsibility to reimburse the City pursuant to the requirement (b).

e. If the City determines it necessary to protect the City’s interests, execute an indemnity and reimbursement agreement with the City under terms consistent with the requirements of this condition.
The City shall notify the applicant within a reasonable period of time of its receipt of any action and the City shall cooperate in the defense. If the City fails to notify the applicant of any claim, action or proceeding in a reasonable time, or if the City fails to reasonably cooperate in the defense, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify or hold harmless the City.

The City shall have the sole right to choose its counsel, including the City Attorney’s office or outside counsel. At its sole discretion, the City may participate at its own expense in the defense of any action, but such participation shall not relieve the applicant of any obligation imposed by this condition. In the event the Applicant fails to comply with this condition, in whole or in part, the City may withdraw its defense of the action, void its approval of the entitlement, or take any other action. The City retains the right to make all decisions with respect to its representations in any legal proceeding, including its inherent right to abandon or settle litigation.

For purposes of this condition, the following definitions apply:

“City” shall be defined to include the City, its agents, officers, boards, commission, committees, employees and volunteers.

“Action” shall be defined to include suits, proceedings (including those held under alternative dispute resolution procedures), claims or lawsuits. Actions includes actions, as defined herein, alleging failure to comply with any federal, state or local law.

Nothing in the definitions included in this paragraph are intended to limit the rights of the City or the obligations of the Applicant otherwise created by this condition.

OBSERVANCE OF CONDITIONS - TIME LIMIT - LAPSE OF PRIVILEGES

All terms and conditions of the approval shall be fulfilled before the use may be established. The instant authorization is further conditional upon the privileges being utilized within three years after the effective date of approval and, if such privileges are not utilized or substantial physical construction work is not begun within said time and carried on diligently to completion, the authorization shall terminate and become void.

TRANSFERABILITY

This authorization runs with the land. In the event the property is to be sold, leased, rented or occupied by any person or corporation other than yourself, it is incumbent upon you to advise them regarding the conditions of this grant.

VIOLATIONS OF THESE CONDITIONS, A MISDEMEANOR

Section 12.29 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code provides:

“A variance, conditional use, adjustment, public benefit or other quasi-judicial approval, or any conditional approval granted by the Director, pursuant to the
authority of this chapter shall become effective upon utilization of any portion of the privilege, and the owner and applicant shall immediately comply with its Conditions. The violation of any valid Condition imposed by the Director, Zoning Administrator, Area Planning Commission, City Planning Commission or City Council in connection with the granting of any action taken pursuant to the authority of this chapter, shall constitute a violation of this chapter and shall be subject to the same penalties as any other violation of this Code.”

Every violation of this determination is punishable as a misdemeanor and shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $2,500 or by imprisonment in the county jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

**APPEAL PERIOD - EFFECTIVE DATE**

The applicant's attention is called to the fact that this grant is not a permit or license and that any permits and licenses required by law must be obtained from the proper public agency. Furthermore, if any Condition of this grant is violated or if the same be not complied with, then the applicant or his successor in interest may be prosecuted for violating these Conditions the same as for any violation of the requirements contained in the Municipal Code. The Zoning Administrator's determination in this matter will become effective after APRIL 1, 2016, unless an appeal therefrom is filed with the City Planning Department. It is strongly advised that appeals be filed early during the appeal period and in person so that imperfections/incompleteness may be corrected before the appeal period expires. Any appeal must be filed on the prescribed forms, accompanied by the required fee, a copy of the Zoning Administrator's action, and received and receipted at a public office of the Department of City Planning on or before the above date or the appeal will not be accepted. Forms are available on-line at [http://planning.lacity.org](http://planning.lacity.org). Public offices are located at:

- Figueroa Plaza
  - 201 North Figueroa Street,
  - 4th Floor
  - Los Angeles, CA 90012
  - (213) 482-7077

- Marvin Braude San Fernando Valley Constituent Service Center
  - 6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Room 251
  - Van Nuys, CA 91401
  - (818) 374-5050

If you seek judicial review of any decision of the City pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5, the petition for writ of mandate pursuant to that section must be filed no later than the 90th day following the date on which the City's decision became final pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6. There may be other time limits which also affect your ability to seek judicial review.

**NOTICE**

The applicant is further advised that subsequent contact regarding this determination must be with the Development Services Center. This would include clarification, verification of condition compliance and plans or building permit applications, etc., and shall be accomplished **BY APPOINTMENT ONLY**, in order to assure that you receive service with a
minimum amount of waiting. You should advise any consultant representing you of this requirement as well.

FINDINGS OF FACT

After thorough consideration of the statements contained in the application, the plans submitted therewith, and the statements made at the public hearing on January 7, 2016, all of which are by reference made a part hereof, as well as knowledge of the property and surrounding district, I find that the requirements for authorizing a conditional use permit under the provisions of Section 12.24-W have been established by the following facts:

BACKGROUND

The project site is located in the Westchester-Playa Del Rey Community Plan with a land use designation of General Commercial and Low Medium II Residential. The project site comprises 32,988 square feet with two zones; 24,456 square feet of the lot is zoned C2-1VL and is developed with two detached commercial buildings and surface parking lot. The remainder of the site is zoned R2-1 and is developed with surface parking lot and landscaping used in conjunction with the commercial development.

The project site is not located within the Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone, but is located 3.4 km to the Newport – Inglewood Fault Zone (Onshore). The site is not located within a hillside area, but is located within the BOE Special Grading area. The site is located within the Airport Hazard area with a 150-foot height limit above elevation 126 and is located within the Los Angeles Coastal Transportation Corridor. The site is not located within a Methane zone, fire district, landslide, liquefaction, or tsunami inundation zone.

The properties to the north are zoned C2-1VL and are developed with a school and one- to two-story commercial office uses. The properties to the west and east are zoned R1-1 and are developed with single family dwellings. The properties to the south are zoned R2-1 and are developed with single family dwellings.

La Tijera Boulevard, adjoining the subject site to the northwest, is a designated Boulevard II, dedicated to a width of 100 feet and improved with asphalt roadway, concrete curb, gutter, and sidewalk.

Airport Boulevard, adjoining the subject site to the east, is a designated Boulevard II, dedicated to a width of 80 feet and improved with asphalt roadway, concrete curb, gutter, and sidewalk.

Previous zoning related actions on the site include:

Subject Property:

Case No. ZA 93-0693(CUZ): On October 7, 1993, the Zoning Administrator denied a Variance to permit a drive-through fast food establishment on the subject property.
The proposed project is the installation, operation, and maintenance of a new unmanned wireless telecommunications facility on a project site which is zoned C2-1VL and R2-1. The wireless facility consists of 12 panel antennas, and 12 remote radio units (RRUs) divided between 3 sectors, mounted to the monopole. In conjunction with the proposed telecommunication facility, the applicant is seeking a conditional use permit to install the facility and to establish the maximum height at 54 feet.

PUBLIC HEARING

A Notice of Public Hearing was sent to nearby property owners and/or occupants residing near the subject site for which an application, as described below, had been filed with the Department of City Planning. All interested persons were invited to attend the public hearing at which they could listen, ask questions, or present testimony regarding the project.

The hearing was held by Theodore Irving from the Office of Zoning Administration who acted under the authority of the Zoning Administrator in taking testimony for ZA 2015-1939(CUW) and CEQA No. ENV 2015-1937-MND. The hearing was held on Thursday, January 7, 2016 at approximately 10:00 a.m. at West Los Angeles Municipal Building, Second Floor Hearing Room, 1645 Cornwall Avenue, Los Angeles CA 90025.

Jerry Ambrose – Representative Verizon Wireless

- The request is a conditional use to install a wireless telecommunications facility,
- The new tower will be 54 feet high,
- The tower will be disguised as a pine tree,
- The pine tree design was selected because of future co-location possibilities,
- The facility will be sited at the south end of the property,
- A small wall will be constructed for the equipment areas,
- We are attempting to address the hole or gap in our coverage area,
- This location is the only viable one based on the willingness of landlords, the technical requirements, and the required zoning,
- I'm submitting a map which shows the gaps in coverage, and the area we're instructed to look into,
- We are requesting a slight height variation from the maximum 45 feet to a maximum 54 feet,

Cory Birkette- Flight Avenue Resident

- I live 500 feet from the project,
- I have an on-line petition opposing the project,
- The project violates the city's zoning requirement,
- I question the poor reception claims,
- There is a LAUSD school nearby,
- I'm opposed to the project because of its aesthetic effects,
- The Second District Court allowed "prudent avoidance" to be used to deny a request,
Ms Birkette submitted a petition opposing the project, with the main points being:

1. Destroys the views, use and enjoyment – The Los Angeles County's General Plan States that one of its primary goals and objectives is to “maintain and enhance the quality of existing residential neighborhoods.” The lots proposed for the cell tower are in very close proximity to residential homes, schools, business and church and will directly impact the residents' view, use and enjoyment of their properties.

2. Lowers Property Values: We have concerns about the aesthetic effect of this project on our neighborhood and on our property values. The unsightliness of these installation will have a negative impact on property values. Whether or not radiation emissions from these antennas are harmful is irrelevant. The perceived threat alone would lower property values. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) guidelines categorize cell towers with hazards and nuisances, and HUD requires its certified appraisers to take the presence of nearby cell towers into consideration when determining the value of single family residential properties. Studies have shown that proximity to a cell tower can lower property values from 5 to 20%.

3. Public Health and Safety Menace – Verizon’s request for a variance violates the standard zoning requirements for cellular wireless cell phone antennas within residential zone. Per Los Angeles Municipal Code, the tower should be no higher than 45 feet in height. This tower will place hundreds school children and residents in very close proximity to potential health risks arising from any failure of the tower (fires, weather, earthquakes, insufficient monitoring). For this reason alone, Verizon application should be denied.

The proposed 54-foot cell phone tower would be built in close proximity to residential properties and four neighboring schools; Carousel Preschool, Carousel School, Westport Heights Elementary School and Westchester Secondary Charter School. The cell tower constitutes a public health and safety menace. A recent Wall Street journal article found that as many as one out of ten cell towers area out of compliance with basic FCC safety rules (“Cell Phone Boom Spurs Antennas-Safety Worries), WSJ 10/22/2014). A faulty cell tower would put many countless neighbors, school children and business in a densely populated area at risk.

4. Sets a Bad Precedent: The proposed 54-foot cellphone tower, if constructed, sets a precedent for wireless carriers to build additional cell-phone towers on this property. The approval of this application will make it easier for other wireless carriers to install their cell phone towers in our communities and near our schools. Westchester deserves the opportunity to set community standards regarding the new construction of cell phone towers, just like other cities within Los Angeles County have done (for example, the City of Glendale in 2010).
5. **Respect for Zoning Ordinances:** The proposed 54-foot cell-phone tower requires a variance (in lieu of the usual 45 foot height minimum in Height District No. 1VL. Verizon's request for a variance violates the standard zoning requirements for cellular wireless cellphone antennas within a residential zone. Per the Los Angeles Municipal Code, the tower should be no higher than 45 feet in height.

6. **Health Risk Associated with Exposure to Wireless Emissions:** While you are not able to take the adverse health effects of RF radiation into account when considering Verizon's application, we respectfully submit that per the Second District Federal Court of Appeals, municipalities may use "prudent avoidance" to ask Verizon to choose another site if other options exist and their site of first choice is a densely populated municipal site (such as our neighborhood). We ask that you do so, given that children's and residents' health is at stake.

