

VI. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

A. EFFECTS NOT FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT

An Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) and Initial Study (IS) were prepared for the Proposed Project. Based on those documents, it was initially determined that the Proposed Project required a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). An MND is permitted when it can be demonstrated that all potential project-related impacts are “less than significant” or can be mitigated to less than significant through project design modifications and/or the implementation of recommended mitigation measures. An MND was prepared and circulated in April 2007. However, comments that were received through the public review of the MND requested the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Consequently, the City and the Applicant agreed that an EIR would be prepared. The scope of this EIR focuses only on those impacts that were determined through the IS, MND, public comments received during the circulation of the MND and Notice of Preparation of an EIR (NOP) and comments received during a Public Scoping Meeting to have a potential significant environmental effect.

Based on the Initial Study, preliminary MND and NOP process, it was determined that implementation of the Proposed Project may, either by itself and/or in conjunction with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development in the project vicinity, have a significant environmental effect in the following areas: Aesthetics/Visual Resources, Air Quality, Geology/Soils, Hazardous Materials/Man-Made Hazards, Water Resources, Land Use/Planning/Urban Decay, Noise, Public Services (Fire and Police), Public Utilities (Solid Waste), and Traffic/Circulation/Access. This EIR includes analysis of the above environmental impacts and recommends mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant impacts.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15128, other possible effects of the Proposed Project, which were not determined to be significant through the Initial Study review, are not discussed in detail in this EIR. Possible effects, which did not warrant detailed analysis, are identified below. The specific issues, as defined by initial study checklist questions or L.A. CEQA Threshold Guide screening criteria¹, are identified, followed by the impact analysis.

Aesthetics (Shade/Shadow)

The Proposed Project will not:

- Include light-blocking structures that would be located within a distance of three times the height of the proposed structure to a shadow-sensitive use on the north, northwest or northeast.

Shade/Shadow. Existing shopping center structures are varied in height with some buildings (or portions thereof) reaching up to 73 feet in height; however, the majority of the existing development ranges in height between 45 and 60 feet. Off-site structures nearest the project site and vicinity of new construction is a two-story retail center (Riverside Woodman Shopping

¹ Los Angeles, City of. 2006 (May). *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide*. Los Angeles, CA: Author. 6 June 2008 <<http://www.lacity.org/ead/EADWeb-AQD/thresholdsguide.htm>>.

Center) at the corner of Riverside Drive and Woodman Avenue located on an adjacent abutting lot to the northeast. Other nearby buildings to the construction area of the site are a series of one- and two-story residential buildings and two office buildings on the north side of Riverside Drive. These buildings are located at a minimum of 100 feet from the project site. Because all new development associated with the Proposed Project will be located further away from existing surrounding properties (i.e., behind the existing shopping center buildings), and the height of all new proposed structures will not exceed the existing building heights (i.e., 75 feet and not taller than the existing Macy's building), future shade/shadow impacts would not be different than what is experienced in the area currently due to the existing development, and potential impacts would be less than significant. Shade/Shadow analysis for the Initial Study for the Proposed Project showed all shadows from new buildings associated with the Proposed Project would fall within the shadow limits already created by existing structures, or would create shadows that fall within the project site (as would be observed with easterly oriented shadows from the new parking structure that would shade the surface parking lot along Woodman Avenue).

The determination of potential significance of impacts related to visual character, views and lighting are subject to further evaluation and have been addressed in Section IV: Environmental Impact Analysis: A-Aesthetics and Visual Resources.

Agriculture

The Proposed Project will not:

- 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.
- Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.
- Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

Agricultural Resources. The project site is currently developed with the shopping center, and the project area is commercial and residential in nature and does not contain agricultural uses. The site has undergone disturbance from prior development that began in the early 1960s with construction of the original shopping center and associated parking. Since at least the early 1960s, the site has continually operated as a shopping center. Currently, the entire site is either improved with structures related to the shopping center or pavement used primarily for surface parking. The project site is bordered on all sides by commercial development, residential development, or major highways. The Proposed Project will be constructed in an area that been developed and used for non-agricultural uses for many decades. The site is void of any farmland and there is no designated farmland in the project vicinity. The project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The Proposed Project will not require a change of the current land use designation of Community Commercial. As a result, the Proposed Project will not convert any such designated land from agricultural use, and will not result in a significant impact to agricultural resources.

The project site is designated as Community Commercial in the Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan. The project site has been developed with non-agricultural type uses for since the early 1960s. The Williamson Act enables local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land to agricultural or related open space use, in return for lower property tax assessments. Because the project site does not currently consist of agricultural uses or open space, the site does not meet the requirements to enter into a Williamson Act contract. The Proposed Project will not request or require a change of the current land use designation of Community Commercial and will not become eligible for the Williamson Act. The Proposed Project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract and will result in a less than significant impact to agricultural lands.

The Proposed Project is not anticipated to result in impacts to agricultural resources and will not contribute to a potential cumulative impact to agricultural resources. Further, the related projects are located on sites that do not contain any recognized agricultural resources. Also, a separate, site-specific environmental analysis will be prepared for related projects to determine related project-specific potential impacts to agricultural resources.

Air Quality (Toxic Air Contaminants and Odor Impacts)

The Proposed Project will not:

- Store, or process carcinogenic or non-carcinogenic toxic air contaminants, which could result in airborne emissions during construction activity.
- Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Toxic Air Contaminant Impacts (Construction Activity) - The greatest potential for TAC emissions during construction would be diesel particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations. According to SCAQMD methodology, health effects from carcinogenic air toxics are usually described in terms of individual cancer risk. "Individual Cancer Risk" is the likelihood that a person continuously exposed to concentrations of TACs over a 70-year lifetime will contract cancer based on the use of standard risk assessment methodology. Given the limited construction schedule of approximately 24 months, the Proposed Project would not result in a long-term (i.e., 70 years) source of TAC emissions. In addition, construction equipment emitting diesel particulate matter would only operate intermittently over the 48 month schedule. No residual emissions of diesel particulates by the Proposed Project are anticipated after construction. As such, project-related construction TAC emission would result in a less than significant impact and are not addressed further in this EIR.

Odor Impacts (Construction Activity and Operations) - Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include equipment exhaust and architectural coatings. Odors from these sources would be localized and generally confined to the project site. The Proposed Project would utilize typical construction techniques that reduce odors, and any remaining odors would be typical of most construction sites and temporary. As such, Proposed Project construction would not cause an odor nuisance, construction odors would result in a less than significant impact, and this issue is not addressed further in this EIR.

According to the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses and industrial operations that are associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies and fiberglass molding. The project site would be developed with retail space and not land uses that are typically associated with odor complaints. On-site trash receptacles would have the potential to create adverse odors. Trash receptacles would be located and maintained in a manner that promotes odor control and no adverse odor impacts are anticipated from these types of land uses. As such, proposed project operational activity would not cause an odor nuisance, operational odors would result in a less than significant impact, and this issue is not addressed further in this EIR.

