

## IX. INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

### INTENDED USE OF THE MEIR

As defined by Section 15362 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Environmental Impact Report is an informational document which will inform public agency decisionmakers and the public of the significant environmental effect of a project, identify ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project. Because the proposed Project will require approval of various discretionary actions by the City of Los Angeles, the proposed Project is subject to CEQA. The LADCP has been designated as the Lead Agency for the proposed Project under CEQA. Under CEQA Article 11, there are many variations of EIRs, as all environmental documents are intended to be tailored to different situations and project conditions.

The proposed Project at the Project Site includes a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change. While a specific development proposal has not yet been determined for the Project Site, a range of potential future development scenarios that will fit within the proposed Plan Amendment and Zone Change has been determined. Due to the nature of the proposed Project scenarios, it was determined by the Lead Agency that a Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) would be the most appropriate environmental document.

The MEIR (CEQA Section 15175) is intended to identify potential mitigation measures early to streamline later environmental analysis. As part of this Draft Master Environmental Impact Report (Draft MEIR), a Project Area Initial Study (attached in **Section IX**) is proposed to be utilized for subsequent projects if this MEIR is certified. At the time that a subsequent project is proposed at the Project Site or Add Area, an Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) must be filed with the LADCP. Following the filing of an EAF, LADCP will utilize the Project Area Initial Study to determine whether the subsequent project is in conformance with the analysis provided in the MEIR and whether the subsequent project is within the scope of the MEIR. If the subsequent project is determined to be outside of the scope of the MEIR, either a Negative Declaration or a Focused Environmental Impact Report will be required.

After completion of the Project Area Initial Study, LADCP will determine all feasible mitigation measures identified in the MEIR that should be adopted as part of the approval of the subsequent project. Prior to a public hearing on the subsequent project, LADCP will provide notice of its intent to utilize the MEIR for the subsequent project. The content of this notice will include, but is not limited to, a brief description of the subsequent project; dates of the review period and locations where the MEIR can be reviewed; notice of any pending public meetings or hearings regarding the subsequent project; a list of significant environmental impacts anticipated as a result of the subsequent project; and the mitigation measures identified by LADCP to be adopted as part of the subsequent project approval. At the time of subsequent project approval, the Lead Agency will recertify the MEIR and make a formal finding of conformance of the subsequent project with the MEIR and make the identified mitigation measures a condition of the subsequent project approval.

**CITY OF LOS ANGELES**

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK  
 ROOM 395, CITY HALL  
 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT  
 INITIAL STUDY AND CHECKLIST**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15063

<b>LEAD CITY AGENCY</b> Los Angeles Department of City Planning	<b>ADDRESS</b> 200 N. Spring St., Room 763 Los Angeles, CA 90012	<b>DATE</b>
--	---	-------------

<b>CONTACT PERSON</b>	<b>TELEPHONE NUMBER</b> (213)978-1355
-----------------------	--

**RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES**

**PROJECT LOCATION**

<b>PROJECT TITLE/NO.</b>	<b>CASE NO.</b>
--------------------------	-----------------

<b>PREVIOUS ACTIONS CASE NO.</b>	<b>" DOES have significant changes from previous actions.</b> <b>" DOES NOT have significant changes from previous actions.</b>
----------------------------------	--

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:**

<b>COMMUNITY PLAN AREA</b>	<b>AREA PLANNING COMMISSION</b>	<b>STATUS:</b> <b>" PRELIMINARY</b> <b>" PROPOSED</b> <b>" ADOPTED</b> date  <b>" DOES CONFORM TO PLAN</b>  <b>" DOES NOT CONFORM TO PLAN</b>
<b>EXISTING ZONING</b>	<b>MAX. DENSITY ZONING</b>	
<b>PLANNED LAND USE &amp; ZONE</b>	<b>MAX. DENSITY PLAN</b>	
<b>SURROUNDING LAND USES</b>	<b>PROJECT DENSITY</b>	

### 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 Resources              | // Air Quality            |
| // Biological Resources          | // Cultural Resources                 | // Geology /Soils         |
| // Hazards & Hazardous Materials | // Hydrology / Water Quality          | // Land Use / Planning    |
| // Mineral Resources             | // Noise                              | // Population / Housing   |
| // Public Services               | // Recreation                         | // Transportation/Traffic |
| // Utilities / Service Systems   | // Mandatory Findings of Significance |                           |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the 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 in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- // I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- // I find that 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 the 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 Master EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier Master EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Signature

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

	Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	---	--	------------------------------	-----------

**I. Aesthetics**

The visual character of the project area is of a major commercial corridor. The range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR proposes to continue the current commercial nature of the area with development of either retail or office buildings. Therefore, the range of development analyzed in the MEIR will not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the project area and surroundings.