**Patrick Murphy – Kittyhawk Street Resident**

- I'm concerned with the placement of the facility near my back yard,
- I'm concerned with the health effects of the facility because I've been diagnosed with prostate cancer,
- I have a renter next door with a heart condition,
- I'm concerned with the dead zone or the radio waves bouncing around,

**Kevin Murphy – 78th Street Resident**

- I also have a slow growing prostate
- I'm 4,000 feet from the tower
- No peer review of the data or studies,
- There are all sorts of risk associated without cell service in the area,
- There are places where there is no signal
- It's a health risk issue because you can't call for emergency service because there is no signal,
- There is peer review about the health risk of phones close to the ear, It requires more power to reach further away,
- I'm tired of no service in the area,
- There is a real need for cell service in the area,
- The facility will be near a home or school because the area is full of homes and schools,
- They should consider a different location other than Mr. Murphy's home,

**Mike Pahlevanlou – Airport Boulevard Resident**

- I have a tenant with a 5-year old son with health conditions
- The school and church are next to the property
- I have an 80-year old mother-in-law with health conditions,
- There is already a tower at St. Jerome Church,
• I own Stuart's Liquor store and was approached about a cell tower and I said no,
• They're not looking to fill a gap in coverage but to setup wherever they can,

John Birkette

• I agree with the petition going around,
• I am concerned that the facility is between two schools,
• Setting up on or near LAUSD properties would set a precedent,
• Negative impact because of close proximity
• I'm concerned with the power coming from the facility,
• A map would be wonderful to see; we have not seen it,
• Can the existing facilities in the area be built upon,
• Also, I'm opposed to the height variance

BASIS FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS

A particular type of development is subject to the conditional use process because it has been determined that such use of property should not be permitted by right in a particular zone. All uses requiring a conditional use permit from the Zoning Administrator are located within Section 12.24-W of the Los Angeles Municipal Code. In order for a wireless telecommunications facility to be authorized, certain designated findings have to be made. In these cases, there are additional findings in lieu of the standard findings for most other conditional use categories.

FINDINGS

Following (highlighted) is a delineation of the findings and the application of the relevant facts to same:

1. The project will enhance the built environment in the surrounding neighborhood or will perform a function or provide a service that is essential or beneficial to the community, city or region.

The proposed project is the installation, operation, and maintenance of a new unmanned wireless telecommunications facility on a project site which is zoned C2-1VL and R2-1. While the site has two zones, the proposed facility will be constructed within the C2-1VL Zone portion. It will be located in an existing landscaped area of the surface parking lot which services the commercial uses on the site. The facility will be set back 24 feet 11 inches from the eastern property line along Airport Boulevard. The monopole will be located within an 18-foot diameter lease space and equipment will be located within a 105 square-foot lease space.

The intent of the proposed facility is to enhance wireless telecommunications services within this part of the city. According to signal propagation maps submitted by the applicant, the service area currently experiences a service coverage gap. The proposed project would serve to fill this coverage gap by bringing acceptable coverage to the area. The wireless telecommunications system have proven to be
invaluable tools in communications, whether in business or personal use and particularly in the event of emergencies and natural disasters. The proposed project would expand these functions and services to the surrounding neighborhood, meet additional demands stemming from data usage, and enable improved signal strength for outdoor, in-vehicle, and in-building penetration. As such, the project will perform a function and provide a service that is essential or beneficial to the community, city or region.

2. **The project's location, size, height, operations and other significant features will be compatible with and will not adversely affect or further degrade adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the public health, welfare and safety.**

The proposed unmanned wireless telecommunications facility will be located within an existing landscaped area of a surface parking lot which services commercial uses. It will not require the removal or cause the loss of required parking spaces. The monopole will be located within an 18-foot diameter lease space and the equipment will be located within a 104 square-foot lease space. The facility is conditioned to a maximum height of 45 feet and will consist of a free-standing tower disguised as a pine tree. The pine tree will conceal three antenna sectors, each containing four panel antenna and two surge protection units. Associated support equipment, GPS antennas, and a back-up generator will be located at ground level. Ground level equipment will be located behind a proposed 8-foot CMU wall and access gate. There is an existing 3-foot tall wrought iron fence located on the eastern property line around the landscaped area.

The properties to the north are zoned C2-1VL and are developed with a school and one- to two-story commercial office uses. The properties to the west and east are zoned R1-1 and are developed with single-family dwellings. The properties to the south are zoned R2-1 and are developed with single-family dwellings.

As previously discussed, the project proposes to disguise the facility as a pine tree and ground level equipment will be located behind a proposed 8-foot wall. The facility will be located within an existing landscaped area and will be set back 24 feet 11 inches from the eastern property line.

As testified in the public hearing, the proposed height of 54 feet will negatively affect the neighboring properties and the surrounding community. The abutting properties are low density residential uses with one-story single-family dwellings. The proposed 54-foot height monopine will tower over the adjoining single story dwellings, destroy views and cause unsightliness. The proposed 54-foot tall structure would also adversely impact the existing streetscape along Airport Boulevard. The applicant's representative testified that the additional height was not necessary, but a desire so that future co-location opportunities could be considered.

Conditions have been imposed as part of this grant to ensure that the facility is developed and maintained in a manner compatible to the area and removed when the use is discontinued.
As conditioned, the operation of the proposed project will not adversely affect adjacent properties as the proposed wireless telecommunications facility will be unmanned, will not have an impact on circulation systems, and will not generate noise, odor, smoke, or any other adverse impacts. Conditions of approval herein require the subject facility to be constructed and operated in full compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, and standards of all local, state, and federal government agencies. For those reasons, the facility as conditioned will be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Furthermore, the telecommunications facility will be required to operate in full compliance with all local, state, and Federal regulations including the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The equipment is required to operate within the standards established by federal regulations for safe continuous exposure to radio frequency emissions.

Section 704 of Title 7 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, effective on February 8, 1996, contains the following language:

“IV. No State or local government or instrumentality thereof may regulate the placement, construction, and modification of personal wireless service facilities on the basis of the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions to the extent that such facilities comply with the Commission’s regulations concerning such emissions.”

Therefore, in conjunction with the above, the project’s location, size, height, operations, and other significant features will be compatible with and will not adversely affect or further degrade adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the public health, welfare and safety.

3. The project substantially conforms with the purpose, intent and provisions of the General Plan, the applicable community plan, and any specific plan.

The purpose, intent, and provisions of the General Plan, the Community Plan, and related Specific Plan all seek to ensure compatibility with surrounding uses, both in development and use, and to encourage economic development through the establishment of new businesses, and the expansion of successful business.

There are eleven elements of the General Plan, each of the elements establish policies that provide for the regulatory environment in managing the City and for addressing environmental concerns and problems. The majority of the policies derived from these Elements are in the form of Code requirements of the Los Angeles Municipal Code. Except for the conditional use described herein, the project does not propose to deviate from any of the requirements of the Los Angeles Municipal Code.
The General Plan framework contains the following statements:

Chapter 9 – Infrastructure and Public Services

Telecommunications is an emerging field with the potential to significantly alter Southern Californians communicate, work, and commute. The concentration of business and population in the City of Los Angeles and rapid technological advances offer the opportunity to provide an integrated network serving as the regional hub for public and private users. Following the 1994 Northridge earthquake, the use of telecommunications expanded significantly as traditional travel corridors were closed, demonstrating the potential for such use.

Goal 90 – A network, integrated telecommunications system that capitalizes on the region’s potential as an information – telecommunications hub and is capable of providing advanced information services, which are produced by public and private providers located within the City, to all members of the public.

Objective 9.35 – Create an integrated information telecommunications infrastructure system, using existing and privately and publicly-owned networks and systems as a base for growth.

Policy 9.35.1 – Support the special needs of urban emergency and public safety services and benefit the largest number of people.

Policy 9.35.5 - Ensure that the City implements state-of-the-art telecommunications technology, consistent with current and future requirements and economic conditions.

Objective 9.36 - Stimulate economic growth and development through the expanded and improved delivery of advanced telecommunications services.

Objective 9.37 - Encourage the development of a wide variety of public and private telecommunications services available to all City residents and businesses.

The Safety Element of the General Plan contains the following statements:

HAZARD MITIGATION

GOAL 1 - A city where potential injury, loss of life, property damage and disruption of the social and economic life of the City due to fire, water related hazard, seismic event, geologic conditions or release of hazardous materials disasters is minimized.
Objective 1.1 - Implement comprehensive hazard mitigation plans and programs that are integrated with each other and with the City’s comprehensive emergency response and recovery plans and programs.

Policy 1.1.3 - Facility/systems maintenance. Provide redundancy (back-up) systems and strategies for continuation of adequate critical infrastructure systems and services so as to assure adequate circulation, communications, power, transportation, water and other services for emergency response in the event of disaster related systems disruptions.

EMERGENCY RESPONSE (Multi-Hazard)

GOAL 2 - A city that responds with the maximum feasible speed and efficiency to disaster events so as to minimize injury, loss of life, property damage and disruption of the social and economic life of the City and its immediate environs.

DISASTER RECOVERY (Multi-Hazard)

GOAL 3 - A city where private and public systems, services, activities, physical condition and environment are reestablished as quickly as feasible to a level equal to or better than that which existed prior to the disaster.

The Land Use Element of the City’s General Plan divides the City into 35 Community Plans. The Westchester-Playa Del Rey Community Plan designates the project site as General Commercial and Low Medium II Residential. The General Commercial land use designation has the following corresponding zones: C1.5, C2, C4, CR, RAS3, and RAS4. The Low Medium II Residential land use designation has the following corresponding zones: RD1.5, RD2, RW2, and RZ2.5. The project site is zoned C2-1VL and R2-1, both zones are consistent with its land use designation. The Westchester-Playa Del Rey Community Plan does not specifically address wireless telecommunications facilities. Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.24 permits a wireless telecommunications facility use to be developed and maintained at this site, pursuant to a Conditional Use authorization.

The proposed facility will improve the region’s telecommunications service without creating significant adverse impacts to surrounding properties. The facility advances the goals and policies within the General Plan Framework and the Safety Element. Therefore, as conditioned, the project substantially conforms to the purpose, intent and provisions of the General Plan, the applicable community plan and any specific plan.

ADDITIONAL REQUIRED FINDINGS

4. The project is consistent with the general requirements of the Wireless Telecommunications Facilities standards set forth in Section 12.21-A,20 of this Code.
a. The site is of a size and shape sufficient to provide the following setbacks:

1) For a monopole or tower, the tower setback requirements of Subparagraph (2) (Antenna Setback) or Paragraph (a) of Section 12.21-A,20 are met as to those portions of the property abutting the residential or public uses.

The project proposes to install a monopole with a maximum height of 45 feet. The facility is proposed to be set back 24 feet 11 inches from the eastern property line. The facility will be located 27 feet 8 from the residential properties to the south and will be located 24 feet 11 inches from public right-of-way along Airport Boulevard. The facility will be disguised as a pine tree and will be located within an existing landscaped area of the surface parking lot.

2) For all other towers or monopoles, the site shall be of sufficient size to provide the setback required in the underlying zone between the base of the tower, accessory structures and uses, and guy anchors, if any, to all abutting property lines.

The project site is zoned C2-1VL and R2-1, the proposed facility is located within the C2-1VL portion of the site.

b. The required setbacks shall be improved to meet the screening and landscaping standards of Subparagraph (5) (Screening) and Subparagraph (6) (Landscaping) of Paragraph (a) of Section 12.21-A,20 to the extent possible within the area provided.

As proposed, the monopole will be disguised as a faux-pine tree, which will conceal the antennas mounted on the pole. The ground-level lease area, containing the monopole and associated support equipment, will be concealed behind an 8-foot high concrete masonry block wall. The monopole and the equipment will be located within a lease area within an existing landscaped area of the surface parking lot. The equipment cabinets will be set back 11 feet 8 inches from the eastern property line along Airport Boulevard, while the tower will be set back 24 feet 11 inches. Currently, there is a 3-foot tall wrought iron fence located along the property line around the landscaped area that will be removed.

The intent of the code requirements is to minimize the visual impacts of the installation from public areas through the use of setbacks, screening, and landscaped areas. In this instance, the proposed facility is designed and conditioned in such a way as to blend in with the existing environment, screened from view, and set back from the surrounding property lines so as not to be intrusive. As proposed, no additional buffer or landscaping is necessary to diminish the appearance of this facility from surrounding off-site
locations. The visual impacts are envisioned to be limited as a result of the imposed condition.

c. **The visual impact standard of Subparagraph (4) of Paragraph (a) of Section 12.21-A,20 is met.**

The intent of the requirements is to minimize the visual impacts of the installation from public areas through the design of the facility. Due to the facility's location on the property and the existing landscaping located along Airport Boulevard, only the monopole portion of the facility will be visible from the surrounding areas. The monopole will be disguised as a faux-pine tree. The design will obscure views of the proposed antenna arrays and dish antennas that will be mounted on the pole. The design will also blend in with the existing landscaping. Therefore, as conditioned, the project will result in the least possible visual impact on the environment. No negative impacts are envisioned as a result of this proposed project.

d. **An effort in good faith was made by the applicant to locate on existing sites or facilities in accordance with the guidelines of Subparagraph (3) (Locating Antenna at Existing Sites) of Paragraph (a) of Section 12.21-A,20.**

The City's Wireless Telecommunications Facility Ordinance strongly encourages the location of new facilities on existing approved structures or sites, when feasible. The applicant has submitted a statement indicating a good faith effort to locate the facility on alternative sites, including sites having a potential for co-location. The applicant indicates that no viable co-location opportunities existed in the area because other candidate sites were either too close to other existing Verizon wireless telecommunication facilities or the property owners could not come to terms with the carrier.