The determination of potential significance of impacts related to other air quality issues are subject to further evaluation and have been addressed in Section IV: Environmental Impact Analysis: B-Air Quality.

Biological Resources

The Proposed Project will not:

- 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.
- 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- 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.
- 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.
- Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.
- Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

The project site and surrounding area is characterized as an urban, developed commercial and residential area. The project site and all surrounding properties have undergone disturbance previously resulting from development of the existing shopping center, additional commercial uses at the adjacent intersections of Riverside Drive and both Hazeltine Avenue and Woodman Avenue, as well as the surrounding residential uses. The project site has been developed with the

established shopping mall and/or covered with pavement for the associated parking since the early 1960s.

Other than existing landscaping, the site is considered to be impervious. Vegetation on the site is limited to landscaping associated with existing development and a block of trees that currently buffer the site from the adjacent Ventura (US 101) Freeway to the south. Due to the length of time that the developed and impervious conditions have existed at the project site, the site is not considered to be conducive to important biological resources or their habitat. Hence candidate, sensitive, or special status species or habitat, nor migratory fish and wildlife and their associated habitat, are not thought or known to exist on the site.

According to the Los Angeles City-wide General Plan Framework, the project site is not located within a Biological Resources Area which is thought to meet habitat needs for plants and animals, nor promote wildlife migration or movement. Further, the Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan designates the project site for commercial uses which is not considered conducive to biological resources or their habitat. The likelihood of wildlife and associated habitat (including candidate, sensitive or special status species) on the project site is considered low. The project site is not located near or within a migratory corridor. The Proposed Project will not interfere substantially with the movement of resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or their migratory wildlife corridors.

The project site does not have any natural standing bodies of water. Hence, riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities, and federally protected wetlands communities are not thought or known to exist on the site. The Proposed Project will not result in a substantial adverse impact to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

The United States Geological Survey (USGS) map, Van Nuys Quadrangle, identifies a blue line stream, commonly known as the Los Angeles River, on the south side of the Ventura (US 101) Freeway.² The River is completely encased in concrete, does not currently support riparian habitat and is not under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Game. Furthermore, the River is separated from the project site by the 10-lane Ventura Freeway; however the River does cross to the north side of the freeway just west of Hazeltine Avenue. The Proposed Project will not encroach into the River channel and will not adversely affect it. The Proposed Project will not result in an adverse impact to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified by local or regional plans or the California Department of Fish and Game.

The City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Ordinance is the only local ordinance that protects biological resources. This Ordinance considers protection of all native California Oak species, Black Walnut, California Bay, and California Sycamore trees. The project site has been developed and covered with either structures or pavement since the early 1960s. Vegetation on the site is limited to landscaping associated with the existing shopping center development and trees that currently buffer the site from the adjacent Ventura (US 101) Freeway to the south.

² U.S. Geologic Survey (USGS). 1966. USGS Map, Van Nuys Quadrangle. 12 June 2008 <[http://store.usgs.gov/b2c_usgs/catalog/setCurrentItem/\(isQuery=yes&layout=6_1_61_62_2&uiarea=2&itemPageSize=5&page=8&ctype=catalogQuery&next=seeItem&care=%24ROOT&cittem=0000000473000000011\)/.do](http://store.usgs.gov/b2c_usgs/catalog/setCurrentItem/(isQuery=yes&layout=6_1_61_62_2&uiarea=2&itemPageSize=5&page=8&ctype=catalogQuery&next=seeItem&care=%24ROOT&cittem=0000000473000000011)/.do)>.

According to a tree survey, attached as Appendix B: Tree Report, prepared for the Proposed Project, no trees covered under the Protected Tree Ordinance exist on site. The Proposed Project will not conflict with local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources, including trees. The Proposed Project will result in a less than significant impact to biological resources, including protected trees.

The project site is not located within a Significant Ecological Area, as defined by the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning. The Proposed Project will not result in a significant impact to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Impacts to biological resources are typically considered to be site specific but can, at certain times, result from indirect growth inducing impacts on regional areas. The Proposed Project will result in a less than significant impact to biological resources. The Proposed Project is being constructed on the existing shopping center site which is considered to be fully developed with either buildings or surface parking and impervious. The Proposed Project will not exceed existing project boundaries and does not include grading of any open space or native lands. The Proposed Project is consistent with development goals of the Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan as a commercial center and will not indirectly disturb biological resources off-site. As such, the Proposed Project is not expected to contribute to a cumulative impact on biological resources. Further, the related projects are located at sites that are not listed in the Community Plan as containing recognized biological resources.

Cultural Resources

The Proposed Project will not:

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

Historical Resources. A “historical resource” is a resource listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register, a local register, or determined by a lead agency to be a historic resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1 (j) or 5024.1. A record search of National Register for Historical Preservation found no historical or cultural resources located on or adjacent to the project site.³

³U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), National Park Service (NPS). 2006 (as updated). *National Register of Historical Places*. 12 June 2008 <<http://nrhp.focus.nps.gov/natreghome.do?searchtype=natreghome>>.

The City of Los Angeles City-wide General Plan Framework EIR does not designate the project site as a Historical-Cultural Monument or as a portion of a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone.⁴ The Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community plan identifies five historic resources within the Community Plan Area - Tower of Wooden Pallets, the Van Nuys Woman's Club Building, the Valley Municipal Building (Van Nuys City Hall), "The Magnolia" (aka Hirschberg) residence, and the Baird House. None of the identified cultural-historical monuments are located on or adjacent to the project site.

Archaeological and Paleontological Resources. The City of Los Angeles City-wide General Plan Framework does not designate the project site as a Prehistoric or Historic Archaeological Site nor is it part of an Archaeological Survey Area.⁵ The City of Los Angeles City-wide General Plan Framework does not designate the project site as a paleontological resource.⁶

The project site has been developed and covered with structures or pavement since the early 1960s. Due to previous site disturbance and the length of time that the property has been developed, no archaeological or paleontological resources, or significant human remains, are known to exist on the site. Furthermore, the Proposed Project will not exceed the boundaries of the current shopping center which will reduce the potential for disturbance of unknown resources. The Proposed Project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, will result in a less than significant impact to historical resources, and will result in a less than significant impact to archaeological or paleontological resources. However, in the event that remains or archaeological/paleontological resources are encountered during excavation, standard regulations and practice by LAMC would require work to immediately stop until any such findings can be assessed. The Proposed Project will result in a less than significant impact to cultural and historic resources.

Impacts to cultural/historical resources are considered to be site specific. There are no identified cultural or historical resources located on the project site. The Proposed Project is anticipated to result in a less than significant impact to both cultural and historical resources and will not contribute to a potential cumulative impact to cultural resources. A separate, site-specific environmental analysis will be prepared for related projects to assess and mitigate related project-specific potential impacts to cultural resources.

