

**DEPARTMENT OF
CITY PLANNING**

COMMISSION OFFICE
(213) 978-1300

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

SAMANTHA MILLMAN
PRESIDENT

VAHID KHORSAND
VICE-PRESIDENT

DAVID H. J. AMBROZ

CAROLINE CHOE
HELEN LEUNG

KAREN MACK
MARC MITCHELL

VERONICA PADILLA-CAMPOS
DANA M. PERLMAN

**CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA**



ERIC GARCETTI
MAYOR

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

200 N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801
(213) 978-1271

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
DIRECTOR

KEVIN J. KELLER, AICP
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

VACANT
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

3977 W Beverly Blvd Project

Case Number: ENV-2019-2766-MND

Project Location: 3951-3977 West Beverly Boulevard; 306 North Heliotrope Drive; 301-307 North Berendo Street, Los Angeles, CA 90027

Community Plan Area: Wilshire

Council District: 13 – O'Farrell

Project Description: The proposed project includes the demolition of two (2) existing single-family dwellings and associated buildings, two (2) existing commercial buildings with an associated surface parking lot, and the construction, use, and maintenance of a new four-story above a partially subterranean parking level, 66-foot in height, 67-unit with 8,450 square feet of commercial retail space mixed-use building within Subarea B (Mixed Use Boulevards) of the Vermont/Western Station Neighborhood Area (SNAP) Specific Plan. The proposed project would set aside seven (7) units (10 percent of the total 67 units and 11 percent of the base 39 units, respectively) as Extremely Low Income units. The project will include 34 residential parking spaces, 12 commercial parking spaces, 41 bicycle parking spaces, and 5,595 square feet of open space. The site is located on a 30,567 square-foot lot that would include 69,895 square feet of total floor area with a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 2.28:1.

The applicant is requesting the following approvals from the City: (1) Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Affordable Housing Incentive Program for a development project that results in 67 dwelling units of which seven (7) units (10 percent of the total 67 units and 11 percent of the base 39 units, respectively, will be set aside for Extremely Low Income Units) with three (3) base incentives that include an 70 percent increase in density, 0.5 spaces per unit for residential parking with a 30 percent reduction to the commercial parking requirement, and a 14 percent increase in FAR; and two (2) additional incentives for 1) a 16-foot increase in overall height, an 11-foot height increase to the stepback requirement from 30 feet to 41 feet in height, transitional height per TOC and 2) a 25 percent reduction in the overall open space requirement; and (2) a Project Permit Compliance Review for the demolition of two (2) existing single-family dwellings and associated buildings, two (2) existing commercial buildings with an associated surface parking lot, and the construction, use, and maintenance of a new five-story with an at-grade parking level, 66-foot in height, 67-unit with 8,450 square feet of commercial retail

November 2020

space mixed-use building. The applicant would also request approvals and permits from the Department of Building and Safety (and other municipal agencies) for project construction activities which may include, but are not limited to, the following: excavation, shoring, grading, foundation, haul route, and removal and replacement of street trees for the project site.

PREPARED BY:

The City of Los Angeles
Department of City Planning

APPLICANT:

David Pourbaba, Beverly Berendo LLC

INITIAL STUDY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Introduction | 3 |
| 2. Executive Summary | 5 |
| 3. Project Description | 10 |
| 3.1. Project Summary | |
| 3.2. Environmental Setting | |
| 3.3. Description of Project | |
| 3.4. Requested Permits and Approvals | |
| 4. Environmental Checklist | |
| I. Aesthetics | 14 |
| II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources | 18 |
| III. Air Quality | 20 |
| IV. Biological Resources | 23 |
| V. Cultural Resources | 26 |
| VI. Energy | 28 |
| VII. Geology and Soils | 31 |
| VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions | 36 |
| IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials | 38 |
| X. Hydrology and Water Quality | 42 |
| XI. Land Use and Planning | 47 |
| XII. Mineral Resources | 49 |
| XIII. Noise | 50 |
| XIV. Population and Housing | 54 |
| XV. Public Services | 55 |
| XVI. Recreation | 58 |
| XVII. Transportation/Traffic | 59 |
| XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources | 62 |
| XIX. Utilities and Service Systems | 66 |
| XX. Wildfire | 68 |
| XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance | 70 |
| 5. Preparers and Persons Consulted | 73 |