**ADDITIONAL MANDATORY FINDINGS**

5. **The National Flood Insurance Program rate maps, which are a part of the Flood Hazard Management Specific Plan adopted by the City Council by Ordinance No. 172,081, have been reviewed and it has been determined that this project is located in Zone C, areas of minimal flooding.**

6. **On October 22, 2015, a Mitigated Negative Declaration (ENV 2015-1937-MND) was prepared for the proposed project. On the basis of the whole of the record before the lead agency including any comments received, the lead agency finds that with imposition of the mitigation measures described in the MND (and identified in this determination), there is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have a significant effect on the environment. I hereby adopt that action. This Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis. The records upon which this decision is based are with the Environmental Review Section of the Planning Department in Room 750, 200 North Spring Street.**
Inquiries regarding this matter shall be directed to Arely Monarez, Planning staff for the Office of Zoning Administration at (213) 978-1321.

JACK CHIANG
Associate Zoning Administrator

cc: Councilmember Mike Bonin
    Eleventh District
    Adjoining Property Owners
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EUKON/AMBIT PROJECTIONS

4/2/99

EXHIBIT "A"
PROPOSED SOUTHEAST ELEVATION
MASTER LAND USE APPLICATION
**APPLICATION TYPE:** Conditional Use Permit

1. **PROJECT LOCATION AND SIZE**
   - **Street Address of Project:** 7910 S. La Tijera Blvd.
   - **Legal Description:** Lot 2, Block 114, Tract 11724
   - **Lot Dimensions:** varies
   - **Lot Area (sq. ft.):** 4/1 acre
   - **Total Project Size (sq. ft.):** 350

2. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**
   - **Present Use:** Vacant/Dry cleaner/Med. Offices
   - **Proposed Use:** New wireless telecommunications facility
   - **New wireless telecommunications facility consisting of a 54' high "monopine" antenna structure with 12 panel antennas (with ancillary antenna equipment), and ground mounted equipment cabinets & generator within walled enclosure + landscaping.

3. **ACTION(S) REQUESTED**
   - **Conditional Use Permit required for new wireless telecom facility.**
   - **Request to exceed 45' height limit up to a height of 54'.**

List related or pending case numbers relating to this site:
4. **OWNER/APPLICANT INFORMATION**

**Applicant's name:** Verizon Wireless c/o Eukon Group  
**Company:** same  
**Address:** 3905 State St., Ste 7-188  
**Telephone:** (805) 637 7407  
**Fax:** (805) 898 0069  
**Santa Barbara CA**  
**Zip:** 93105  
**E-mail:** jambrose@wireless01.com

**Property owner's name (if different from applicant):** Rellek La Tijera LLC / Tom Maloney  
**Address:** 139 N. Saltair Ave.  
**Telephone:** (925) 944-2140  
**Fax:** N/A  
**Los Angeles, CA**  
**Zip:** 90049  
**E-mail:** tom.maloney@am.jll.com

**Contact person for project information:** Jerry Ambrose  
**Company:** Eukon Group  
**Address:** 3905 State St., Ste 7-188  
**Telephone:** (805) 637 7407  
**Fax:** (805) 898 0069  
**Santa Barbara CA**  
**Zip:** 93105  
**E-mail:** jambrose@wireless01.com

5. **APPLICANT'S AFFIDAVIT**

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

a. The undersigned is the owner or lessee if entire site is leased, or authorized agent of the owner with power of attorney or officers of a corporation (submit proof). (NOTE: for zone changes lessee may not sign).

b. The information presented is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

c. In exchange for the City's processing of this Application, the undersigned Applicant agrees to defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City, its agents, officers or employees, against any legal claim, action, or proceeding against the City or its agents, officers, or employees, to attack, set aside, void or annul any approval given as a result of this Application.

**Signature:** [Signature]  
**Print:** Jerry Ambrose, Eukon Group

6. **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION/FINDINGS**

In order for the City to render a determination on your application, additional information may be required. Consult the appropriate Special Instructions handout. Provide on attached sheet(s) this additional information using the handout as a guide.

NOTE: All applicants are eligible to request a one time, one-year only freeze on fees charged by various City departments in connection with your project. It is advisable only when this application is deemed complete or upon payment of Building and Safety plan check fees. Please ask staff for details or an application.

**Base Fee:** 5350  
**Receipt No.:** 23845

**Reviewed and Accepted by [Project Planner] Date**

**Deemed Complete by [Project Planner] Date**

CP-7771 (09/09/2011)
CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of California
County of SANTA BARBARA

On 21 May 2015 before me, personally appeared Jerry Ambrose

who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person whose name is subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature _________

Signature of Notary Public

Place Notary Seal Above

OPTIONAL

Though this section is optional, completing this information can deter alteration of the document or fraudulent reattachment of this form to an unintended document.

Description of Attached Document
Title or Type of Document: Applic. or Hnd Document Date: 05/21/15
Number of Pages: ____________ Signer(s) Other Than Named Above: ____________

Capacity(ies) Claimed by Signer(s)
Signer’s Name: □ Corporate Officer — Title(s): 
□ Partner — □ Limited □ General
□ Individual □ Attorney in Fact
□ Trustee □ Guardian or Conservator
□ Other: ____________________________
Signer Is Representing: ____________________________

Signer’s Name: □ Corporate Officer — Title(s):
□ Partner — □ Limited □ General
□ Individual □ Attorney in Fact
□ Trustee □ Guardian or Conservator
□ Other: ____________________________
Signer Is Representing: ____________________________

©2014 National Notary Association • www.NationalNotary.org • 1-800-US NOTARY (1-800-876-6827) Item #5907
Findings/Justification:

**ZONING ADMINISTRATOR’S ADJUSTMENT (ZAA) — LAMC 12.28**

City of Los Angeles — Department of City Planning

Fences, Walls, Gates, Hedges, Light Fixtures, and other appurtenances > 8' in the Yard or Setback Area (Various Zones; 12.21 C1 (g))

Adjustments from Density (lot area per unit), Height and FAR < 20% (Various Zones; 12.21.1)

Adjustments from Yard or Setback requirements (Various Zones and Sections)

Adjustments from Space/Passageway and Location (12.21 C2 & 5)

Adjustments from Residential Floor Area ≤ 10% (Various Zones)

Encroachments into Building Lines (12.32 R)

The Zoning Administrator’s Adjustment Findings/Justification is a required attachment to the MASTER LAND USE APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS (CP-7810).

Public Noticing Requirements: Abutting Owners.

**FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL OF ADJUSTMENTS:**

In order to grant your request, the following findings/justification must be addressed. Explain how your request conforms to the following requirements:

1. That while site characteristics or existing improvements make strict adherence to the zoning regulations impractical or infeasible, the project nonetheless conforms with the intent of those regulations.

   The intent of the City’s wireless guidelines/ordinances is to ensure the design of wireless facilities are "well integrated" into the characteristics of on-site and surrounding development. To meet technical / "line of site" requirements, it is necessary for the antennas to be 49' above grade (54' overall). The site design, a "monopine", is consistent with existing pine trees in the immediate area.

2. That in light of the project as a whole, including any mitigation measures imposed, the project’s location, size, height, operations and other significant features will be compatible with and will not adversely affect or further degrade adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the public health, welfare, and safety.

   An additional 9' of height over the height limit will not adversely affect or degrade surrounding properties or public health, safety & welfare in that all antennas will be concealed within the branches of the monopine and will not appear out of place with trees of similar (or more) height and type in the surrounding area. There are several taller trees and man-made structures in the area.

3. That the project is in substantial conformance with the purpose, intent and provisions of the General Plan, the applicable community plan and any applicable specific plan.

   The overall goal of the General Plan is to encourage an arrangement of land uses that contribute to the health, safety, welfare and convenience of people who live and work in the City. An additional 9' of height above the height limit will not detract from the project’s conformance with this goal, and will actually enhance this goal by allowing the facility to serve its intended quasi-public use.

ZA 2015-1936 — CWW
Authorized Agent for Verizon Wireless

Verizon Project Name: FLIGHT

City of Los Angeles
Application for a Conditional Use Permit
Project Information and Justification

Verizon Wireless is requesting approval of Conditional Use Permit for the operation and construction of an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility and presents the following project information for your consideration.

Project Specific Location
Address: 7910 S. La Tijera Blvd.
Zoning: C2-1VL

Project Authorized Representative
Jerry Ambrose, Eukon Group
Address: 3905 State St., Ste 7-188, Santa Barbara, CA 93105
jamrose@wireless01.com / (805) 637-7407

Project Description
Verizon is proposing a 54-ft high antenna support structure disguised as a pine tree (Monopine) with twelve (12) eight foot (8-ft) antennas, ancillary antenna equipment, ancillary ground mounted equipment cabinets, and a stand by generator. The ground mounted equipment & generator will be enclosed within an approximate 100 sf., 8' high, CMU walled enclosure surrounded by new landscaping. The exterior appearance of the wall will match the existing trash enclosure on site.

The proposed Monopine is designed to mitigate visual impacts, blend within the existing environment and obscure the symmetric nature of the antennas. Antennas and other equipment on the tower will be painted to match the tree foliage. Access to the proposed wireless telecommunication facility will be via an existing drive way off Airport Blvd.

Project Objectives
The purpose of this project is close a “Significant Gap” in coverage within the general area surrounding the intersection of Airport & S. La Tijera Blvds. As illustrated in the enclosed propagation map “Flight – Existing Coverage”, much of the area surrounding this intersection has poor/unreliable service for Verizon customers (Indoor, Outdoor & Vehicular). There is “some” service in this area but the strength of signal is inadequate to meet customer demand.
As illustrated in the enclosed propagation map ""FLIGHT + Connected with existing Sites", installation of the proposed facility at 7910 S. La Tijera Blvd. will resolve a majority of this significant gap in service. The proposed facility is the least intrusive option for the area, will improve operations of surrounding Verizon facilities, and will improve overall service in the area for both Data and Phone service.

Safety – RF is Radio

The FCC regulates RF emissions to ensure public safety. Standards have been set based on peer-reviewed scientific studies and recommendations from a variety of oversight organizations, including the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP), American National Standards Institute (ANSI), Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Federal Drug Administration (FDA), Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH).

Alternative Site Analysis/Co-location

The following locations were evaluated as potential locations and the reason why they are not selected for this project is addressed below (all at the intersection of Airport & La Tijera Blvds): There are no “viable” co-location opportunities in the area.

- **Medical Building** – 8110 Airport Blvd. – This property has an existing AT&T wireless facility at 38’ above grade. This height is too low to meet Verizon’s objectives and Verizon was unable to come to agreement with the property owner to secure more height (and more space) on the building/property.
- **Church of Christ at Westchester** – 5925 West 79th St. - The property owner was not interested in leasing space to Verizon.
- **Airport Counseling Service** – 7891 La Tijera Blvd. – There is not enough room on the property for a new free-standing antenna structure. There is also a large billboard that would inhibit the wireless signal.

CUP & WTF Findings

**CUP Findings**

A. *Why does applicant believe the location of the project will be desirable to the public convenience and welfare.*

The proposed project will contribute and promote public health, safety and welfare by providing affordable, reliable wireless telecommunications services to the area. Mobile phones and other devices are a necessary emergency service device and business tool, as well as being convenient for personal and family use.

After comparison of other potential site locations in the surrounding area (intersection of Airport & LA Tijera Blvds), the project site at 7910 S. La Tijera Blvd. offered the most desirable location in the interest of public convenience and welfare. The proposed stealth design and compatible...
appearance with surrounding pine trees will allow the facility to serve its intended function without being unsightly or causing adverse impacts to surrounding properties.

B. Describe briefly how the proposed project will be proper in relation to adjacent uses of the development of the community.

The facility structures and equipment are located, designed and screened to blend with the existing facilities on site in such a manner so as to alleviate any adverse impacts to adjacent uses and structures in the vicinity. The project is unmanned and will not generate any smoke, odor, noise, or other adverse impacts to the adjacent land uses. The proposed use will also have no impact on parking, traffic, circulation or density in the area and will not adversely affect existing viewsheds or any scenic/natural vistas.