There are no natural features, significant views, scenic vistas, or significant scenic resources identified by the Community Plan in the project area. The range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not insert a prominent feature that would alter the existing visual character of the area. The range of development analyzed in the MEIR will not eliminate or substantially alter any natural features in the area.

The range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not create or substantially change light or glare projecting into or out of the project area that would adversely affect day or nighttime views.

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

**II. Agricultural Resources**

No Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency are located on the Project Site and Add Area. None of the development scenarios would result in other changes to the existing environment that would result in the indirect conversion of farmland. The development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR would not conflict with existing agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the range of development analyzed in the MEIR would not result in a significant impact to agricultural resources.

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	"	"	"	"	"
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	"	"	"	"	"

	Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	"	"	"	"	"

**III. Air Quality**

**Construction Phase Impacts**

Estimated daily construction emissions for development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR are anticipated to exceed the SCAQMD threshold for ROG during the finishing phase and PM10 during the Grading/Excavation Phase. The development scenarios analyzed could result in significant impacts to air quality during construction activities. However, with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, including SCAQMD Rule 403, will reduce any construction air quality impacts to a less than significant level.

**Operational Phase Impacts**

Long-term Project emissions would be generated by both stationary and mobile sources in the project area. The development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR are anticipated to exceed thresholds of significance established by the SCAQMD for ROG, NOx, and CO. After implementation of mitigation measures proposed in the MEIR, daily operational emissions would still exceed SCAQMD thresholds of significance for CO, ROG, and NOx. However, the state one- and eight-hour carbon monoxide (CO) standards by which local impacts are measured would not be exceeded at worst-case receptor locations. Therefore, the range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to air quality during the operational phase due to exceedance of thresholds of significance established for ROG, NOx, and CO.

**Consistency with the Air Quality Management Plan**

The air quality analysis conducted for development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR indicates that the range of development would not exacerbate existing violations of the State CO concentration standard and would therefore comply with Consistency Criterion 1 of the AQMP. The range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR do not exceed growth projections in the General Plan and is therefore considered consistent with Consistency Criterion 2 of the AQMP. Therefore, the development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR is considered consistent with the AQMP.

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	"	"	"	"	"
---	---	---	---	---	---

	Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	"	"	"	"	"
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	"	"	"	"	"
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	"	"	"	"	"
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	"	"	"	"	"

**IV. Biological Resources**

Due to the existing urban development on and around the Project Site, the almost one hundred percent impervious nature of the Project Site and Add Area, and the length of time that these conditions have existed, there are no known or identified biological resources, including endangered or threatened species, at the Project Site or Add Area. Therefore, the range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not result in habitat modification, directly or indirectly, of identified candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

The City of Los Angeles Citywide General Plan Framework EIR does not identify the project area as a Biological Resource Area, an area known for providing habitat for threatened or endangered species. Further, the project area is not located within an existing or proposed Significant Ecological Area (SEA) known for providing habitat and movement corridors for both endangered and non-endangered species. There are no riparian habitat nor protected wetlands identified in the project area. Therefore, the range of development analyzed in the MEIR will not conflict with adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans. Additionally, proposed development scenarios will not interfere substantially with the movement of fish or wildlife species.

There are no oak trees located on the Project Site or Add Area; therefore development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not conflict with any local plans or preservation policies protecting biological resources.

	Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	"	"	"	"	"
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	"	"	"	"	"
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	"	"	"	"	"
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	"	"	"	"	"
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	"	"	"	"	"
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	"	"	"	"	"

	Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	---	--	------------------------------	-----------

**V. Cultural Resources**

The Project Site and Add Area are fully developed and there are no known or identified cultural resources on the Project Site or Add Area. Construction of the proposed development scenarios is not anticipated to disturb any human remains including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. Therefore, the development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR would not result in a substantial adverse change to the significance of an historical, archaeological, or paleontological resource.