⁴ Figure CR-4: Historical-Cultural Monuments and Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs) in the City of Los Angeles. Los Angeles, City of. 1995. *The Citywide General Plan Framework An Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan*. Agoura Hills, CA: Envicom Corporation. 19 May 2008 <<http://cityplanning.lacity.org/>>.

⁵ Los Figure CR-1: Prehistoric and Historic Archaeological Sites and Survey Areas in the City of Los Angeles. Los Angeles, City of. 1995. *The Citywide General Plan Framework An Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan*. Agoura Hills, CA: Envicom Corporation. 19 May 2008 <<http://cityplanning.lacity.org/>>.

⁶ Figure CR-2: Vertebrate Paleontological Resources in the City of Los Angeles. Los Angeles, City of. 1995. *The Citywide General Plan Framework An Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan*. Agoura Hills, CA: Envicom Corporation. 19 May 2008 <<http://cityplanning.lacity.org/>>.

Geology and Soils

The Proposed Project will not:

- 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,
 - Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction,
 - Landslides.
- Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Proposed Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

Surface Rupture - The site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone for surface fault rupture hazards, or City of Los Angeles fault rupture study area⁷. Based on the 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 site. The potential for surface rupture due to fault plane displacement propagating to the surface at the site during the design life of the Proposed Project is considered less than significant and further analysis is not warranted.

Landslides, Seiche, Tsunami and Mudflow - The project site is not known to have, or be located within an area known to be prone to, any landslides, seiches, tsunami or mudflows. The site is relatively flat (i.e. 22 feet of relief from west to east), and located away from major sloped areas or large bodies of water that contribute to these seismic and slope related hazards. Hence, the Proposed Project will result in a less than significant geologic hazards impact due to the potential for landslides, seiches, tsunami and mudflows, and further analysis is not warranted.

Landform Alteration - The project site has been previously graded and is relatively level due to past construction of the shopping center in the 1960's. Mass grading for the Proposed Project is expected to entail only minor cuts and fills from the existing grades to establish the building pad and to provide surface drainage of the site. Because significant land alterations are not proposed and the Proposed Project will have a less than significant impact to local landforms, further analysis is not warranted.

The determination of potential significance of impacts related to seismic groundshaking, soils stability and soil erosion are subject to further evaluation and have been addressed in Section IV: Environmental Impact Analysis: C-Geology and Soils.

⁷ Figure GS-8 Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zones and Fault Rupture Study Areas in the City of Los Angeles. Los Angeles, City of. 1995. *The Citywide General Plan Framework An Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan*. Agoura Hills, CA: Envicom Corporation. 19 May 2008 <<http://cityplanning.lacity.org/>>.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Proposed Project will not:

- 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.
- Be 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, where the Proposed Project would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.
- Be within the vicinity of a private airstrip, where the Proposed Project would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.
- Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- 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.

Listed Hazardous Site - The Cortese List of hazardous materials sites, compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 does not list the project site as having a hazardous materials problem needing cleanup. The Proposed Project will not create a significant hazard to the public or environment as a result of a listing on the Cortese List.

Soil Contamination - As noted above, the project site is not identified on any list as having a hazardous materials problem needing cleanup. Hence, there are no soils on-site having any known contamination. The Proposed Project is not expected to exceed maximum regulatory requirements for hazardous materials and is not expected to release hazardous materials to soils within the project site or adjacent areas. The Proposed Project is not expected to be affected by and/or have an effect upon soil contamination and further analysis is not warranted.

Groundwater Contamination - The project site is not identified on any list as having a hazardous materials problem needing cleanup. As noted in Section IV: Environmental Impact Analysis: D-Hazardous Materials and Man-Made Hazards, the adjacent westerly property (Sunkist) was identified in as having a leaking underground gasoline storage tank (LUST) that had affected the aquifer. Remedial action was completed and the case was closed in 1996 and this previous LUST event was not known to have affected the project site. Four other LUST sites were identified within a one-half mile radius of the project site, but due to their distance and cross/down-gradient location from the project site, these sites are not expected to negatively affect the project site. The Proposed Project is not expected to exceed maximum regulatory requirements for hazardous materials and is not expected to release hazardous materials to local groundwater underlying the project site or adjacent areas. The Proposed Project including excavation and construction of subterranean parking is not expected to encounter groundwater, thus will not be affected by and/or have an effect upon groundwater supplies and further analysis is not warranted.

Airport Hazards - No private airstrip is located within the project vicinity. The closest airport (public airport) is Burbank/Bob Hope Airport, located approximately 9 miles northeast of the project site. The Proposed Project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

The determination of potential significance of impacts related to the transport and generation of hazardous materials, and the potential effect of such to sensitive receptors, are subject to further evaluation and have been addressed in Section IV: Environmental Impact Analysis: D-Hazardous Materials and Man-Made Hazards.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The Proposed Project will not:

- 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).
- 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.
- Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows.
- 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.

Groundwater - Existing development does not currently directly extract or recharge to groundwater resources and permeable surface area is very limited and urban runoff is directed to the stormwater system. With the Proposed Project, there would be no change to groundwater resources as the Proposed Project does not propose to extract or recharge to groundwater facilities. Further, the permeability of the site will not substantially increase and conveyance of groundwater to local recharge and spreading facilities will not be impaired or substantially altered. Even with the implementation of surface materials that are more pervious, the net change to groundwater infiltration would be negligible. The Proposed Project will result in a less than significant impact related to groundwater quality and further analysis is not required.

Flood Zone/Flood Hazard - As determined by the Flood Insurance Rate Maps, the project site is located within Flood Zone C (since reclassified as Zone X-No Shading), which is located outside of both the 100- and 500-year flood zones. The Proposed Project will result in a less than significant impact due to flooding and further analysis is not required.

The determination of potential significance of impacts related to the transport and generation of surface water pollutants, are subject to further evaluation and have been addressed in Section IV: Environmental Impact Analysis: E.1- Water Resources: Hydrology/Water Quality.

Land Use and Planning (Habitat or Natural Community Conservation Plan)

The Proposed Project will not:

- Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

The Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan because there are no such plans that affect the project site. Additional analysis of such habitat plans is not warranted.

The determination of potential significance of impacts related to other land use and planning issues, are subject to further evaluation and have been addressed in Section IV: Environmental Impact Analysis: F-Land Use.

Mineral Resources

The Proposed Project will not:

- 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.
- 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.

Mineral Resources. According to the Los Angeles City-wide General Plan Framework, the project site is not located in an area containing significant mineral deposits, nor is it in an area of current or historical aggregate mining and is not within the limits of an active or historic oil field.^{8 9} The project site is located within the Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan for which no mineral resource recovery is identified in this Plan.