Appendices

| | |
|-----|---|
| A-1 | Phase I Environmental Site Assessment |
| B-1 | Noise |
| C-1 | LADBS Soils Approval Letter, Soils Report, and Grading Plan |
| D-1 | LADOT Traffic Assessment Form and VMT Calculator |
| E-1 | Historic Resource Evaluation |
| F-1 | AB-52 letters |

INITIAL STUDY

1 INTRODUCTION

This Initial Study (IS) document evaluates potential environmental effects resulting from construction and operation of the proposed **67-unit Mixed-Use** Project (“Project”). The proposed Project is subject to the guidelines and regulations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Therefore, this document has been prepared in compliance with the relevant provisions of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines as implemented by the City of Los Angeles (City). Based on the analysis provided within this Initial Study, the City has concluded that the Project will not result in significant impacts on the environment. This Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration are intended as informational documents, and are ultimately required to be adopted by the decision maker prior to project approval by the City.

1.1 PURPOSE OF AN INITIAL STUDY

The California Environmental Quality Act was enacted in 1970 with several basic purposes: (1) to inform governmental decision makers and the public about the potential significant environmental effects of proposed projects; (2) to identify ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced; (3) to prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures; and (4) to disclose to the public the reasons behind a project’s approval even if significant environmental effects are anticipated.

An application for the proposed project has been submitted to the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning for discretionary review. The Department of City Planning, as Lead Agency, has determined that the project is subject to CEQA, and the preparation of an Initial Study is required.

An Initial Study is a preliminary analysis conducted by the Lead Agency, in consultation with other agencies (responsible or trustee agencies, as applicable), to determine whether there is substantial evidence that a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the Initial Study concludes that the Project, with mitigation, may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report should be prepared; otherwise the Lead Agency may adopt a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code §21000 et seq.), the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, §15000 et seq.), and the City of Los Angeles CEQA Guidelines (1981, amended 2006).

1.2. ORGANIZATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study is organized into four sections as follows:

1 INTRODUCTION

Describes the purpose and content of the Initial Study, and provides an overview of the CEQA process.

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Provides Project information, identifies key areas of environmental concern, and includes a determination whether the project may have a significant effect on the environment.

3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Provides a description of the environmental setting and the Project, including project characteristics and a list of discretionary actions.

4 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Contains the completed Initial Study Checklist and discussion of the environmental factors that would be potentially affected by the Project.

INITIAL STUDY

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| PROJECT TITLE | 3977 W BEVERLY BLVD PROJECT |
| ENVIRONMENTAL CASE NO. | ENV-2019-2766-MND |
| RELATED CASES | DIR-2019-2065-TOC-SPP |

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| PROJECT LOCATION | 3951-3977 W BEVERLY BLVD; 306 N HELIOTROPE DR; 301-307 N BERENDO ST |
| COMMUNITY PLAN AREA | WILSHIRE |
| GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION | GENERAL COMMERCIAL |
| ZONING | C2-1 |
| COUNCIL DISTRICT | 13 – O’FARRELL |

| | |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| LEAD AGENCY | CITY OF LOS ANGELES |
| STAFF CONTACT | JASON HERNÁNDEZ |
| ADDRESS | CITY HALL, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012 |
| PHONE NUMBER | 213-978-1276 |
| EMAIL | JASON.HERNANDEZ@LACITY.ORG |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| APPLICANT | DAVID POURBABA, BEVERLY BERENDO LLC |
| ADDRESS | 8271 MELROSE AVE #200, LOS ANGELES, CA, 90046 |
| PHONE NUMBER | 310-435-3442 |