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**

The Project Site and Add Area are not located within an established Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone for surface fault rupture hazards. Based on available geologic data, active or potentially active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are not known to be located directly beneath or projecting toward the project area. The project area could be subjected to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake however, this hazard is common in Southern California and can be mitigated to a less than significant level.

Although the most recent depth to groundwater beneath the project area is estimated between approximately 41 to 66 feet, water levels could reach the historic high of 35 to 40 feet in the future. Based on historic groundwater levels in nearby wells, there is a potential for shallow groundwater to have an adverse impact on the proposed development scenarios. With the incorporation of mitigation measures, this potential will be reduced to a less than significant level.

	Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	---	--	------------------------------	-----------

According to the California Division of Mines and Geology, the southern portion of the Project Site is located within an area identified as having a potential for liquefaction. The northern portion of the Project Site and the entire Add Area are not located within an area identified as having a potential for liquefaction. As a result, a site specific liquefaction analysis must be completed prior to completion of the proposed Project. With the incorporation of mitigation measures, the proposed Project will result in a less than significant impact due to liquefaction.

According to the City and County of Los Angeles Safety Element, the Project Site and Add Area are not within an area identified as having a potential for slope instability. The project area is not located within an area of potential inundation by earthquake induced dam failure, a coastal area, or an area prone to flooding. Therefore, the range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not result in a significant impact to the project area due to tsunamis, seiches, and flooding.

The Project Site and Add Area are not within an area of known subsidence associated with fluid withdrawal,(groundwater or petroleum), peat oxidation, or hydrocompaction.

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	"	"	"	"	"
i) 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.	"	"	"	"	"
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	"	"	"	"	"
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	"	"	"	"	"
iv) Landslides?	"	"	"	"	"
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	"	"	"	"	"
c) 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?	"	"	"	"	"

	Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) 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?	"	"	"	"	"
e) 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. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Due to the historically industrial nature of the project area, the use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials has been identified at the Project Site and Add Area. Contaminated soils and groundwater are not known to exist on the Project Site and Add Area from previously reported accidents and were not identified during various Phase I investigations conducted on the Project Site and Add Area.

A regulatory agency database search identified hazardous substance and/or hazardous waste sites within the ASTM specified distances of the Project Site and Add Area. However, all cases identified are either closed or under remediation and are unlikely to affect the Project Site and Add Area.<sup>142</sup> With proper site investigation of the Project Site and Add Area with respect to possible soil contamination prior to demolition and adherence to code requirements, the proposed Project at the Project Site and development scenarios analyzed for the Add Area will result in a less than significant impact to soil contamination.

The range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment due to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials. However, due to the age of the existing structures on the Project Site, the potential for asbestos and lead-based paint does exist. A survey of asbestos containing materials and lead based paint was not included in the scope of the Phase I Environmental Assessment conducted on the Project Site. The demolition of any structures with asbestos containing materials or lead-based paint would have the potential to release these substances if they are not properly stabilized or

---

<sup>142</sup>Studies provided by American Environmental Specialist, Co. include Phase I Environmental Site Assessment - Litton Guidance and Control Facility, October 7, 1996; Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Update - Litton Guidance and Control Facility, April 9, 1999; Phase I Environmental Assessment - Southeast Corner of Prairie Street and Corbin Avenue, October 7, 1996; and Phase I Environmental Assessment Update - Proposed New Parcel Southeast Corner of Prairie Street and Corbin Avenue, March 10, 1999.

	Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	---	--	------------------------------	-----------

removed prior to demolition activity. Therefore, the Project could result in a significant impact to hazardous materials due to the occurrence of asbestos containing materials and lead-based paint on site. With the incorporation of mitigation measures to appropriately stabilize and/or remove asbestos containing materials and lead-based paints proposed in the MEIR, the Project would result in a less than significant impact to hazardous materials.

The project area is not located with an airport land use plan or near an air strip. Therefore, development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area due to the proximity to an air strip.

The project area is not located within one quarter mile of an existing or proposed school facility. Therefore, the development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not result in a significant impact to school facilities or emergency response plans due to hazardous materials.

Development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not result in the impairment of an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan.