The proposed construction is limited to one level of subterranean construction which reduces the potential for encounter with mineral resources. A separate, site-specific environmental analysis will be prepared for related projects to assess and mitigate related project-specific potential impacts to mineral resources.

Because the project site is not known to support mineral resources, and the Proposed Project does not directly involve the extraction of mineral resources, the Proposed Project is anticipated to result in no impact to mineral resources and will not contribute to a potential cumulative impact to mineral resources. Further analysis of mineral resources is not warranted.

⁸ Figure GS-1: Areas Containing Significant Mineral Deposits in the City of Los Angeles. Los Angeles, City of. 1995. *The Citywide General Plan Framework An Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan*. Agoura Hills, CA: Envicom Corporation. 19 May 2008 <<http://cityplanning.lacity.org/>>.

⁹ Figure GS-6: Oil Field and Oil Drilling Areas in the City of Los Angeles. Los Angeles, City of. 1995. *The Citywide General Plan Framework An Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan*. Agoura Hills, CA: Envicom Corporation. 19 May 2008 <<http://cityplanning.lacity.org/>>.

Noise

The Proposed Project will not:

- Be 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, where the project would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.
- Be within the vicinity of a private airstrip, where the project would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.
- Result in noise-sensitive land use being located within 3,000 feet of a railroad line.

Airport Noise - The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or private airstrip. The closest airport is Burbank Airport (a public facility), located approximately eight miles northeast of the project site. The Proposed Project would not expose people residing or working within the project site to excessive noise levels from an airport and, as such, would not have any impacts relative to airport noise.

Railroad Noise - The project site is not located adjacent to any railroad tracks or crossings; therefore, the proposed project would not have significant adverse impacts relative to railroad noise.

The determination of potential significance of impacts related to other noise issues are subject to further evaluation and have been addressed in Section IV: Environmental Impact Analysis: G-Noise.

Population, Housing and Employment

The Proposed Project will not:

- 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).
- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Population. The City's CEQA Thresholds Guide indicates that determination of a significant impact to population should consider the degree to which the Proposed Project would cause or accelerate development in an undeveloped area that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment; whether the Proposed Project would introduce unplanned infrastructure not previously evaluated in the Community Plan; and the extent to which growth would occur without implementation of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project is estimated to generate approximately 2590 employees at the site daily, an increase of approximately 788 employees over existing uses. The Proposed Project does not include a residential component. A substantial

employment base and residential population currently exist in the San Fernando Valley. The necessary employees for the proposed redevelopment can be found nearby and the proposed commercial expansion will not directly increase the permanent population within the community.

Furthermore, the Proposed Project is an expansion of the existing shopping center. The development will not exceed the existing project site boundaries and will not grade any undeveloped area, causing a physical change in the environment. The site is currently improved for necessary stormwater drainage and erosion control. The project site is currently served by City of Los Angeles infrastructure including sanitary sewer, water, and roadways, and will not require an unplanned expansion of infrastructure in the community. The Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan identifies, "The major commercial center in North Sherman Oaks is the Sherman Oaks Fashion Square." As a result, commercial growth and development in this area would most likely continue, without this project, in accordance with the goals and policies of the Community Plan. As a result, the Proposed Project would not be considered to create a substantial growth in the permanent population of the community directly or indirectly. The Proposed Project would result in a less than significant population impact due to a substantial project increase.

Housing. There are no housing units currently located on the project site that might be displaced, forcing the displacement of substantial numbers of people. The Proposed Project is an expansion of the existing shopping center uses and does not include a residential component that could result in the construction of housing units. The commercial use of the project site as a shopping center will not be changed under the Proposed Project. The development will not exceed the existing project site boundaries and will not grade any undeveloped area, causing a physical change in the environment. The Proposed Project will result in a less than significant impact to the population due to the displacement of existing housing in the area and will not require the construction of additional housing off-site. Nor will the Proposed Project result in displacement of substantial numbers of people.

Impacts to population and housing are typically based on the degree to which a project would cause growth or accelerate development within an undeveloped area; whether the Proposed Project would introduce unplanned infrastructure not previously included in a General Plan; and the extent to which growth would occur without implementation of the Proposed Project.

The Proposed Project will not result in an increase in the permanent, resident population of the area and does not include a residential component. As such, the Proposed Project will result in a less than significant impact to population and housing.

Identified related projects could result in a net increase of approximately 1,092 dwelling units and a net population increase of approximately 2,728 residents. The Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan is considered to be a fully developed area and does not have large portions of undeveloped areas that could be adversely affected by the identified related projects. Furthermore, these identified areas are within the Community Plan area that has identified infrastructure including streets, sewer, and water. The related projects will not trigger unplanned infrastructure development that could indirectly induce growth in the area. As such, the identified related projects are anticipated to result in a less than significant impact to population

and housing within the Community Plan area. The Proposed Project, which does not include a residential component, will result in a less than significant cumulative impact to population and housing.

Parks and Recreation

The Proposed Project will not:

- 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.
- Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Parkland. The operation and management of public recreational facilities in the project area is provided by the City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. The Department of Recreation and Parks currently operates approximately 176 recreation centers, 59 pools, 30 senior citizen centers, 7 museums and historic sites, 13 golf courses, 24 child care centers, and 7 skate parks.¹⁰

The project site is currently developed with retail/shopping center facilities. No parkland, open space or recreational facilities are currently located on the project site. The proposed expansion of the retail and restaurant facilities will not result in the creation or removal of parkland or active recreational facilities. Furthermore, the Proposed Project does not include a residential component which could increase the permanent population that could accelerate the use of recreational facilities in the area.

Based on the proposed shopping center expansion, employees at the site on a daily basis could increase from approximately 1,800 to approximately 2,590, an increase of approximately 788 employees per day. A substantial employment base and residential population currently exist in the San Fernando Valley. The necessary employees for the proposed redevelopment can be found nearby. The increase in employees will not result in an increased use of park and recreational facilities in the project area. As a result, the Proposed Project will not substantially increase the use of existing recreational facilities and will not encourage the physical deterioration of any such facility. The Proposed Project will result in a less than significant impact to surrounding parklands and recreation facilities due to deterioration.

No parkland, open space, or recreational facilities are currently provided on the project site. The Proposed Project does not include the development of recreational facilities. Additionally, the Proposed Project will not remove any existing parkland or recreational facilities within the community.

¹⁰ Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. 2007. *City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks*. 22 May 2008 <<http://www.laparks.org/dept.htm>>.

Recreational Services. An impact to parks and open space is generally based on the number of residents and employees located on a project site that would intend to utilize park facilities. The City of Los Angeles CEQA Significance Thresholds indicate that consideration should be given to the net population increase resulting from the Proposed Project, the demand for recreation services anticipated at the time of buildout, and whether the Proposed Project includes features that would reduce demand for recreational services.