The project is in proper relationship with adjacent uses and development within the community. The antennas will be hidden within an antenna support structure disguised as a pine tree. This design is compatible with several existing pine trees in the area. In addition, the proposed ancillary equipment enclosure will be located at grade, surrounded by a CMU wall & landscaping, and not readily visible to the public. Care has been taken in locating the proposed antennas and equipment to alleviate any potential adverse impacts to adjacent properties. Installation of the new wireless antenna facility will not create a measurable change in the appearance of the area.

C. Describe how the proposed project will not be detrimental to the character of development in the immediate neighborhood and will be in harmony with the various elements and objectives of the General Plan.

The proposed project will not be detrimental to the character of development in the immediate neighborhood in that the project has been designed with a “stealth” appearance to alleviate any potential adverse visual or land use impacts to the area. The antennas and equipment will be mostly hidden from public view.

The overall goal of the General Plan, as implemented through the Zoning Ordinance and Community Plan, is to provide an arrangement of land uses, circulation and services which will encourage and contribute to the health, safety, welfare and convenience of the people who live and work in the area. The proposed project location and design are consistent with this overall goal.

The proposed project also complies the design recommendations of Section 12.21 A 20 relating to wireless telecommunication facilities.

WTF Findings

a. (i/ii/iii): Setbacks for monopoles or towers only

The antennas will meet the minimum siting distances to habitable structures required for compliance with FCC regulations as well as required monopole (pine) setbacks. Structural Calculations for the proposed monopine will be provided once a
determination by the zoning administrator is made. The structural calculations will be made available at the time of plan check and not at the time this filing.

b. **Setbacks for screening and landscaping**

The proposed antennas have been set back as far as possible from surrounding properties and streets to maximize screening of the facility, while also allowing the facility to serve its intended purpose.

The antennas and related antenna equipment will be "hidden" within the monopine structure and will be compatible with other pine trees in the area. The monopine will not result in any measurable aesthetic changes to the surrounding area.

New landscaping around the equipment wall is proposed. The landscaping will further shield the equipment from public view.

**Visual Impact Standard**

The visual impact standard under Section 12.21 A 20 (a)(4) is met in that the facility is designed to have the least possible visual impact after considering the varied technical, engineering, economic and other factors necessary for the successful and reasonable operation of the facility. The antenna structure will be disguised as a pine tree and the antennas will be hidden within the foliage. The ancillary equipment will be located behind a walled enclosure and not readily visible to the public.

c. **A good faith effort was made to locate on existing sites or facilities.**

See above. The only potential co-location / co-habitation was not viable for technical and real estate reasons.

d. **The project is consistent with the general requirements of the Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Standards in design, collocation efforts, screening, etc.**

See compliance with other sections herein.

e. **The use will have no substantial adverse impact on the properties or improvements in the surrounding neighborhood.**

By: (1) locating the project on a commercial "use" property; (2) disguising the antenna structure as a pine tree; and (3) screening the ancillary equipment & generator from public view with a walled enclosure & landscaping, the project will result in no substantial adverse impacts to properties or improvements in the surrounding neighborhood.
Setbacks and Landscaping
Appropriate setbacks are proposed as necessary to screen the equipment from public views. Landscaping is proposed as noted above and as illustrated on the plans.

Visual Impact Standard
Note finding in “c” above. Project design will comply with Section 12.21 A 20(a) (4)

Locating Antennas on Existing Sites
Note finding in “d” above.

The enclosed application is presented for your consideration. Verizon Wireless requests approval of Conditional Use Permit to build the proposed facility. Please contact me at (805) 637-7407 with any questions or request for additional information.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Jerry Ambrose, Eukon Group
Authorized Agent of Verizon Wireless
ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT
ND, MND, CE
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 11 - MIKE BONIN

PROJECT TITLE
ENV-2015-1937-MND

CASE NO.
ZA-2015-1936-CUW

PROJECT LOCATION
7900 - 7910 South La Tijera Boulevard and 8124 South Airport Boulevard

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The project is the construction, use, and maintenance of a new unmanned wireless telecommunications facility (WTF) for Verizon Wireless on a proposed 54-foot tall monopole disguised as a pine tree (monopine) with ancillary equipment and an emergency generator placed at grade behind a CMU wall enclosure located within a landscaped portion of a parking lot of a commercial development.

The requested entitlement is a Conditional Use to permit the construction, use, and maintenance of a new unmanned WTF with a height of 54 feet in lieu of 45 feet and ancillary equipment.

NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT IF OTHER THAN CITY AGENCY
VERIZON WIRELESS c/o Eukon Group
3905 State Street, Suite 7-183
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

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
MAY SIRINOPWONGSAGON

TITLE
City Planning Associate

TELEPHONE NUMBER
(213) 978-1372

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

SIGNATURE (Official)

DATE
NOVEMBER 11, 2015
I-70. **Aesthetics (Unmanned Wireless Telecommunications Facility)**

- Environmental impacts may result to the character and aesthetics of a neighborhood by project implementation. However, the potential impact will be mitigated to a less than significant level by the following measure:
- The proposed facility shall be disguised so as to blend into the surrounding neighborhood to the satisfaction of the decision-maker. This may involve, but not be limited to, one or more of the following: painting and texturing to match the existing surroundings, disguising the installation, concealment behind screen walls, incorporation into existing structures, and/or surrounding the installation with additional landscaping.

I-130. **Aesthetics (Glare)**

- Environmental impacts to adjacent residential properties may result from glare from the proposed project. However, the potential impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level by the following measure:
- The exterior of the proposed structure shall be constructed of materials such as, but not limited to, high-performance and/or non-reflective tinted glass (no mirror-like tints or films) and pre-cast concrete or fabricated wall surfaces to minimize glare and reflected heat.

XII-20. **Increased Noise Levels (Demolition, Grading, and Construction Activities)**

- Construction and demolition shall be restricted to the hours of 7:00 am to 6:00 pm Monday through Friday, and 8:00 am to 6:00 pm on Saturday.
- Demolition and construction activities shall be scheduled so as to avoid operating several pieces of equipment simultaneously, which causes high noise levels.
- The project contractor shall use power construction equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices.
ENVIRONMENTAL CASE: ENV-2015-1937-MND

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
CONDITIONAL USE FOR A 54-FOOT MONOPINE.

ENV PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
The project is the construction, use, and maintenance of a new unmanned wireless telecommunications facility (WTF) for Verizon Wireless on a proposed 54-foot tall monopole disguised as a pine tree (monopine) with ancillary equipment and an emergency generator placed at grade behind a CMU wall enclosure located within a landscaped portion of a parking lot of a commercial development.

The requested entitlement is a Conditional Use to permit the construction, use, and maintenance of a new unmanned WTF with a height of 54 feet in lieu of 45 feet and ancillary equipment.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTINGS:
The project site is an irregularly shaped lot consisting of approximately 32,988 square feet of lot area. The site is bounded by La Tijera Boulevard, a designated Boulevard II, to the northwest and Airport Boulevard, a designated Boulevard II, to the east.

The project site is located in the Westchester - Playa del Rey Community Plan with a land use designation of General Commercial and Low Medium II Residential. The project site is designated with two zones, 24,456 square feet of the lot is zoned C2-1VL and is developed with two detached commercial buildings and surface parking lot. The remainder of the site is zoned R2-1 and is developed with surface parking lot and landscaping used in conjunction with the commercial development. The project site is located within the Los Angeles Coastal Transportation Corridor.

The project site is not located within the Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone, but is located 3.4 km to the Newport – Inglewood Fault Zone (Onshore). The site is not located within a hillside area, but is located within the BOE Special Grading area. The site is located within the Airport Hazard area with a 150-foot height limit above elevation 126. The site is not located within a Methane zone, fire district, landslide, liquefaction, or tsunami inundation zone.

The properties to the south are zoned R2-1 and are developed with single family dwellings. The properties to the west and east are zoned R1-1 and are developed with single family dwellings. The properties to the north are zoned C2-1VL and are developed with a school and one- to two-story commercial office uses.

PROJECT LOCATION:
7900 - 7910 South La Tijera Boulevard and 8124 South Airport Boulevard

COMMUNITY PLAN AREA:
WESTCHESTER - PLAYA DEL REY
STATUS: Yes, Does Conform to Plan

AREA PLANNING COMMISSION:
WEST LOS ANGELES

CERTIFIED NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL:
WESTCHESTER - PLAYA DEL REY

ENV-2015-1937-MND
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING ZONING:</th>
<th>MAX. DENSITY/INTENSITY ALLOWED BY ZONING:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2-1VL / R2-1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL PLAN LAND USE:</th>
<th>MAX. DENSITY/INTENSITY ALLOWED BY PLAN DESIGNATION:</th>
<th>LA River Adjacent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL COMMERCIAL / LOW MEDIUM II RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED PROJECT DENSITY:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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 on-site as well as off-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 that 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 CEA 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 Address. 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.

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

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

Background

PROPOSENT NAME: VERIZON WIRELESS
c/o Eukon Group
APPLICANT ADDRESS: 3905 State Street, Suite 7-188
Santa Barbara, CA 93105
AGENCY REQUIRING CHECKLIST: Department of City Planning
PROPOSAL NAME (if Applicable):

PHONE NUMBER: (805) 637-7407
DATE SUBMITTED: 05/21/2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. AESTHETICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with existing zoning 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))?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. AIR QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---
| 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

<p>| 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? | | | ✓ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**X. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XI. MINERAL RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XII. NOISE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially significant impact</th>
<th>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</th>
<th>Less than significant impact</th>
<th>No impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially significant impact</td>
<td>Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated</td>
<td>Less than significant impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>XV. RECREATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Potentially</td>
<td>Less than</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significant impact</td>
<td>significant unless mitigation incorporated</td>
<td>impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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? ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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? ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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? ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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? ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; 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)? ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-2015-1937-MND and the associated case(s), ZA-2015-1936-CUW.

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:
MAY SIRINOPWONGSAGON City Planning Associate (213) 978-1372 10/14/2015
### APPENDIX A: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS EXPLANATION TABLE