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 revised school?	"	"	"	"	"
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	"	"	"	"	"
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	"	"	"	"	"

	Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	"	"	"	"	"
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	"	"	"	"	"
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	"	"	"	"	"

**VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality**

The proposed development scenarios will result in an increase in the amount of impervious surface on the Project Site due to the removal of a small stand of trees located on the Project Site. However, due to the fully-developed and impervious nature of the rest of the project area, the removal of this small piece of undeveloped land will only increase the downstream flow by approximately 0.4 percent of the existing capacity. Therefore, the proposed Project will not result in a significant impact to hydrology in the area based on alteration of the movement or quantity of surface water sufficient to produce a substantial change in the current or direction of water flow.

The range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not substantially change the existing drainage pattern of the site or area such that flooding or substantial erosion would result. Additionally, development will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR would not result in a substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume.

The project area is currently located within Flood Zone X(No Shading) which is defined as being outside both the 100- and 500-year flood plains. Therefore, the range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not place housing or other structures within a 100-year flood zone.

	Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Due to the location of the project area inland, the potential for risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow is considered low. Therefore, the Project at the Project Site and development scenarios analyzed at the Add Area will result in a less than significant to hydrology.</p>					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	"	"	"	"	"
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	"	"	"	"	"
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	"	"	"	"	"
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	"	"	"	"	"
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	"	"	"	"	"
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	"	"	"	"	"
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	"	"	"	"	"

	Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	"	"	"	"	"
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	"	"	"	"	"
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	"	"	"	"	"

**IX. Land Use and Planning**

Zoning

All of the anticipated commercial and residential uses in the proposed development scenarios are allowable under the C2-1 zoning designation. Based on the size of the Project Site and type of proposed development, the maximum yield of floor area on the Project Site is approximately 1,668,000 square feet, or an FAR of 1.08:1 which does not exceed the allowable C2-1 FAR of 1.5:1. The proposed six story height is allowed within the C2-1 zone. Due to the existing office-related nature of the Project Site, a Zone Change from MR2-1 to C2-1 would not result in a legal non conforming use on the Project Site and would not create a substantial conflict with relevant zoning regulations.

The Add Area properties cover 673,437 square feet (15.4 acres) of land area, which allows for a floor area of approximately 1,010,156 square feet. The maximum yield of the development scenarios at the Add Area is approximately 586,000 square feet of floor area, or an FAR of 0.58:1 which does not exceed the allowable C2-1 FAR of 1.5:1. The proposed six story height is allowed within the C2-1 zone. With the approval of a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change, the development scenarios analyzed will result in a less than significant impact as a result of inconsistencies with the existing and proposed zoning.

Due to the industrial nature of the Add Area, existing land uses in the Add Area including manufacturing and public storage would be considered legal, non-conforming uses. If the requested Zone Change and General Plan Amendment are approved, this land use inconsistency is considered a significant impact before mitigation. However, with incorporation of the proposed mitigation measure, the development scenarios analyzed for the Add Area will result in a less than significant land uses impact due to inconsistencies with the Zoning and General Plan designations.

<b>Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	--	---	---	------------------

Framework Element

The proposed Zone Change and General Plan Amendment would result in a decrease of 35.5 acres, or 0.1 percent, of industrially designated land on a Citywide basis and a corresponding increase of 35.5 acres, or 0.2 percent, in commercially designated land on a Citywide basis. The scale of change in land use designations is not considered significant by itself. With adoption of the General Plan Amendment from Light Industrial to Community Commercial, the proposed Zone Change would be considered consistent. Therefore, the range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not result in a significant impact due to an inconsistency between the Zoning and Land Use designation.

*Land Use Compatibility*

A land use compatibility analysis concluded that the proposed residential and commercial uses would not be considered to conflict with the existing commercial type land uses located to the south and east of the Project Site. The properties zoned and designated for Light Industrial uses to the west and north of the Project Site consist of uses that, with the exception of the tennis center and skate park, are fully contained within their respective buildings. These uses do not generate potentially objectionable noise, odors, or smoke. As a result, although these properties are zoned for industrial uses, due to the office nature of activities on the properties, they are considered to be compatible with adjacent, commercially zoned uses. Thus, a significant impact to land use compatibility at the Project Site is not anticipated from off-site uses. Therefore, the range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR would not create a significant impact to land use compatibility.