As part of a worst-case scenario, the potential for recreational use by employees at the site during their work shift has been analyzed. Employees at the site on a daily basis could increase to approximately 2,590, an increase of approximately 788 employees per day. An increase of this magnitude will not generate the need for or involve the construction of new or altered park facilities since a substantial employment base and residential population currently exist in the San Fernando Valley. The necessary employees for the proposed redevelopment can be found nearby which will not substantially increase the use of existing recreational facilities and will not encourage the physical deterioration of any such facility. The Proposed Project also includes provision of a new community room.

Impacts to recreational facilities are typically based on the increase in demand on facilities linked to a project. As discussed above, the Proposed Project will result in a less than significant impact to recreational and park facilities. The Proposed Project will not result in a substantial increase in the new permanent, resident population in the area and will not decrease the amount of parkland within the Community Plan Area. A review of the related projects indicates that there are no General Plan Amendment cases requested. As such, the identified related projects are consistent with growth impacts within the Community Plan Area and population will not increase above anticipated levels which could result in a significant related projects impact on parks. As such, identified related projects will result in a less than significant impact to recreational facilities. The Proposed Project will not contribute to a significant cumulative impact to recreational facilities or parks.

Schools

The Proposed Project will not:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts or reduction in acceptable level of services associated with schools.

Schools. According to the City of Los Angeles CEQA Significance Thresholds, in determining an impact to school facilities, consideration should be given to the population increase resulting from the Proposed Project based on the net increase of residential units or square footage of non-residential floor area, the demand for school services at the time of project buildout, whether accommodation of the increased demand would require construction of new facilities, and whether the Proposed Project includes features that would reduce demand for school facilities.

The Proposed Project includes expansion of the existing retail and restaurant uses at the shopping center. The Proposed Project does not include a residential component. The Proposed Project will result in a less than significant impact due to a significant population increase. The

Proposed Project could result in an increase of approximately 788 employees at the site daily. Based on the location of the shopping center within the heavily populated San Fernando Valley, it is anticipated that an adequate workforce is locally available and the Proposed Project will not materially increase the permanent resident population of the community. The number of school-aged children within the community will not change substantially due to the Proposed Project.

Based on the finding that the Proposed Project will result in a less than significant impact on schools services and will result in a less than significant population increase in the community, the Proposed Project will not result in the need for construction of new school facilities. Due to the commercial nature of the Proposed Project and the less than significant impact anticipated on population in the area, no on-site school facilities are proposed at the Proposed Project. Furthermore, the applicant will pay school facility fees required by the Los Angeles Unified School District during the building permitting process to mitigate incremental secondary effects from new job creation. The Proposed Project will result in a less than significant impact to schools.

All related projects will be required to pay their applicable school fees, which will reduce all potential impacts of the identified related projects. As such, the Proposed Project will not contribute to a significant cumulative impact to schools.

Services (Police and Fire Protection)

The Proposed Project will not:

- 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:
 - Fire protection due to the use and storage of toxic, readily combustible, or otherwise hazardous materials,
 - Police protection during project construction.

Police Services During Construction (Short-Term) Activity - Construction activity can be a source of increased hazards and attractive nuisances. Construction sites, when not properly secured, can become a target for theft and vandalism. Disruption of traffic patterns and added construction traffic and trucks to the area can also pose hazards on adjacent roadways. In urban environments such as the project site, precautions are generally taken during the construction phase to secure the project sites and prevent trespassing. Typically, temporary fencing with lockable gates are installed around construction sites and roving security and/or video surveillance utilized to minimize the potential for intruders and theft. The shopping center shall continue to utilize on-site security throughout the construction stage and would stage construction activity for the Proposed Project in such a manner that construction areas are segregated from the ongoing uses of the shopping center. Under such circumstances, the impacts to local police services are less than significant. And, although minor traffic delays may occur during the construction phase, impacts to police response times would be minimal and

temporary. The Proposed Project would have a less than significant effect on police services during the construction phase, and further analysis is not warranted.

Hazardous Materials Response - The LAFD also responds to hazardous materials spills and other similar health hazard incidents. Due to the nature of land uses proposed with the Proposed Project, and the commercial use of the shopping center in general, the potential for hazardous material response incidence at the project site is low and the potential impact on fire protection services is considered to be less than significant. This issue is discussed in more detail in Section IV: Environmental Impact Analysis: D-Hazardous Materials and Man-Made Hazards of this DEIR.

The determination of potential significance of impacts related to other police and fire protection services, are subject to further evaluation and have been addressed in Section IV: Environmental Impact Analysis: H-Public Services.

Traffic, Transportation and Access (Air Traffic)

The Proposed Project will not:

- 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?

Air Traffic - The project site is not within the flight path of an airport or airfield and the Proposed Project will not result in a measurable direct or indirect increase to air traffic levels in the area. The Proposed Project will result in a less than significant impact to air traffic patterns and further analysis of this issue is not required.

The determination of potential significance of impacts related to other traffic, transportation and access issues, are subject to further evaluation and have been addressed in Section IV: Environmental Impact Analysis: J-Transportation and Traffic.

Utilities (Sewer and Water)

The Proposed Project will not:

- Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.
- 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.
- Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or require new or expanded entitlements needed.

- Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the Proposed Project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the Proposed Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

The site is currently developed with approximately 867,000 GLSF, including approximately 842,045 GLSF of retail space and approximately 24,955 GLSF of restaurant/food court area. The Proposed Project will result in approximately 1,147,000 GLSF including approximately 1,075,223 GLSF of retail, 28,000 GLSF of sit-down restaurants, and 43,777 GLSF of the Gourmet Dining Terrace (food court).

Sewer - Existing development generates approximately 77,467 gallons per day (gpd) of wastewater.¹³ This total development will result in approximately 111,757 gpd of wastewater, an increase of approximately 34,290 gpd of wastewater.¹⁴

The City's sewer system is subject to Section 201 of the Federal Clean Water Act (CWA). According to the CWA, the City must adopt a wastewater facilities plan in accordance with the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Rules and Regulations, 40 CFR, Section 35.917. Section 201 specifies the following:

“Facilities planning will demonstrate the need for facilities and, by a systematic evaluation of feasible alternatives, will also demonstrate that the proposed measures represent the most cost-effective means of meeting established effluent and water quality goals while recognizing environmental and social considerations.”¹⁵

The City prepared a Wastewater Facilities Plan (WFP) in 1982 and updated it in 1991. The 1991 WFP update planned for facilities through the year 2010 and currently regulates wastewater facilities in the City. In addition, to guarantee sufficient sewer capacity, the City of Los Angeles has taken various steps to manage growth in the system. In 1990, to respond to the problem of insufficient sewer capacity, the City adopted Ordinance No. 166,060. In summary, Ordinance No. 166,060 established sewer permit allocation regulations for projects that discharge sewage to the Hyperion Treatment System (HTS). Allocation is based on a City Council determination of “priority” and “non-priority” projects. “Priority” projects, which include such uses as nonprofit hospitals, emergency medical trauma centers, and affordable rental housing projects, are first allocated a monthly sewage allotment. The remaining “non-priority” projects receive a monthly sewage allotment, of which 65 percent goes to residential projects and 35 percent goes to non-residential projects. The applicant must comply with the provisions of ordinances regarding

¹³ Based on the City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Sewer Facility Connection Rates Table, March 20, 2002. This Table provides the following generation rates for the Project: 80 gallons per day per 1,000 square feet of retail/shopping center space, 300 gallons per day per 1,000 square feet of take-out restaurant space, 30 gallons per day per seat of fixed seat restaurant space. Assumes approximately a worst-case scenario of 35 square feet per seat of approximately 4,680 GLSF of sit down restaurant, or the equivalent of 134 seats.