#### I. AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is located at the corner of La Tijera Boulevard and Airport Boulevard and is not located within or near any known scenic vistas. No impact will result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is located at the corner of La Tijera Boulevard and Airport Boulevard and is not located near any scenic resources. No impact will result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED</td>
<td>The proposed WTF has the potential to substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. A mitigation measure is incorporated to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED</td>
<td>The proposed WTF has the potential to create a new source of substantial glare for adjacent residential land uses. A mitigation measure is incorporated to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is located within an urban area and is zoned C2-1VL and R2-1. The site is not zoned for farmland uses. No impact will result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is located within an urban area and is zoned C2-1VL and R2-1. The site is not zoned for agricultural use and would not result in a conflict with Williamson Act contract. No impact will result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is located within an urban area and is zoned C2-1VL and R2-1. The site is not zoned for agricultural use and would result in the loss of forest land or timberland. No impact will result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is located within an urban area and is zoned C2-1VL and R2-1. There will be no loss of forest land or conversion of forest land. No impact will result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is located within an urban area and is zoned C2-1VL and R2-1. There will be no change or conversion of farmland. No impact will result.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### III. AIR QUALITY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact?</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed monopine WTF will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of applicable air quality plans. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed monopine WTF will not violate any air quality standards or contribute to an existing air quality violation. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed monopine WTF will not violate any air quality standards or contribute to an existing air quality violation. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed monopine WTF will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. No impacts will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed monopine WTF will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact?</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is zoned C2-1VL and R2-1 and is developed with commercial buildings and a surface parking lot within an urbanized area. It does not contain any biological resources or habitat areas. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is zoned C2-1VL and R2-1 and is developed with commercial buildings and a surface parking lot within an urbanized area. It does not contain any biological resources or habitat areas. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is zoned C2-1VL and R2-1 and is developed with commercial buildings and a surface parking lot within an urbanized area. It does not contain any biological resources or habitat areas. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is zoned C2-1VL and R2-1 and is developed with commercial buildings and a surface parking lot within an urbanized area. It does not contain any biological resources or habitat areas. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is zoned C2-1VL and R2-1 and is developed with commercial buildings and a surface parking lot within an urbanized area. It does not contain any biological resources or habitat areas. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact?</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is zoned C2-1VL and R2-1 and is developed with commercial buildings and a surface parking lot within an urbanized area. It does not contain any biological resources or habitat areas. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed monopine WTF will be new construction on a site that has existing commercial buildings constructed in 1970 and has not been identified as historically significant. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>The construction and installation of the monopine WTF will require a minimal amount of grading, approximately 15 cubic yards. It is not anticipated to find archeological resources on the site; however, if archeological resources are found then the project will be required to follow the procedures as detailed in the California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>The construction and installation of the monopine WTF will require a minimal amount of grading, approximately 15 cubic yards. It is not anticipated to find paleontological resources on the site; however, if paleontological resources are found then the project will be required to follow the procedures as detailed in the California Public Resources Code Section 5097.5 and 30244. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>The construction and installation of the monopine WTF will require a minimal amount of grading, approximately 15 cubic yards. It is not anticipated to find human remains on the site; however, if human remains are found on the site then the project would be required to comply with procedures detailed in the California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If the remains are of Native American origin, then the project would be required to comply with Public Resource Code Section 5097. Impacts will be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is not located within the Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone. No impact will occur.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact?</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is located 3.4 km from the Newport - Inglewood Fault Zone (Onshore). The project is not expected to cause or accelerate any geological hazards. The project would also be subject to the seismic standards of the Department of Building and Safety's Uniform Building Code. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is not located within a liquefaction zone. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is not located within a landslide area. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is not located within an area known or suspected erosion hazards. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is not located within an unstable soil area, landslide, or liquefaction area, and is not expected to cause or accelerate any geological hazards. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is not located in an area known to have expansive soils. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed project is a monopine WTF and the site is currently served by the City's sewer system. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VII. GREEN HOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact?</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>Through required implementation of the LA Green Building Code, the proposed project would be consistent with local and statewide goals and polices aimed at reducing the generation of GHGs. Therefore, the proposed project’s generation of GHG emissions would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to emissions. Impacts will be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed monopine WTF will not interfere with SCAG's ability to implement the regional strategies outlined in the 2012 – 2035 RTP/SCS. The proposed project; therefore, would be consistent with statewide, regional and local goals and policies aimed at reducing GHG emissions. Impacts are less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact?</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>No hazardous materials are proposed to be routinely transported, used, or disposed of as part of the proposed unmanned monopine WTF. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed unmanned monopine WTF will be required to comply with building code requirements. Impacts will be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>The project is located 95 feet to the east of Carousel School, located across La Tijera Boulevard. Impacts from the proposed project will be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is not located on a list of known hazardous materials sites. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is located 2.7 miles from LAX. The site is not located within an airport land use plan or is located more than 2 miles from the airport; however, it is located within an airport hazard zone, limiting heights to 150 feet above elevation 126. The proposed monopine WTF is proposed with a height of 54 feet. Impacts will be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is not located within two miles of a private airstrip. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project will not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed WTF is not located within a Very High Fire Hazards Severity Zone and is located within a developed urbanized area that is not subject to wildland fires. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>No violations of any water quality or waste discharged requirements are anticipated from the proposed unmanned monopine WTF. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>No violations of any water quality or waste discharged requirements are anticipated from the proposed unmanned monopine WTF. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed monopine WTF will be located within an existing landscaped area of a commercial development. Impacts from removal of the landscaped area will be minimal and is not anticipated to alter existing drainage at the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact?</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>Impacts will be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>No streams or rivers are located on the site and the proposed monopine WTF will not alter the existing drainage patterns. Further, the project will comply with LAMC Section 64.70 to ensure that surface runoff will not result in flooding. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed WTF is not anticipated to exceed the capacity of the existing storm water draining system. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>No violations of any water quality or waste discharged requirements are anticipated from the proposed unmanned monopine WTF. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is not located within a 100 year flood hazard area. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is not located within a 100 year flood hazard area. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is not located within a potential dam inundation zone. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**X. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact?</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed monopine WTF will be located on a project site that is commercial developed and will not divide an established community. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>The Los Angeles Municipal Zoning Code requires specific entitlements to allow the proposed project. With the approval of the requested entitlements the project will be in conformance with the Municipal Code and all applicable land use regulations. Impacts will be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed WTF is located in an urbanized area that is not subject to any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XI. MINERAL RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact?</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>No impacts are anticipated as the site is not located in a known area of mineral resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact?</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>No impacts are anticipated as the site is not located in a known area of mineral resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. NOISE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed unmanned monopine WTF does not propose to deviate from any requirements of LAMC Section 111 or any other applicable noise standards. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>No groundborne vibration or groundborne noise is anticipated from the operation of a monopine WTF to be located on a commercially developed lot. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed monopine WTF will not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED</td>
<td>During the construction phase, the project may create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. However, a mitigation measure has been incorporated to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.</td>
<td>XII-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is located 2.7 miles from LAX. The site is not located within an airport land use plan or is located more than 2 miles from the airport. As the facility will be unmanned, no noise impacts will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is not located within two miles of a private airstrip. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed WTF will not induce substantial population growth in the area. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project will not displace any existing housing as there are no dwellings are located on the project site. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>There are no residential dwellings located on the site. The proposed project will not displace any people. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact?</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is served by Fire Station 5, which is located approximately 1.5 miles away from the site. The project will comply with all applicable City fire safety regulations, reducing potential impacts to a less than significant level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed unmanned monopine WTF will not require additional police services. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>No new housing is being proposed as part of the project, there will be no increase demand for schools in the area. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>No new housing is being proposed as part of the project, there will be no increase demand for parks in the area. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed monopine WTF will not impact other government facilities. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XV. RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact?</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>No new housing is being proposed as part of the project, there will be no increase demand for parks in the area. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project does not include any recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact?</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed unmanned monopine WTF will not conflict with any plan, ordinance, or policy impacting the circulation system. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed unmanned WTF does not conflict with any applicable congestion management program. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The project site is located 2.7 miles from LAX. The site is not located within an airport land use plan or is located more than 2 miles from the airport. The project site is located within an airport hazard area which has a height limit of 150 feet over elevation 126. The proposed monopine will have a height of 54 feet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed monopine WTF does not involve any design features that are unusual for the area or any incompatible uses. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact?</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>Emergency access will not impacted by the proposed unmanned WTF. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed WTF is not expected to significantly affect any adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian or alternative transportation facilities in the area. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed unmanned monopine WTF will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements with the Regional Water Quality Control Board. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed unmanned monopine WTF will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements with the Regional Water Quality Control Board. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed unmanned monopine WTF will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements with the Regional Water Quality Control Board. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed unmanned monopine WTF will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements with the Regional Water Quality Control Board. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>The existing development has sufficient water supplies available. The addition of an unmanned WTF will not have a significant impact on water supplies. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed unmanned monopine WTF must comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulations relating to solid waste. Impacts will be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed unmanned monopine must comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulations relating to solid waste. Impacts will be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. NO IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed unmanned monopine WTF does not have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, or threaten to eliminate a plan animal community. The project is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact?</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>located in a developed, urbanized area and will not disrupt or hinder any known habitats. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>The proposed project is a unmanned monopine WTF to be located on a lot that is commercial developed in an urban area. There are no known current or future projects in the immediate vicinity that would result in cumulatively significant environmental impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</td>
<td>The mitigation measures required herein will reduce the potential impacts of the proposed project on human beings to a less than significant level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MISCELLANEOUS REPORTS
April 14, 2015

To: Jerry Ambrose  
RE: Verizon Wireless "FLIGHT" , Site Located at: 7910 S. La Tijera Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90045

To Whom It May Concern,

We write to inform you that Verizon Wireless has performed a radio frequency (RF) compliance pre-construction evaluation for the above-noted proposed site and based on the result of the evaluation, will be compliant with FCC Guidelines.

The FCC has established safety guidelines relating to potential RF exposure from cell sites. The FCC developed the standards, known as Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE) limits, in consultation with numerous other federal agencies, including the Environmental Protection Agency, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. The FCC provides information about the safety of radio frequency (RF) emissions from cell towers on its website at: http://www.fcc.gov/oet/rfsafety/rf-faqs.html

Please refer to the FCC Office of Engineering and Technology Bulletin 65 for information on RF exposure guidelines. Policy questions should be directed to VZWRFCompliance@verizonwireless.com. Contact your local Verizon Wireless resource below if you have additional site-specific questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Contact Email</th>
<th>Contact Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diana Scudder</td>
<td><a href="mailto:WestSoCalNetworkCompliance@VerizonWireless.com">WestSoCalNetworkCompliance@VerizonWireless.com</a></td>
<td>949-243-4849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sincerely,

Victor Fung  
Manager-RF System Design  
Verizon Wireless
FAA Part 77 Statement

Location: 7910 S. La Tijera Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90045
Carrier: Verizon Wireless  Site No: “FLIGHT”

In compliance with the requirements of Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.21-A, 20, the above-referenced installation is not near an airfield and does not need to be reviewed under FAA regulations.
Business Entity Detail

Data is updated to the California Business Search on Wednesday and Saturday mornings. Results reflect work processed through Tuesday, May 19, 2015. Please refer to Processing Times for the received dates of filings currently being processed. The data provided is not a complete or certified record of an entity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity Name</th>
<th>RELLEK LA TIJERA, LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entity Number</td>
<td>20071210422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Filed</td>
<td>07/30/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>ACTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity Address</td>
<td>139 NORTH SALTAIR AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity City, State, Zip</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES CA 90049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent for Service of Process</td>
<td>JAMES V MALONEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent Address</td>
<td>139 NORTH SALTAIR AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent City, State, Zip</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES CA 90049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates the information is not contained in the California Secretary of State's database.

* Note: If the agent for service of process is a corporation, the address of the agent may be requested by ordering a status report.

- For information on checking or reserving a name, refer to Name Availability.
- For information on ordering certificates, copies of documents and/or status reports or to request a more extensive search, refer to Information Requests.
- For help with searching an entity name, refer to Search Tips.
- For descriptions of the various fields and status types, refer to Field Descriptions and Status Definitions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HILLSIDE</td>
<td>5840 W. Centinela Ave., LA, CA 90045</td>
<td>Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80th St.</td>
<td>8065 Emerson Ave., LA, CA 90045</td>
<td>Rooftop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAX</td>
<td>9540 S. Sepulveda Blvd., LA, CA 90045</td>
<td>Rooftop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINSFORD</td>
<td>8621 Bellanca Ave., LA, CA 90045</td>
<td>Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NECTARINE</td>
<td>416 W. Manchester Blvd., Inglewood, CA 90301</td>
<td>Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA TIJERA</td>
<td>820 Industrial Ave., Inglewood, CA 90302</td>
<td>Tower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verizon @ 7910 S. LA Tijera - 1.5 Mile List

ZA 2015-1936 - cmw
Flight - Connected with existing sites
RADIUS MAP
VICINITY MAP

SITE: 7910 S. LA TIJERA BLVD. - "VERIZON-FLIGHT"

GC MAPPING SERVICE, INC.
3055 WEST VALLEY BOULEVARD
ALHAMBRA CA 91803
(626) 441-1080, FAX (626) 441-8850
GCMAPPING@RADIUSMAPS.COM

©1994 Thomas Bros. Maps
PLOT PLANS &
OTHER PLANS
Planning Staff Exhibit A

Aerial photograph of subject property
Location of proposed WTF

Planning Staff Exhibit A

View of subject property looking west across Airport Boulevard
Close-up view of proposed WTF location
View of subject property looking southeast across La Tijera Boulevard
View of adjacent properties to the northwest across La Tijera Boulevard
Planning Staff Exhibit A

View of adjacent properties to the east across Airport Boulevard
View of adjacent properties to the south, looking west across Airport Boulevard
View of adjacent properties to the southwest, looking south across La Tijera Boulevard
View looking north along Airport Boulevard
View looking south along Airport Boulevard
Planning Staff Exhibit A

View looking east along La Tijera Boulevard
View looking west along La Tijera Boulevard
SURVEYOR DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT ALL UTILITY LOCATIONS ARE CORRECT OR THEIR LOCATION IS DEFINITE. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR AND DEVELOPER TO CONTACT BLUE STAKE AND ANY OTHER INVOLVED AGENCIES PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. REMOVAL, REPLACEMENT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR.

BENCHMARK PROJECT ELEVATIONS ESTABLISHED FROM CPS DERIVED ORTHOMETRIC HEIGHTS BY APPLICATION OF NGS 'GEOID 12A' MODELED SEPARATIONS TO ELLIPSOID HEIGHTS DETERMINED BY OBSERVATIONS OF THE 'SMARTNET' REAL TIME NETWORK.