Land use compatibility issues are related to potential conflicts of the Add Area with existing off-site land uses and potential conflicts of existing off-site uses with future on-site uses. A land use compatibility analysis for the Add Area concluded that the proposed residential and commercial uses would not conflict with the existing commercial type land uses located to the north and east of the Add Area. The properties zoned and designated for Light Industrial uses to the west and south of the Add Area which are fully contained within their respective buildings and do not generate potentially objectionable noise, odors, or smoke. As a result, these uses are considered to be compatible with the proposed adjacent commercially designated properties. A significant impact to land use compatibility at the Project Site and Add Area is not anticipated from off-site uses.

General Plan Elements

The proposed Zone Change and General Plan Amendment at the Project Site and Add Area would result in a decrease of approximately 50.0 acres, or 4.4 percent, of industrially designated land and a corresponding increase of 35.5 acres, or 8.2 percent, of commercially designated land within the Chatsworth-Porter Ranch Community Plan which is not considered significant by itself. Therefore, the range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will result in a less than significant impact due to an inconsistency between Zoning and Land Use designation.

Although the proposed General Plan Amendment will result in a reduction of industrially designated land, lands on three sides of the General Plan Amendment Request area are already zoned, designated, and developed with commercial uses; the General Plan Amendment Request area is separated from other industrially designated lands by Corbin Avenue; and non-industrial uses have previously been permitted within the project vicinity (Homeplace Retirement facility, public storage, skate park, tennis facility). The General Plan Amendment is requested because it will encourage consistency between the existing land use designation and the existing use of the property. Further, with coordination of land use designation and use for commercial purposes, the General

	Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	---	--	------------------------------	-----------

Plan Amendment could encourage the conservation of other industrial lands in the Community Plan that are actually utilized for industrial purposes currently. Therefore, the proposed General Plan Amendment and Zone Change will result in a less than significant impact to the Land Use Element due to an incompatibility with land uses in the area.

The range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not conflict with any applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations including Community Plans and Regional Plans. Further, development will not conflict with applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	---	--	------------------------------	-----------

**X. Mineral Resources**

There are no known or identified mineral resources located at the Project Site. Therefore, the range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will result in a less than significant impact to mineral resources.

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	"	"	"	"	"
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	"	"	"	"	"

**XI. Noise**

**Construction Phase Impacts**

Construction of the range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the project area on an intermittent basis. The increase in noise would likely result in a temporary annoyance to nearby sensitive receptors. However, the incremental increase in noise levels is less than the significance threshold of a five decibel increase over the existing ambient noise level. Therefore, the range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will result in a less than significant impact to noise levels at sensitive receptors.

**Operational Phase Impacts**

The predominant operational noise source for the development scenarios is vehicular traffic. The incremental increase in the noise level under each development scenario would not be perceptible by the general public and would not exceed the significance threshold determined by the Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Environment for an increase in noise level. Therefore, the range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will result in a less than significant impact to noise levels at sensitive receptors.

	Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	"	"	"	"	"
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	"	"	"	"	"
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	"	"	"	"	"
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	"	"	"	"	"
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	"	"	"	"	"
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	"	"	"	"	"

	Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---	---	--	------------------------------	-----------

**XII. Population and Housing**

The population increase within the Chatsworth - Porter Ranch Community Plan Area that would result from the development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not exceed the Los Angeles Citywide General Plan Framework EIR population projection for the Plan area. Therefore, the range of development options analyzed in the MEIR will not result in a significant impact to population or public services as a result of a population increase.

The increase in housing units within the Chatsworth - Porter Ranch Community Plan Area as a result of the development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not exceed the Los Angeles Citywide General Plan Framework EIR housing projection for the Plan Area. Therefore, the development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not result in a significant impact to housing in the area.

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

<b>Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	--	---	---	------------------

**XIII. Public Services**

Police

The range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR has the potential to increase population in the area by approximately 1,797 residents and approximately 5,089 employees. Based on LAPD staffing requirements, this increase could require the need for approximately seven additional officers. Due to existing understaffed conditions in the Devonshire Area, a potential increase in required officers may result in a significant impact on police services in the project area due to increased staffing needs and delayed response times.

The LAPD has indicated that intersections operating at a LOS of E or F could have a significant adverse impact on police protection services. The range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not increase the number of intersections operating at a LOS of E or F and will not decrease the LOS at intersections already operating at these conditions. Therefore, the development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not result in a significant impact on police services due to intersection conditions.

Based on the development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR, with the incorporation of mitigation measures proposed under the MEIR any potential impacts to police services will be reduced to the greatest extent possible. However, the development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR would result in a significant impact to police protection services.