¹⁴ Based on the City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Sewer Facility Connection Rates Table, March 20, 2002. This Table provides the following generation rates for the Project: 80 gallons per day per 1,000 square feet of retail/shopping center space, 300 gallons per day per 1,000 square feet of approximately 39,097 GLSF of take-out restaurant space, 30 gallons per day per seat of approximately 32,680 GLSF of fixed seat restaurant space. Assumes approximately a worst-case scenario of 35 square feet per seat. Assumes one half of the total gross leasable square footage for sit-down restaurants to exclude foyers, waiting areas, hallways, and storage areas.

¹⁵ *City of Los Angeles Integrated Resources Plan Facilities Plan, Volume 1, July 2004, Revised November 2005, page 3-1.*

sewer capacity allotment in the City of Los Angeles. It should be noted that during the slow development period of the 1990s, much of the sewer permit allocation went unused resulting in a residual sewer capacity “surplus” from which projects today can draw. Adherence to the provisions of the sewer capacity allotment ordinances by the City of Los Angeles would further ensure that permitted development would not exceed the HTS capacity.

As a follow-up to these plans and programs, the City adopted the Integrated Resources Plan (IRP) in 2006 that incorporates a new City-prepared WFP for facilities through 2020, as the City was faced with the task to meet future wastewater needs of more than 4.9 million residents to live within the City by 2020. The IRP serves to update the information prepared in the 1991 WFP, while also considering the City’s recycled water and urban runoff system needs. Specifically, the IRP was developed to accommodate the projected increase in wastewater flow over the next 20 years while maximizing the beneficial reuse of recycled water and urban runoff and as a result, optimizing the use of the City’s existing facilities and water resources. Demographics (population and employment) projections and data sources used in the IRP were based on the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which estimates that the population of Los Angeles would reach almost 4.9 million people in 2020.

In order to meet the needs of increased wastewater generation, the City chose to expand its current overall treatment capacity, while maximizing the potential to reuse recycled water through groundwater replenishment in future years. As identified in the IRP, the Hyperion Water Treatment Plan (HWTP) can currently serve roughly 450 million gallons of wastewater per day (MGD), while the Donald Tillman Water Reclamation Plant (TWRP) in the Sepulveda Basin in Van Nuys can accommodate approximately 80 MGD. With an expected 18.7 percent population growth to occur in the City, the TWRP may be increased in size to convey approximately 100 MGD of wastewater by 2020. A third treatment plant, the Los Angeles-Glendale Water Reclamation Plant (LGWRP) has capacity for another 20 MGD. According to the IRP, the TWRP could be expanded to provide additional service capacity of up to an additional 20 MGD.

These improvements, along with new sewer pipelines, will ensure that untreated wastewater is not discharged to rivers or the ocean, thereby protecting the environment. As stated previously, the IRP also proposes to maximize recycled water reuse through groundwater replenishment, as this is considered a valuable potential benefit, since it would allow the City to reduce the need to import water from other regions. However, the IRP states that if the City does not implement groundwater replenishment by the time additional treatment capacity is needed, the expansion of wastewater treatment capacity would occur at the HWTP rather than at the TWRP. This will result in additional wastewater capacity levels at the HWTP and improved sewer facilities and pipelines. In general, implementation of the IRP will enable the City to adequately convey wastewater to the treatment plants with minimal potential for sewage spills, which will result in the protection of public health and safety. It will also enable the City to treat future wastewater flows that protects public health and safety and meets regulatory requirements, thereby protecting the environment, in general, and surface waters, in particular.¹⁶

¹⁶ *City of Los Angeles Integrated Resources Plan, IRP Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, September 2006, page 33.*

In November 2006, the City Council certified the Final EIR for the IRP. The City of Burbank filed suit against the City challenging that the conclusions in the Final EIR involving construction of a new 5.75-mile underground sewer conveyance, the Glendale-Burbank Interceptor Sewer (GBIS) that would be constructed to divert future flows from and allow rehabilitation of an existing aging sewer line. The Superior Court ruled in favor of the City of Burbank and found the IRP EIR lacking in five areas relating to the GBIS only that need to be clarified or corrected. In response to this ruling, the City Council: 1) Decertified the Final EIR; 2) Suspended the GBIS portion of the IRP pending adequate environmental review consistent with the Court's final decision; 3) Recertified the Final EIR (excluding references to the GBIS portion of the IRP); and 4) instructed the Board of Sanitation and other relevant staff to conduct the necessary environmental review of the GBIS portion of the IRP and correct deficiencies in the EIR that have been identified in the Court's decision, prior to any re-approval of the GBIS portion of the IRP.

However, even before the improvements associated with the IRP are implemented, the HTS will still have sufficient capacity to serve the wastewater treatment needs of the Proposed Project and the related projects. According to the City's City-wide Framework, the project site is located within the Hyperion Water Treatment Plant (HWTP) Service Area. As explained above, the three treatment plants within the HWTP Service Area together have a total treatment capacity of approximately 550 MGD (450 MGD at HWTP, 80 MGD at TWRP and 20 MGD at LGWRP). According to the City's CEQA Threshold Guide, the HWTP currently treats approximately 413 MGD, so it operates at a surplus of approximately 37 MGD.¹⁷ Therefore, the existing wastewater treatment provider would have adequate capacity to serve the anticipated wastewater generation of the 34,290 gpd from the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project will not exceed established wastewater treatment requirements and will result in a less than significant impact to sewers.

With respect to cumulative sewer impacts, the identified related projects could generate an additional approximately 172,000 gpd. As this additional wastewater generation is well below the remaining capacity within the HSA, the existing wastewater treatment provider would have adequate capacity to serve the anticipated wastewater generation of the related projects. Therefore, development of the Proposed Project in conjunction with the related projects will result in a less than significant wastewater impact.

In addition, the City's CEQA Threshold Guide has identified Sewer Capacity Threshold Study Areas, which are considered to be areas of known sewer constraint and potential areas of insufficient service. Neither the Proposed Project nor any of the identified related projects is located within an identified Sewer Capacity Threshold Study Area. The Proposed Project will result in a less than significant cumulative impact to wastewater service provision and infrastructure.