ALL ELEVATIONS SHOWN HEREON ARE REFERENCED TO NAV088.
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FLOOD ZONE

This project appears to be located within Zone "A," based on the information provided. The project is described as a "verizon wireless" project located at 949.286.7000. The site survey is referenced as "Exhibit "A" and "B." The project information includes details on the project number, site survey, and project description, but the full text is not fully legible due to the quality of the image.
EXHIBIT "A"
NOT USED

SCALE NOTE:
-if dimensions shown on plan do not scale correctly, check for reduction or enlargement from original plans.

NOTES:
1. Proposed Monopine foliage not shown.
2. All proposed antennas and equipment shall be painted to match proposed monopine.
3. Proposed Verizon Wireless B Past Antennas (17'-10" per sector, total of 12) painted to match proposed monopine at top of existing spires.
4. Proposed Verizon Wireless B Past Antennas (17'-10" per sector, total of 12) painted to match proposed monopine.
5. Proposed Verizon Wireless A2 Module (17'-4" per sector, total of 12) painted to match proposed monopine.

EXHIBIT "A"
7069
Proposed antennas and equipment shall be painted to match proposed monopine.

Existing 30.9' high tree

Existing 33.7' high tree

Proposed English Ivy

Proposed 8' high CMU wall enclosure. Textured and painted to match existing trash enclosure.

Proposed 8' high wall enclosure. (Typ. -4 per sector, total of 12) painted to match proposed monopine.

Proposed monopine 54' high monopine

Proposed monopine 54' high monopine

Existing 33.7' high tree

Existing 30.9' high tree

Proposed 8' wall enclosure. (Typ. -4 per sector, total of 12) painted to match proposed monopine.

Proposed monopine 54' high monopine

Proposed monopine 54' high monopine
CORRESPONDENCE
August 4, 2016

VIA EMAIL AND FEDEX

President Thomas Donovan
Vice President Esther Margulies
Commissioners Joseph W. Halper, Marian Merritt
and Lisa Waltz Morocco
West Los Angeles Area Planning Commission
City of Los Angeles
200 North Spring Street, Room 532
Los Angeles, California 90012

Re: Appeal of Verizon Wireless Application ZA 2015-1936(CUW)
Telecommunications Facility, 7900-7910 South La Tijera Boulevard /
8124 South Airport Boulevard
West Area Planning Commission Agenda, August 17, 2016

Dear President Donovan, Vice President Margulies and Commissioners:

We write on behalf of our client Verizon Wireless to urge you to follow the recommendation of Department of City Planning Staff and uphold the Zoning Administrator’s approval of a wireless facility disguised as a pine tree in the Westchester area (the “Approved Facility”). The appeal filed by John Birkett and Cory Birkett (“Appellants”) provides no substantial evidence to warrant denial of the application and must be rejected.

The Approved Facility complies with the Los Angeles Municipal Code zoning regulations (the “Code”) and meets all findings for issuance of a conditional use permit. It also represents the least intrusive means to fill a significant gap in Verizon Wireless service in the Westchester area. For this reason, denial of the Approved Facility would violate the federal Telecommunications Act. We urge you to deny the appeal and uphold the Zoning Administrator’s approval.

I. The Project

The Approved Facility has been thoughtfully designed and re-designed to minimize any impact on the adjacent community. In fact, the facility height has been lowered by nine feet to minimize visual impacts, eliminating the need for a zoning variance. Verizon Wireless proposes to place its antennas on a 45 foot tower disguised as
a pine tree. Antennas will be concealed within faux foliage and branches, and branches will extend an additional five feet above the tower, providing a realistic tapered appearance. Antennas will be covered with pine needle socks for further concealment. Under a condition of approval, the pole will be covered with faux bark cladding for a realistic appearance. The treepole will be placed adjacent to an approximately 143 square foot lease area, which will contain radio cabinets and a standby generator to provide continued service in case of emergency. The lease area is located in an unused landscaped area of the property and will be surrounded by an eight foot CMU wall to be covered with English ivy. Photosimulations of the Approved Facility are attached as Exhibit A.

Verizon Wireless also considered an alternative design that would disguise the Approved Facility as a eucalyptus tree in the same location. A photosimulation showing the alternative eucalyptus design is attached as Exhibit B.

II. The Approved Facility Complies with All Code Requirements and Meets All Findings for Issuance of a Conditional Use Permit.

As confirmed in the Zoning Administrator’s approval, the Approved Facility complies with the City’s standards for wireless facilities and meets all findings for issuance of a conditional use permit. Verizon Wireless designed the Approved Facility to resemble a pine tree, an alternative screening measure allowed under Code §12.21(A)(20)(a)(6)(ii). The Approved Facility height of 45 feet allows for a disguised facility with antennas mounted at a centerline of 36 feet, the minimum height required to serve the Significant Gap, and the Approved Facility is set back 24 feet 11 inches from the closest property line to the east, well over the nine foot setback required, meeting the height and setback requirements of Code §12.21(A)(20)(a)(2)(i).

The Zoning Administrator’s approval confirms that the Approved Facility will expand wireless service in the surrounding neighborhood, thus providing an essential and beneficial service and meeting the required conditional use permit finding of Code §12.24(E)(1). Disguised as a pine tree on a landscaped area on the parcel, and meeting setback requirements of the Code, the Approved Facility is compatible with and will not adversely affect adjacent properties, the neighborhood, or public health, welfare and safety, consistent with the finding of Code §12.24(E)(2).

The Zoning Administrator also confirmed that the Approved Facility is consistent with all General Plan requirements, notably General Plan Infrastructure and Public Services Goal 90 of a networked and integrated telecommunications system, complying with the finding of Code §12.24(E)(3). The Approved Facility also meets the special wireless facility finding of §12.24(W)(49)(e) in that it complies with all Code requirements, in particular Code §12.21(A)(20)(a)(4) requiring a design with the least visual impact. Because the Approved Facility meets all findings for approval, the Commission should deny the appeal and affirm the Zoning Administrator’s approval.
III. Substantial Evidence for Approval, Lack of Substantial Evidence for Denial

As interpreted under controlling federal court decisions, the “substantial evidence” requirement means that a local government’s decision to deny a WCF application must be based on requirements set forth in the local code and supported by evidence in the record. (See Metro PCS, Inc. v. City and County of San Francisco, 400 F.3d 715, 725 (9th Cir. 2005) [denial of application must be “authorized by applicable local regulations and supported by a reasonable amount of evidence”].)

While a local government may regulate the placement of WCFs based on aesthetics, mere generalized concerns or opinions about aesthetics or compatibility with a neighborhood do not constitute substantial evidence upon which a local government could deny a permit. See City of Rancho Palos Verdes v. Abrams, 101 Cal. App. 4th 367, 381 (2002).

As set forth above, Verizon Wireless has provided substantial evidence to show that the Approved Facility complies with all requirements for approval under the Code. Among other evidence, photosimulations demonstrate the minimal visual impacts of the disguised treepole placed in a landscaped area of the subject parcel.

In contrast, Appellants have provided no evidence – let alone the substantial evidence required by federal law – to support denial of the Approved Facility. We respond briefly below to the points raised in the appeal. As we will explain, none are supported by substantial evidence.

A. The Approved Facility Poses Minimal Visual Impacts.

Appellants raise concerns over the appearance of the Approved Facility, but as affirmed by the Zoning Administrator, Verizon Wireless selected a location and design that minimizes visual impacts as directed by the Code. The Approved Facility will be placed in an unused landscaped area near established trees on a commercial property, and the pine tree design sufficiently disguises antennas. Photosimulations demonstrate the minimal visual impacts of the Approved Facility among tall structures in the immediate vicinity such as billboards and utility poles. The Zoning Administrator concluded that, at the reduced height of 45 feet, the Approved Facility design “will obscure views of the proposed antenna arrays” and “will result in the least possible visual impact on the environment,” thus meeting the requirement of Code §12.21(A)(20)(a)(4). The Approved Facility is not located in an area with any special scenic designation, and as appellants do not raise any substantial evidence of any visual impact, this ground for appeal must be rejected.

\[1\] See Zoning Administrator Approval, Conditional Use Case No. ZA 2015-1936(CUW), March 16, 2016, p. 17.

Appellants challenge the benefit of the Approved Facility, claiming that certain local residents do not experience dropped calls or service issues and that a recently-approved Verizon Wireless facility is intended to alleviate the same coverage gap. As affirmed by Verizon Wireless engineers, there is a significant gap in Verizon Wireless coverage and network capacity in the Westchester area which will be remedied by the Approved Facility. The Verizon Wireless engineer’s statement referenced below includes maps depicting the coverage of the recently-approved Naylor facility that will be located 0.7 miles northwest of the Approved Facility and will serve a distinct coverage objective. Several federal court decisions have confirmed that the type of anecdotal call data referenced by Appellants suggesting a lack of need for the Approved Facility does not constitute substantial evidence of the absence of a significant gap, particularly when such evidence conflicts with scientifically-based propagation mapping and similar engineering data provided by the carrier. This ground for appeal presents no substantial evidence and must be rejected.

C. The Approved Facility is Structurally Safe.

Appellants express an alarmist concern over the hazard tower collapse, but the Approved Facility design will incorporate new seismic standards for wireless towers adopted by the Los Angeles City Council in 2015. These strict standards require that new wireless towers be designed and constructed with a 1.5 importance factor, the same as public safety facilities, to ensure continued operation during a seismic event. See Los Angeles Municipal Code Chapter IX §91.3108.

As described in the Zoning Administrator approval, the Approved Facility is not located in a fault zone or hillside area. Pursuant to Code §12.21(A)(20)(a)(2)(i), the tower will be certified by a professional structural engineer to meet industry standards, and the Approved Facility will be reviewed and inspected by the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety during the building permit process. This ground for appeal uncovers no actual risk of hazard and must be rejected.

D. The Generator Will Operate Infrequently and Will Comply with City Noise Regulations.

Appellants raise a concern over noise, odor and smoke from the standby generator, but the generator will only be operated during power outages and during

---

2 See, e.g., T-Mobile Northeast LLC v. City of Lawrence, 755 F. Supp. 2d 286, 292 (overturning denial based on lay opinion that existing coverage was adequate; “Unscientific, anecdotal evidence will not suffice to controvert the plaintiff’s evidence of a coverage gap.”); Nextel Communns. of the Mid-Atlantic, Inc. v. Town of Sudbury, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2642 (D. Mass. 2003), slip op. at 35-38 (overturning denial based on town’s “semi-scientific” test of coverage).

testing which occurs once per week for 20 minutes in the middle of a weekday. The eight-foot CMU wall will attenuate any noise from this infrequent generator testing, and the generator will comply with noise regulations of Los Angeles Municipal Code Chapter XI. The generator will be reviewed by the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety prior to operation. This ground for appeal fails to reveal any non-compliance of the proposed generator and must be rejected.

E. The Approved Facility Meets All Setback Requirements.

Appellants dispute compliance with setbacks, relying on a tape measure to arrive at different measurements from the tower base to property lines. Verizon Wireless’s project plans are based on surveys conducted under the direction of registered engineers. As described above, the Approved Facility tower will be set back 24 feet 11 inches from the closest property line to the east, well over the nine foot setback – 20 percent of the tower height – required under Code §12.21(A)(20)(a)(2)(i). This ground for appeal does not reveal any non-compliance with setback regulations and must be rejected.

F. The Approved Facility Is the Least Intrusive Feasible Alternative.

Appellants question Verizon Wireless’s site selection process, focusing on the building at 8110 Airport Boulevard that supports AT&T antennas. As described in the Alternatives Analysis referenced below, Verizon Wireless contacted the landlord of this property who was unwilling to allow an additional wireless facility on roof of the building. Lacking a willing landlord, the 8110 Airport Boulevard building is an infeasible alternative. This ground for appeal raises no evidence to the contrary and must be rejected.