Fire

A hydraulic analysis was performed on the existing water distribution system, in the vicinity of the proposed development, to simulate additional demands at critical locations in the system. The existing water distribution system is capable of handling a variable amount of additional flow, as determined by the Los Angeles Water Distribution Engineer.

Based on response distance criteria, fire protection of the Project Site would be considered inadequate. However, with incorporation of mitigation measures proposed under the MEIR, any potential impacts due to response time will be mitigated to a less than significant level.

The LAFD has indicated that intersections operating with a Level of Service (LOS) of E or F could have a significant adverse impact on fire protection services. The range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not increase the number of intersections operating at a LOS of E or F. Therefore, with the incorporation of mitigation measures proposed under the MEIR, all fire protection services impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level.

Libraries

The range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR would generate a maximum of 1,797 new residents to 86,531 residents. Based on the current service capacity of the Porter Ranch Library (approximately 100,000 residents), the demand for library services would not exceed the level of service available at the library branch currently serving the project area. Additionally, the Northridge Branch and the Chatsworth Branch Libraries are anticipated to open in late 2003 which will increase the capacity of library services in the project area. Therefore, the development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will result in a less than significant impact to library services in the area.

<b>Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	--	---	---	------------------

Schools

Schools serving the project area include Calahan Elementary School, Nobel Middle School, and Cleveland High School. School service needs are related to the size of the residential population, the geographic area served, and community characteristics. The range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR have the potential to generate a maximum of twenty eight new students.

Both Calahan and Nobel schools are anticipated to have the necessary capacity to accommodate the maximum number of potential students generated by the proposed Project. Cleveland High School is projected to have a population that exceeds its operating capacity. However, as within other LAUSD schools, Cleveland High School could begin to operate on a four-track, year-round school calendar, as opposed to the current one-track, traditional calendar. The four-track, year-round calendar allows for an increase of approximately twenty five percent in the enrollment at a particular school annually. With implementation of the proposed fee mitigation measure, the proposed development scenarios at the Project Site and Add Area will result in a less than significant impact to school services in the area.

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?	"	"	"	"	"
Police protection?	"	"	"	"	"
Schools?	"	"	"	"	"
Parks?	"	"	"	"	"
Other public facilities?	"	"	"	"	"

Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---	--	------------------------------	-----------

**XIV. Recreation**

Currently, there is no open space or parkland on the Project Site or Add Area. Further, there are no existing recreational facilities, active or passive, located on the Project Site or Add Area. The range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR does not include the construction or removal of open space or parkland. Currently, the Chatsworth -Porter Ranch Community Plan Area provides a ratio of 32.5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. As a result of the worst case development scenario analyzed in the MEIR for the Project Site and Add Area, the ratio of acres of parkland per 1,000 residents will be reduced to 31.8. However, this ratio of 31.8 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents is still greater than both the City of Los Angeles requirement of 4 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents and the City of Los Angeles provision of 4.25 acres per 1,000 residents.

Based on the number of recreational facilities available in the project area, the range of development options analyzed in the MEIR will not result in an increased demand on recreational facilities that cannot be absorbed by existing facilities in the area. Further, development analyzed in the MEIR will be required to pay in-lieu park fees, otherwise known as Quimby fees, as required by the City’s Ordinance (No. 141,422) and as set forth in the City’s Zoning Code (Section 17.12). Therefore, the range of development analyzed in the MEIR will not result in a significant impact to recreational facilities in the project area.

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

<b>Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	--	---	---	------------------

**XV. Transportation/Traffic**

The range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR is expected to generate a maximum of 13,136 net new daily trip ends during a typical weekday 24-hour period (6,568 inbound and 6,568 outbound trips). During the AM peak hour, the Project is expected to generate a maximum of 1,091 net new vehicle trips (981 inbound and 110 outbound). During the PM peak hour, the Project is expected to generate a maximum of 1,249 net new vehicle trips (222 inbound and 1,027 outbound).

Thirty nine study intersections were evaluated using the Critical Movement Analysis (CMA) method of analysis which determines Volume-to-Capacity (v/c) ratios on a critical lane basis. A maximum of seventeen of the study intersections are expected to operate at LOS D or better during the AM and/or PM peak hours with the addition of growth in ambient traffic and traffic due to related projects. Twenty two study intersections are anticipated to operate at LOS E or F with the addition of growth in ambient traffic and related projects traffic during peak hours. According to LADOT impact criteria, the range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR would create a significant impact to a maximum of twenty four study intersections, as a result of the worst case scenario Full Project Buildout. Incremental but not significant impacts are noted at the remaining study intersections due to the analyzed development scenarios.