Water Supply

Groundwater - Existing development does not currently directly extract or recharge to groundwater resources. With the Proposed Project, there would be no change to groundwater

¹⁷ City of Los Angeles, L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide, M.2. Wastewater, 2006

resources in the site vicinity as the Proposed Project does not propose to directly extract or recharge to groundwater facilities. Groundwater use as part of the regional water supply is addressed through the MWD water planning process. The Proposed Project will result in a less than significant impact related to groundwater and further analysis is not required.

Water Treatment Facilities - Most of the water supply through LADWP is derived from “clean” sources that typically have undergone some level of pre-treatment. An emphasis on managing the water quality plays a primary role in the delivery of clean water supplies. As discussed above, the three outside sources for Los Angeles’ water are: approximately 60% from the Eastern Sierra via the Los Angeles Aqueduct system, 15% from the San Fernando groundwater basin, and 25% from the MWD’s Colorado River supplies. Treated reclaimed water (processed at local wastewater treatment facilities) is an additional source.

Water from the Owens River watershed is protected from industrial and agricultural contamination by LADWP land management practices. However, some turbidity arises as water from the watersheds travels through unlined channels in a natural rural setting before being diverted into the two aqueducts for destination to the City. To reduce this turbidity, the Los Angeles Filtration Plant treats up to 600 million gallons of water each day using ozone and rapid rate deep bed filters. New operations, commencing in 1999, have allowed the plant to convert to biologically active filtration, or biofiltration. Also in 1999, Los Angeles began to fluoridate its water at the Los Angeles Aqueduct Filtration Plant. Additional fluoridation facilities have already, or will soon, come on line at groundwater treatment sites and at MWD service connections.

Water provided through MWD has already gone through filtration and chlorination. Further, when MWD sells the water from its reservoirs to a local water agency, the water quality is monitored by the USEDA and the Department of Health Services to ensure that it meets certain minimal health and safety standards. In order to deliver water that meets required standards, MWD operates five water treatment/filtration facilities throughout its service area.

The San Fernando groundwater basin not only supplies 15% of Los Angeles’ domestic needs, but it also acts as a vast underground reservoir where water accumulates during years of abundant rainfall and is stored for use in the future. The North Hollywood Aeration Facility removes and treats any contaminated groundwater in the upper zone of the aquifer and prevents the migration of the contaminants downward into the San Fernando groundwater basin. The Pollock Wells Treatment Plant (PWTP) restores the contaminated groundwater wells back to operation. The operation of Pollock wells also limits excessive rising groundwater discharges from the San Fernando Basin to the Los Angeles River.

Because water treatment capacity is addressed in tandem with securing water supplies, the need for water treatment is minimized through improved watershed management practices, and sufficient wastewater treatment capacity is available, the Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact to water and wastewater treatment facilities and further analysis is not required in this EIR.

Utilities (Electric and Natural Gas)

The Proposed Project will not:

- Result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to power or natural gas.

Electricity - Electricity at the project site is currently provided by the City of Los Angeles, Department of Water and Power (LADWP). LADWP owns the electrical power generation plant and, as such, electrical service within the LADWP service area has not been affected by the recent statewide energy shortage. According to the City's Significance Thresholds, a project would have a significant impact on electricity service systems if it would create a need for new supply facilities, distribution infrastructure, or would result in the need for capacity enhancing alterations to existing facilities. The existing shopping center generates a demand for electricity of approximately 11,443,542 KilowattHour per year (KwH/yr).¹⁸ The proposed retail and restaurant expansion is anticipated to generate a demand for approximately 14,666,581 KwH/yr, an increase of approximately 3,223,039 KwH/yr.¹⁹ LADWP is projected to have an annual demand of 26,906,000 Mwh in 2012.²⁰ The projected demand by LADWP is based on the growth projections assumed in the General Plan for the City of Los Angeles. While the Proposed Project will result in an increase in the demand for electricity, the Proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan designation on the project site and would not require new service facilities or upgrades to existing infrastructure and capacity. As the Proposed Project falls within the projected demand levels of DWP, levels which DWP expects to have sufficient supply to meet. The Proposed Project will result in a less than significant impact to electricity service. While the identified related projects will increase the demand on electricity facilities compared to existing conditions, a review of the related projects indicates that there are no General Plan Amendment cases requested. As such, the identified related projects are consistent with growth impacts within the Community Plan Area and demand for utilities is not anticipated to increase above supply levels identified by the providers, which could result in a significant related projects impact on utility services. Related projects will result in a less than significant impact to electricity systems. The Proposed Project will not contribute to a significant cumulative impact on electricity systems.

Natural Gas - Natural gas at the project site is currently provided by the Southern California Gas Company (Gas Company). According to the City's CEQA Significance Thresholds, a project would have a significant impact on natural gas service systems if it would create a need for new supply facilities, distribution infrastructure, or would result in the need for capacity enhancing alterations to existing facilities. The existing shopping center generates a demand for natural gas

¹⁸ Table A9-11-A. South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 1993. *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. Diamond Bar: Author. 6 June 2008 <<http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/oldhdbk.html>>. Assumes an electricity generation rate of 13.55 KwH/sf/yr for retail uses and 47.45 KwH/sf/yr for restaurant uses.

¹⁹ Table A9-11-A. South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 1993. *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. Diamond Bar: Author. 6 June 2008 <<http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/oldhdbk.html>>. Assumes an electricity generation rate of 13.55 KwH/sf/yr for retail uses and 47.45 KwH/sf/yr for restaurant uses.

²⁰ PCR Services Corporation. 2005. *Grand Avenue Project Initial Study*. Los Angeles, CA: The Los Angeles Grand Avenue Authority. 6 June 2008 <http://ftp.cajaeir.com/eirs/2006_Projects/Grand_Ave/DEIR%20Sections/DEIR/Appendix%20A-part1%20NOP_IS_Scoping%20Meeting%20Trans.pdf>.

of approximately 2,443,998 cubic feet per month (CF/month).²¹ The proposed retail and restaurant expansion is anticipated to generate a demand for approximately 3,124,094 CF/month, an increase of approximately 680,096 CF/month.²² The Gas Company has a projected annual demand of 883,400 million cubic feet in 2012 within the entire service area.²³ The projected demand by The Gas Company is based on the growth projections assumed in the city's General Plan. While the Proposed Project will increase demand for natural gas, it is consistent with the General Plan designation on the project site and would not require new service facilities or upgrades to existing infrastructure and capacity. As the project falls within the projected demand levels of the Gas Company, levels which the Gas Company expects to have sufficient supply to meet. The Proposed Project will result in a less than significant impact to natural gas service.