Certain residents have objected to the Approved Facility based on generalized fears of the health effects of RF emissions. However, local governments are specifically precluded under federal statute from considering any alleged health or environmental effects of RF emissions of proposed WCFs “to the extent such facilities comply with the FCC’s regulations concerning such emissions.” 47 U.S.C. §332(c)(7)(B)(iv). Under Condition of Approval 14 of the Zoning Administrator Approval, the Approved Facility must not exceed applicable FCC public exposure limits, and Verizon Wireless must certify actual emissions within 60 days following installation.4

Moreover, federal preemption goes beyond decisions that are explicitly based on RF emissions. It also bars efforts to circumvent such preemption through some proxy such as aesthetics or property values. See, e.g., AT&T Wireless Servs. of Cal. LLC v. City of Carlsbad, 308 F. Supp. 2d 1148, 1159 (S.D. Cal. 2003) (in light of federal preemption, “concern over the decrease in property values may not be considered as substantial evidence if the fear of property value depreciation is based on concern over the health

4 Id. at 3.
effects caused by RF emissions’’); Calif. RSA No. 4, d/b/a Verizon Wireless v. Madera County, 332 F. Supp. 2d 1291, 1311 (E.D. Cal. 2003). Where, as here, a wireless facility will comply with FCC guidelines, health concerns, or any proxy for health concerns, cannot justify rejection of the Approved Facility.

V. **Approval is Required in Order to Avoid Unlawful Prohibition of Service.**

A local government’s denial of a permit for a wireless facility violates the “effective prohibition” clause of the TCA if the wireless provider can show two things: (1) that it has a “significant gap” in service; and (2) that the proposed facility is the “least intrusive means,” in relation to the land use values embodied in local regulations, to address the gap. See T-Mobile USA, Inc. v. City of Anacortes, 572 F.3d 987 (9th Cir. 2009); see also T-Mobile West Corp. v. City of Agoura Hills, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 134329 (C.D. Cal. 2010).

If a provider demonstrates both the existence of a significant gap, and that the proposed facility meets the “least intrusive means” standard, the local government must approve the facility, even if there is substantial evidence to deny the permit under local land use provisions. This is because the provider has met the requirements for federal preemption; i.e., denial of the permit would “have the effect of prohibiting the provision of personal wireless services.” 47 U.S.C. §332(c)(7)(B)(1)(ii); T-Mobile v. Anacortes, 572 F.3d at 999. To avoid such preemption, the local government must show that another alternative is available, technologically feasible, and less intrusive than the proposed facility. T-Mobile v. Anacortes, 572 F.3d at 998-999.

A. **Verizon Wireless Has Demonstrated a Significant Gap in Service.**

Verizon Wireless has identified a significant gap in coverage in the Westchester area of Los Angeles. The significant gap is described in the Statement of Radio Frequency Design Engineer Rahat Moin attached as Exhibit C (the “RF Engineer’s Statement”). As shown through coverage maps included in the RF Engineer’s Statement, there is a significant gap in Verizon Wireless coverage in the Westchester area. The RF Engineer’s Statement also demonstrates that the existing Verizon Wireless facility serving much of the gap area is nearing capacity exhaustion, compromising network reliability and resulting in slow data speeds and poor connectivity.

As further evidence of the need for the Approved Facility, a letter from a Verizon Wireless Customer Relationship Management Director attached as Exhibit D provides evidence of 452 Westchester area residents who sent text messages of support for improved Verizon Wireless service in the area.

B. **The Approved Facility is the Least Intrusive Means to Fill the Significant Gap in Service.**

In an effort to address the significant gap, Verizon Wireless evaluated eight specific locations as well as a small cell network as shown in the comprehensive
Alternatives Analysis attached as Exhibit E. Verizon Wireless discounted locations that were infeasible, cannot serve the significant gap or are more intrusive. The Alternatives Analysis confirms that the Approved Facility is the least intrusive means of providing wireless service to the significant gap.

When comparing the locations of the Approved Facility to other potential alternatives, it is important to note that federal law does not require that a site be the “only” alternative, but rather that no feasible alternative is less intrusive than the Approved Facility. *MetroPCS v. San Francisco*, 400 F.3d at 734-35. In this case, as explained in the Alternatives Analysis, there is no feasible location that would be less intrusive.

In short, Verizon Wireless has identified a significant gap in coverage and has shown that the Approved Facility is the least intrusive means to address it, based on the values expressed in the Code. Under these circumstances, Verizon Wireless has established the requirements for federal preemption such that denial of the permit would constitute an unlawful prohibition of service.

**Conclusion**

Verizon Wireless has worked diligently to identify the ideal location and design for a camouflaged wireless facility to serve the Westchester area. The Approved Facility is consistent with all Code requirements and meets all findings for issuance of a conditional use permit. It also represents the least intrusive means to address a significant gap in Verizon Wireless coverage. Bringing improved Verizon Wireless service to this area is essential to reliable communications with emergency services providers, and to the health, safety, and welfare of residents and visitors in the surrounding community. We strongly encourage you to affirm the Zoning Administrator’s approval and deny the appeal.

Very truly yours,

Paul B. Albritton

cc: Ernesto Valazquez, Esq.
Arely Monarez
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August 3, 2016

To: Los Angeles West Area Planning Commission

From: Rahat Moin, Radio Frequency Design Engineer, Verizon Wireless Network Engineering Department

Subject: Statement in Support of Verizon Wireless’s Proposed Telecommunications Facility, 7900-7910 South La Tijera Boulevard / 8124 South Airport Boulevard

Executive Summary

Verizon Wireless has identified a significant gap in its fourth-generation long-term evolution (“LTE”) service in the Westchester area of Los Angeles. This area currently receives inadequate service coverage from the existing Verizon Wireless Hillside facility located 0.75 miles north of the proposed facility, the La Tijera facility 0.9 miles to the east, the Winsford facility 0.5 miles to the south, the LAX facility 0.7 miles to the southwest and the 80th Street facility 1.1 miles to the west. A recently-approved Verizon Wireless facility, Naylor, will be located 0.7 miles northwest of the Proposed Facility.

As a result of the distance of existing facilities and demands on the existing network, there is an absence of LTE in-building service coverage in the Westchester area. Further, accelerated growth in voice and data usage by Verizon Wireless customers has increased the demand on the existing Verizon Wireless network in a manner that compromises network accessibility and reliability. This accelerating growth in demand will soon lead to capacity exhaustion of the nearby Verizon Wireless facility serving much of the gap area. Verizon Wireless is expanding its fourth-generation LTE service in Los Angeles. To meet demand, Verizon Wireless’s existing 3G network will be replaced with the more efficient and higher-speed fourth-generation technology. The majority of Verizon Wireless’s new 4G service must be provided using AWS Spectrum, which requires facilities closer together and closer to the end user in order to provide adequate LTE service.

The coverage gap and capacity gap described below constitute the “significant gap” Verizon Wireless seeks to serve (the “Significant Gap”). To provide adequate LTE coverage and avoid further degradation of Verizon Wireless service in the Westchester area, the Significant Gap must be remedied through construction of new infrastructure, in this case, a camouflaged treepole facility at 7900-710 South La Tijera Boulevard / 8124 South Airport Boulevard (the “Proposed Facility”).
Coverage Gap

Verizon Wireless is experiencing a gap in LTE in-building coverage roughly bounded by West 78th Street to the north, Osage Avenue to the east, West Manchester Avenue to the south and Truxton Avenue to the west. Additionally, there is a lack of LTE in-vehicle coverage on certain local roadways, including a 0.4 mile stretch of Airport Boulevard north of La Tijera Boulevard. A graphic description of the current Coverage Gap is shown in the map below. The Proposed Facility will provide new reliable LTE service to an area of approximately 1.1 square miles and a population of 21,780 residents.

Coverage plot maps like that below provide important information regarding the anticipated level of LTE signal, and therefore the projected coverage provided by a site at a given location. The areas in green reflect good coverage that meets or exceed thresholds to provide consistent and reliable network coverage in homes and in vehicles. The areas in yellow and pink depict decreasing levels of coverage, respectively, with yellow areas generally representing reliable in-vehicle coverage, and pink areas depicting poor service areas with marginal coverage unsuitable for in-vehicle use. Areas in white receive unreliable service levels. The coverage map includes a depiction of service to be provided by the recently-approved Naylor facility.

Current LTE Coverage Map
Capacity Gap

The identified gap area is served by the existing Verizon Wireless Hillside, La Tijera, Winsford, LAX and 80th Street facilities, and will receive service from the recently-approved Naylor facility. This is apparent in the following best server plot. Best server plots depict the dominant signal provided by each nearby Verizon Wireless facility. Signal from these facilities is depicted in a different color.

The closest existing facility to the Proposed Facility, Winsford, serves a large area of the gap including the location of the Proposed Facility. The Proposed Facility is located such that all three of its antenna sectors will provide coverage to the gap area, substantially relieving the Winsford facility north-facing antenna sector which is approaching capacity exhaustion as well as sectors of other nearby facilities serving the gap area.

Current Best Server Plot

At times of high traffic volume, the coverage area of surrounding Verizon Wireless facilities shrinks to accommodate an increasing number of mobile devices closer to that facility. As a result, the Coverage Gap area is actually enlarged during times of high customer usage. In addition, the volume of voice and data services used by Verizon Wireless customers has been increasing rapidly over time, nearly doubling every year.¹ Verizon Wireless has modified its existing facilities in an effort to maximize the capacity available by adding AWS

service; however, as shown in the graphs below, increased demand for voice and data services is projected to outstrip the capacity of the existing Verizon Wireless Winsford facility antenna sector serving the gap area in 2018.

The below graph show the increased usage over the last year as well as predicted usage through 2018 for the existing Winsford facility north-facing antenna sector serving much of the gap area. FDV (Forward Data Volume) is the total volume of data the sector is carrying. By comparing the trend line of increasing usage (orange line) with the absolute maximum capacity throughput and spectrum availability of this existing facility (red line), Verizon Wireless RF engineering demonstrates that this antenna sector serving much of the gap area will reach capacity exhaustion in early 2018. Capacity exhaustion severely compromises the Verizon Wireless network serving the Westchester area, leading to call failures and slow data speeds (the “Capacity Gap”).

**Capacity Graphs**

**Existing Winsford Facility**

**North-Facing Antenna Sector**

**Conclusion**

As cellular networks mature, distant sites must be supplemented with more sites closer to customers, in large measure due to the increase in usage of the network. Certain fourth-generation technologies (AWS) used by Verizon Wireless require facilities closer to customers and this technology cannot be provided by the current distant sites. These coverage and capacity demands have resulted in the Significant Gap in Verizon Wireless LTE service in the Westchester area. Verizon Wireless must deploy the Proposed Facility to provide the LTE in-building service coverage required by customers and to avoid further degradation of its network in the area of the identified Significant Gap.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or comments regarding Verizon Wireless's Proposed Facility.

Respectfully submitted,

Rahat Moin

RF Design Engineer
June 3, 2016

West Los Angeles Area Planning Commission
City of Los Angeles
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Re: 452 Supporters for Verizon Wireless Facility
7900-7910 South La Tijera Boulevard / 8124 South Airport Boulevard

Dear Commissioners:

I am the Verizon Wireless Marketing Director over the team that maintains and manages all data and information messages that are sent to Verizon Wireless customers in California. In connection with the application referred to above, Verizon Wireless arranged for a text message to be sent to customers with billing addresses within the ZIP code 90045 in the Westchester area of West Los Angeles. The entire text message sent reads as follows:

Reply YES to this text message to show your support for improved Verizon Wireless service in the Westchester area of Los Angeles. Add a message to tell the City that you support a faux pine tree wireless facility at 7910 S. La Tijera Blvd. Include your email address for meeting updates.

The text message above was sent on May 23, 2016. As of May 31, 2016, we have received 452 affirmative text message responses indicating support for the proposed facility and 15 respondents opposed. Text messages received confirmed the need to provide improved Verizon Wireless service in Westchester area of West Los Angeles. Samples of the text messages of support received from Verizon Wireless customers appear on the attached pages.

I am available to verify the above information as you may require.

Sincerely,

Jeremy McCarty
Director
Customer Relationship Management

Attachment
Sample Text Messages of Support for Verizon Wireless Facility
7900-7910 South La Tijera Boulevard / 8124 South Airport Boulevard

I also support the faux pine tree wireless facility

I support better service

I support the new tower

Pls support he paid pine tree facility as Verizon service in Westchester area not good and needs improvement. TY

Too many calls are being dropped

Westchester is in dire need of better cell reception and I completely support a new cell tower on LaTijera Blvd.

Yes - I absolutely support a faux pine tree in Westchester to improve wireless service!!

YES - I support a faux pine tree wireless facility at 7910 S. La Tijera Blvd.

YES I support a faux pine tree wireless facility at 7910 S. La Tijera Blvd.

Yes I support a Verizon wireless facility being installed at 7910 South LA Tijera Blvd.