**Congestion Management Plan Traffic Impact Assessment**

The CMP TIA guidelines require that intersection monitoring locations must be examined if the Project will add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak periods. The Project will not add 50 or more trips during the AM or PM peak hours at the CMP monitoring intersections and therefore, no further review of potential impacts to intersection monitoring locations which are part of the CMP highway system is required.

Further, the CMP TIA guidelines require that freeway monitoring locations must be examined if the Project will add 150 or more trips (in either direction) during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours. The Project will not add 150 or more trips (in either direction) during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours at CMP mainline freeway monitoring locations and therefore, no further review of potential impacts to freeway monitoring locations which are part of the CMP highway system is required.

Parking associated with commercial and retail development at the Project Site will adhere to the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed development scenarios will result in a less than significant impact to parking.

The range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will result in significant transportation impacts at a maximum of twenty four of the thirty nine study intersections. Due to differing levels of development between potential development scenarios, differing traffic distribution between potential development scenarios, and the level of development at the time of implementation of a specific mitigation measure, the need for a specific improvement may differ. However, the identified improvement at each intersection will not be different from one development scenario to another.

With the incorporation of mitigation measures, the development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will result in a less than significant impact to traffic and the existing transportation system.

	Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	"	"	"	"	"
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard 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) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	"	"	"	"	"
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	"	"	"	"	"

<b>Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	--	---	---	------------------

**XVI. Utilities and Service Systems**

Electricity

Electricity demand as a result of the proposed development scenarios will increase by approximately 15,624,409 Kwh annually. According to LADWP, the proposed increase will not adversely impact the existing electricity distribution system. Further, the proposed increase will not result in the need for new or major modifications to generation or distribution systems. Therefore, the range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will result in a less than significant impact to the electrical utility in the project area.

Natural Gas

The range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR would increase natural gas demand by approximately 4,162,758 cubic feet monthly. The Southern California Gas Company has indicated that they have adequate supply for estimated demand in the foreseeable future and future service problems are not anticipated. Given the land use intensities proposed for the Project Site, the Gas Company would not require a major modification to the local distribution system. Therefore, the range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not result in a significant impact to natural gas provision.

Water

Domestic water service for the Project Site is anticipated to be provided by the LADWP, the agency that currently provides water service to the area. The range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will increase water demand in the project area by approximately 303,119 gallons per day (339 acre-feet annually). A water supply assessment conducted by the LADWP, indicates that the projected growth in water demand from the development scenarios falls within the range of expected water demand growth within the City. Therefore, the range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will result in a less than significant water supply impact.

Wastewater/Sewers

The project area is currently served by the Tillman Water Reclamation Plant. The range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will increase sewage generation by approximately 276,978 gallons per day (gpd). Based on an operating capacity of 80,000,000 gpd and a daily collection of 40,382,924 gpd in 1990, an increase of approximately 276,978 gpd would not exceed capacity of the Tillman WRP. Therefore, the range of development scenarios will not require expansion or development of new facilities and will not result in a significant impact to regional sewage treatment plants.

According to the City of Los Angeles - Bureau of Engineering, the sewer systems in Nordhoff Street and Corbin Avenue, both contiguous to the Project Site, are anticipated to provide sufficient capacity to adequately convey all tributary flow resulting from the Project Site and Add Area. Therefore, the proposed Project at the Project Site and development scenarios analyzed for the Add Area will result in a less than significant impact to local sewers in the area. However, if development upstream of or within the Add Area does occur, local sewers in Melvin Avenue, Prairie Street, and Shirley Avenue must be studied independently for capacity sufficiency. Therefore, the range of development scenarios analyzed in the MEIR will not result in a significant impact to local sewers.

	Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	"	"	"	"	"
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	"	"	"	"	"
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	"	"	"	"	"
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	"	"	"	"	"
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	"	"	"	"	"
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	"	"	"	"	"
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	"	"	"	"	"

	Potentially Significant Impact and Inconsistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Impact; However, Consistent with MEIR	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance –</b>					
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	"	"	"	"	"
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	"	"	"	"	"
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	"	"	"	"	"