While the identified related projects will increase the demand on natural gas facilities compared to existing conditions, a review of the related projects indicates that there are no General Plan Amendment cases requested. As such, the identified related projects are consistent with growth impacts within the Community Plan Area and demand for utilities is not anticipated to increase above supply levels identified by the providers, which could result in a significant related projects impact on utility services. Related projects will result in a less than significant impact to natural gas systems. The Proposed Project will not contribute to a significant cumulative impact on natural gas systems.

²¹ Table A9-11-A. South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 1993. *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. Diamond Bar: Author. 6 June 2008 <<http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/oldhdbk.html>>. Assumes a natural gas generation rate of 2.9 CF/SF/month for retail uses and 2.9 CF/SF/month for restaurant uses.

²² Table A9-11-A. South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 1993. *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. Diamond Bar: Author. 6 June 2008 <<http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/oldhdbk.html>>. Assumes a natural gas generation rate of 2.9 CF/SF/month for retail uses and 2.9 CF/SF/month for restaurant uses.

²³ PCR Services Corporation. 2005. *Grand Avenue Project Initial Study*. Los Angeles, CA: The Los Angeles Grand Avenue Authority. 6 June 2008 <http://ftp.cajaeir.com/eirs/2006_Projects/Grand_Ave/DEIR%20Sections/DEIR/Appendix%20A-part1%20NOP_IS_Scoping%20Meeting%20Trans.pdf>.

VI. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

B. SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(b) requires that an EIR discuss significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the Proposed Project is implemented. Based upon the analysis in Section IV: Environmental Impact Analysis, with implementation of mitigation measures, the Proposed Project will not result in a significant environmental effect with regard to the issues analyzed herein, except for potentially significant short-term construction phase air quality with respect to PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀ and NO_x.

VI. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

C. SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(c) requires that an EIR discuss irreversible environmental changes due to the Proposed Project. Irreversible environmental changes will not occur as a result of project implementation. The site has been committed to urban use for many years, and the Proposed Project uses are consistent with City planned land uses for the site. Thus, development of the site is not considered a new commitment to urban development and does not represent the conversion of undeveloped land.

Construction of the Proposed Project will require the consumption of natural resources and renewable and nonrenewable materials, including building materials (e.g., wood and metal) and fossil fuels (e.g., gasoline, diesel fuel, and natural gas). Once operational, the Proposed Project uses will require consumption of natural resources and renewable and non-renewable materials such as electricity, natural gas, potable water, and fossil fuels for project-generated vehicle trips. The commitment of resources associated with the Proposed Project is consistent with planned future development within the City of Los Angeles. Moreover, the use of resources represents a very small percentage of the resources to be utilized by development City-wide.

Additionally, the Proposed Project provides public benefits, such as a reduction in the improvement to local adjacent roadways, implementation of neighborhood protection and traffic calming measures, enhancement of aesthetic conditions at the project site, and improved economic vitality resulting in increased tax revenues for the City. There is no particular justification for avoiding or delaying the continued commitment of these resources.

VI. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

D. GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

How the Proposed Project Could Foster Growth

Section 15126(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR "discuss the growth inducing impact of the Proposed Project, including "ways in which the Proposed Project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment."

The Proposed Project is not expected to generate growth in the area beyond the intensification of the project site. Construction of the proposed 280,000 GLSF of retail/restaurant commercial uses will result in an increase in short-term construction and long-term employment opportunities. While the Proposed Project would create new job opportunities, the City of Los Angeles and surrounding areas include a large employee base and new jobs in this area would offer employment opportunities closer to those who may reside in the Van Nuys/Sherman Oaks area.

Further, the site is readily accessible from area freeways, local roadways and mass transit (buses). It is not expected that any significant number of employees will move to the area specifically because of the Proposed Project. No significant growth inducing impact would occur. Short-term construction jobs are not anticipated to induce unanticipated new population growth, because of the short-term nature of the construction process.

It is anticipated that the Proposed Project will be adequately serviced by existing extensions of the electrical, water, sewer and natural gas utility systems existing on or near the project site. No additional infrastructure of this nature would be constructed that could generate additional population growth in the project area.

The Proposed Project would physically and may economically revitalize the shopping center that has been underutilized. Surrounding land uses and businesses may experience secondary effects of the economic revitalization. Construction of the Proposed Project will create short-term construction jobs, as well as permanent jobs associated with the new businesses. Although the Proposed Project inherently represents growth at the project site, such growth is not outside the scope of what has been anticipated and planned for in the Community Plan area. Thus, no significant growth inducing impacts are anticipated.

Cumulative Development Impacts

The related projects (see Section III: General Description of the Environmental Setting) are primarily infill projects that will similarly add to the physical and economic revitalization of Van Nuys/Sherman Oaks area. Cumulative impacts relating to each environmental issue discussed in this EIR are addressed under the individual impact analysis sections (see Section IV: Environmental Impact Analysis). The City will require the preparation of an EIR for those related projects that the City anticipates will have potentially significant environmental impacts.

Those EIRs must similarly discuss cumulative impacts and growth inducing effects. Individual project mitigation measures may be required in order to reduce environmental impacts. The Proposed Project and the related projects are not expected to generate unwanted or unplanned growth inducing effects. On the contrary, the City's General Plan Framework favors infill development, and the continued development of vital, Regional and/or Community Centers such as the project area to provide for high-intensity centers, consistent with the preservation and protection of low-density, single-family residential areas from encroachment by other types of uses. Such land use arrangements are generally considered to have less of an effect on the environment by preserving unplanned or premature lands from development on the urban fringe or in more remote and rural locations.

VI. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

E. MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

A Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) has been prepared in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, which requires a Lead or Responsible Agency that approves or carries out a project where an EIR has identified significant environmental effects to adopt a “reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.” The City of Los Angeles is the Lead Agency for the Proposed Project.

The function and format of the MMP are described here while a copy of the Draft Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) is provided in Appendix M. A Final MMP will be adopted at the conclusion of the EIR process and will reflect the final set of required mitigation measures to address project impacts.

The MMP is designed to monitor implementation of all feasible mitigation measures as identified in the EIR for the Proposed Project. In the Draft MMP, mitigation measures are listed and numbered consistent with the relevant section numbering provided in the Draft EIR. Each mitigation measure is listed and categorized by topic with an accompanying discussion of the following:

- The phase of the Proposed Project during which the mitigation measure should be monitored (i.e., prior to issuance of a building permit, construction, or occupancy);
- The enforcing agency (i.e., the agency with the authority to enforce the mitigation measure); and
- The monitoring agency (i.e., the agency which monitors compliance and implementation of the required mitigation measure).

The project Applicant shall be obligated to provide certification prior to the issuance of site or building plans (or an appropriate subsequent stage) that compliance with the required mitigation measures has been achieved. All departments listed in the MMP are within the City of Los Angeles unless otherwise noted. The entity responsible for the implementation of all mitigation measures shall be the project Applicant unless otherwise noted.