YES I support this facility!

YES PLEASE

Yes please put a wireless facility.

YES this is badly needed!

Yes we strongly need it.

Yes yes yes

Yes, better service today!!!!!!!

Yes, City of Los Angeles the people of Westchester want faster service. Please allow a faux pine tree wireless facility at 7910 S La Tijera Blvd

Yes, I support a faux pine tree wireless facility at 7910 S. La Tijera Blvd.

Yes, I support improved Verizon wireless service in Westchester.
Yes, I support the improvement of Verizon service in the Westchester area.

Yes, I support Verizon for better wireless service

Yes, I would like better coverage in my local area from my provider VZW

Yes, it would great.

Yes, please improve service, if it takes a faux pine tree then that is fine!!

Yes, please use faux pine trees

Yes, PLEASE. I would love better service, who wouldn't?

YES, The Westchester area of Los Angeles needs a faux pine tree wireless facility at 7910 So. La Tijera Blvd.

Yes, we support the faux pine tree wireless facility at 7910 S LA Tijera Blvd.

YES!! I support a faux pine tree wireless facility at 7810 La Tijera Blvd

Yes!! We need a faux pine tree for improved service.

Yes. Reception needs GREAT improvement.

YES. I support the faux pine tree

Yes. Add a tree or whatever is needed to make the service better. It is horrible right now.

YES. Better reception means better service and more tax revenue for the city!

YES. Currently have 2G service at my home, and frequently drop calls (or have them go direct to voicemail).

YES. I support the installation of faux trees for better service in Westchester.

Yes. I support the new facility at 7910 S La Tijera

Yes. I would be in favor of improving Verizon Wireless service in Westchester area.

Yes. I would like to get rid of my landline but can not because I can't get good cell service in my home. I support better cell service in my area.

YES. Please add cell tower, we're in a dead zone today and can't receive calls.
Yes. Service sucks here make it happen

Yes. I support a faux pine tree wireless facility!

Yes. There is no reason we should NOT improve our cellular service in this area. It is important to our overall safety.

Yes. We desperately need this facility ASAP.

YES...we get almost zero reception at our home.

SI SENOR
Verizon Wireless
Alternatives Analysis
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August 4, 2016

Summary of Site Evaluations
Conducted by Wireless 1 Consulting Services, Inc.
Compiled by Mackenzie & Albritton LLP
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Map of Alternatives
I. Executive Summary

Verizon Wireless seeks to fill a significant gap in its coverage and network capacity in the Westchester area of Los Angeles. Based on a review of alternatives as set forth in the following analysis, Verizon Wireless believes that concealing antennas in a stealth treepole facility (the “Proposed Facility”) constitutes the least intrusive alternative to provide service to the identified gap based on the values expressed in the Los Angeles Municipal Code (the “Code”).

II. Significant Gap

There is a significant gap in Verizon Wireless coverage and network capacity in the Westchester area of Los Angeles. In-building service coverage is lacking in this area, which is composed primarily of residential areas. Further, Verizon Wireless facilities serving much of the gap area area are nearing capacity exhaustion, and Verizon Wireless must place an additional facility in the vicinity of the Proposed Facility to provide new coverage and relieve existing antenna sectors to ensure the reliability of the network. The identified “significant gap” in network coverage is more fully described in the Statement of Verizon Wireless RF Engineer Rahat Moin.

III. Methodology

Once a significant gap has been determined, Verizon Wireless seeks to identify a location and design that will provide required coverage through the “least intrusive means” based upon the values expressed by local regulations. In addition to seeking the “least intrusive” alternative, sites proposed by Verizon Wireless must be feasible. In this regard, Verizon Wireless reviews the radio frequency propagation, elevation, grading requirements, height of any existing structures, available electrical and telephone utilities, access, available ground space, zoning and other critical factors such as a willing landlord in completing its site analysis.

IV. Analysis

Collocation Review

Verizon Wireless first sought to identify existing wireless facilities that could potentially serve as a collocation facility to serve the Significant Gap, reviewing the following existing wireless facility.

1. AT&T Facility
   Address: 8110 Airport Boulevard
   Elevation: 105 feet
   Zoning: C-2 Commercial

Verizon Wireless considered collocation on this building that currently supports small two-foot long AT&T antennas concealed within the top portion of decorative columns on the building façade at approximately 38 feet. When approached by Verizon Wireless, the property owner indicated they were not interested in placement of antennas on the roof of the building. A Verizon Wireless architectural and engineering (A&E) team reviewed concealment of new panel antennas within unused decorative columns on the building. Two-foot antennas are inadequate for the LTE technology used by Verizon Wireless, and the Proposed Facility requires six-foot antennas to serve the Significant Gap. The A&E team determined that due to the required six-foot antenna length and also the width of panel antennas, concealment within the decorative columns of this building would require placement of antennas further down the columns, well below the 36 foot antenna centerline required to serve the Significant Gap. In addition, further down the columns there are structural tiebacks for the window curtain wall that cannot be removed, and the A&E team determined these would cause passive interference modulation compromising signal propagation from antennas. The A&E team found that concealment within the decorative columns is infeasible. Lacking the ability to locate on the roof or sides of this building, this is not a feasible alternative to the Proposed Facility.
**Rooftop Facilities Permitted by Right**

Lacking a feasible collocation opportunity, Verizon Wireless next reviewed the area for buildings at least 40 feet in height in commercial zones where a rooftop wireless facility would be permitted by right. The four commercially zoned properties identified are reviewed in this analysis as Alternatives 1, 2, 3 and 6, and the tallest of these buildings, reviewed as Alternative 1, is 38 feet in height. No buildings at least 40 feet in height were identified on commercially-zoned properties in the area.

**New Monopole Facilities**

Verizon Wireless next reviewed the area for properties where a new wireless facility can be placed with a conditional use permit, reviewing the following seven locations not in residential use. On these properties, there are no buildings of sufficient height to elevate antennas to the centerline of 36 feet required to serve the Significant Gap. Verizon Wireless reviewed these locations for placement of a new monopole to support antennas.
Verizon Wireless proposes to place its antennas on a 45 foot tower disguised as a pine tree. Antennas will be concealed within faux foliage and branches, and branches will extend an additional five feet above the tower, providing a realistic tapered appearance. Antennas will be covered with pine needle socks for further concealment, and the pole will be covered in bark cladding. The treepole will be placed adjacent to an approximately 143 square foot lease area which will contain radio cabinets and a standby generator to provide continued service in case of emergency. The lease area is located in an unused landscaped area of the property next to several established trees and approximately 250 feet from the nearest intersection, La Tijera Boulevard and Airport Boulevard, to the north. The lease area will be surrounded by an eight foot CMU wall to be covered with English ivy. No parking spaces will be removed for the Proposed Facility.

The treepole design allows Verizon Wireless to mount its antennas at a centerline of 36 feet, the minimum height necessary to serve the Significant Gap, while minimizing visual impacts. As shown in the following coverage maps, the Proposed Facility is placed in an ideal location such that all three of its antenna sectors will provide new in-building coverage and offload network traffic from the antenna sector serving much of the gap area that is nearing capacity exhaustion, providing required coverage and network capacity to serve the Significant Gap. This is Verizon Wireless’s preferred location for the Proposed Facility.
Coverage Provided by Proposed Facility

A description of coverage maps and best server plots is contained in the Statement of Verizon Wireless Radio Frequency Engineer Rahat Moin.

1
Verizon Wireless considered placement of a new monopole on this property located north of the Proposed Facility property across La Tijera Boulevard. Aside from the building on the property, there is a parking lot, which Verizon Wireless did not consider due to removal of parking spaces, leaving only a small area of grass located on the north side of the property immediately adjacent to the intersection of Airport Boulevard and Flight Avenue. Placement of a monopole wireless facility on the grass area would present substantial visual impacts due to the lack of landscaping and screening trees nearby and immediate proximity of an intersection. Given these visual impacts, this cannot be considered a less intrusive alternative to the Proposed Facility.
### 4. Westchester Church

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>5925 West 79th Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>105 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>R-2 Two-Family Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verizon Wireless reviewed this church property located 450 north of the Proposed Facility. Verizon Wireless representatives sent a letter of interest to church administration regarding placement of a wireless facility at this location and followed up with telephone calls, but church administration did not respond. Due to lack of landlord interest, this is not a feasible alternative to the Proposed Facility.
Verizon Wireless considered placement of a new monopole on this property located northeast of the Proposed Facility property on the opposing corner of the intersection of La Tijera Boulevard and Airport Boulevard. Aside from the building on the property which encloses electrical transmission equipment, there is a small parking area, which Verizon Wireless did not consider as it is used for City access and vehicles, and an area of grass located on the south side of the property immediately adjacent to the intersection of La Tijera Boulevard and Airport Boulevard. Placement of a monopole wireless facility on the grass area would present substantial visual impacts due to location within 130 feet of the intersection. Given these visual impacts, this cannot be considered to be a less intrusive alternative to the Proposed Facility.
6. Carousel School
- Address: 7899 South La Tijera Boulevard
- Elevation: 105 feet
- Zoning: C-2 Commercial

Verizon Wireless considered placement of a new monopole on this property located north of the Proposed Facility property across La Tijera Boulevard. Aside from the school building on the property, there is a small parking area on the north side of the property, which Verizon Wireless did not consider due to removal of parking spaces, and a playground located on the south side of the property immediately adjacent to the intersection of La Tijera Boulevard and West 79th Street. Verizon Wireless determined that there are no unused portions of the property available for placement of a monopole. Lacking available ground space, this is not a feasible alternative to the Proposed Facility.
7. Carousel School Infant Center and Preschool
   Address: 8333 Airport Boulevard
   Elevation: 105 feet
   Zoning: R-2 Two-Family Residential

Verizon Wireless reviewed this property located 300 feet south of the Proposed Facility on Airport Boulevard with several buildings occupied by businesses including the Carousel School Infant Center and Preschool. There is a parking lot to the rear of the property west of the buildings, which Verizon Wireless did not consider due to removal of parking spaces, and a landscaped area along Airport Boulevard. Due to the required front yard setback of a minimum of approximately 15 feet in this R-2 zone, there is insufficient ground space between the Airport Boulevard right-of-way and existing buildings for placement of a treepole wireless facility and equipment area. Due to removal and parking spaces and lack of ground space, this is not a feasible alternative to the Proposed Facility.
Verizon Wireless reviewed this Los Angeles Unified School District property located 1,000 feet northwest of the Proposed Facility. In 2009, the Los Angeles Board of Education adopted a resolution opposing location of wireless towers in close proximity to schools. Lacking a willing landlord, this is not a feasible alternative to the Proposed Facility.
Small Cell Network Alternative

At the City’s request, Verizon Wireless evaluated development of a network of small wireless facilities placed on utility poles in the right-of-way within the Significant Gap. Verizon Wireless RF engineers concluded that a minimum of eight such small cells in residential areas would be required to serve the gap. Generally, small cell networks are used in areas of high capacity demand, such as the City’s urban core, or complicated topographic coverage areas unlike the flat coverage area to be served by the Proposed Facility. Each small cell has a limited coverage area due to the smaller antennas and radio equipment used, resulting in dead spots where the street layout dictates excess distance between small cells across City blocks. In this case, a small cell network would require installation of antennas on a minimum of eight utility poles as well as pole-mounted and ground-mounted equipment cabinets. The gap area is comprised almost entirely of residentially-used properties. The individual aesthetic and environmental impact of each of the eight small cells in sidewalks in front of homes would be likely more intrusive on immediate neighbors than the minimal impacts of the Proposed Facility. Given the potential increased impacts due to multiple locations, a small cell network cannot be considered a less intrusive and feasible alternative to the Proposed Facility.

Small Cell Network Alternative
(Eight Small Cell Facilities in Right-of-Way)
Conclusion

Verizon Wireless has reviewed eight alternatives and a small cell network to serve a Significant Gap in the Westchester area of Los Angeles. Based upon the standards identified in the Los Angeles Municipal Code, the Proposed Facility – with antennas concealed in a tower resembling a pine tree – clearly constitutes the least intrusive location for Verizon Wireless’s facility under the values expressed by City of Los Angeles regulations.
1. AT&T Collocation
2. Proposed Facility
3. Airport Counseling Service
4. Westchester Church
5. LADWP Distributing Station No. 58
6. Carousel School
7. Carousel School Infant Center and Preschool
8. Westport Heights Elementary School