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project includes the demolition of two (2) existing single-family dwellings and associated buildings, two (2) existing commercial buildings with an associated surface parking lot, and the construction, use, and maintenance of a new four-story above a partially subterranean parking level, 66-foot in height, 67-unit with 8,450 square feet of commercial retail space mixed-use building within Subarea B of the Vermont/Western SNAP Specific Plan. The proposed project would set aside seven (7) units (10 percent of the total 67 units and 11 percent of the base 39 units, respectively) as Extremely Low Income units. The project will include 34 residential parking spaces, 12 commercial parking spaces, 41 bicycle parking spaces, and 5,595 square feet of open space. The site is located on a 30,567 square-foot lot that would include 69,895 square feet of total floor area with a FAR of 2.28:1.

(For additional detail, see “Section 3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION”).

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The subject property consists of a six (6) contiguous rectangular shaped lots with approximately 91 feet of frontage along the easterly side of Heliotrope Drive, 300 feet of frontage along the northerly side of Beverly Boulevard, and approximately 108 feet of frontage along the westerly side of Berendo Street. The subject lot has a total lot size of 30,567 square feet. The project site is located within the Wilshire Community Plan and Subarea B of the Vermont/Western SNAP. The site is zoned C2-1, designated for General Commercial land uses and currently improved with a two (2) commercial buildings built in 1919 and 1942, and two (2) residential buildings built in 1922. There are three (3) non-protected trees on-site and two (2) street trees that will be removed as part of the project scope.

The surrounding area is characterized by level topography and improved streets. Properties to the south, east, and west are zoned C2-1, located within Subarea B of the SNAP, and developed with one-story commercial buildings. Properties to the north are zoned R3-1, located within Subarea A (Neighborhood Conservation) of the SNAP, and developed with one- to three-story single- and multi-family residential buildings. The property is located 1.59 kilometers from the Puente Hills Blind Thrusts Fault Zone and located within the Methane Buffer Zone.

(For additional detail, see “Section 3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION”).

OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED

(e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement)

None.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> 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 on the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Jason Hernández

PRINTED NAME



SIGNATURE

City Planning Associate

TITLE

11/12/2020

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 a mitigation measure has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analysis," as described in (5) below, may be cross referenced).
- 5) Earlier analysis must be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR, or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A sources list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whichever 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.

INITIAL STUDY

3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposed project includes the demolition of two (2) existing single-family dwellings and associated buildings, two (2) existing commercial buildings with an associated surface parking lot, and the construction, use, and maintenance of a new four-story above a partially subterranean parking level, 66-foot in height, 67-unit with 8,450 square feet of commercial retail space mixed-use building within Subarea B (Mixed Use Boulevards) of the Vermont/Western Station Neighborhood Area (SNAP) Specific Plan. The proposed project would set aside seven (7) units (10 percent of the total 67 units and 11 percent of the base 39 units, respectively) as Extremely Low Income units. The project will include 34 residential parking spaces, 12 commercial parking spaces, 41 bicycle parking spaces, and 5,595 square feet of open space. The site is located on a 30,567 square-foot lot that would include 69,895 square feet of total floor area with a FAR of 2.28:1.

3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.2.1 Project Location

The subject site (3977 West Beverly Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90004) is bounded by Beverly Boulevard to the south, Heliotrope Drive to the west, and Berendo Street to the east. The subject property consists of a six (6) contiguous rectangular shaped lots with approximately 91 feet of frontage along the easterly side of Heliotrope Drive, 300 feet of frontage along the northerly side of Beverly Boulevard, and approximately 108 feet of frontage along the westerly side of Berendo Street. The subject lot has a total lot size of 30,567 square feet. The project site is located within the Wilshire Community Plan and Subarea B of the Vermont/Western SNAP.

3.2.2 Existing Conditions

The subject site is a slightly sloped, rectangular-shaped, 30,567 square-foot lot and currently improved with two (2) commercial buildings built in 1919 and 1942, and two (2) residential buildings built in 1922. The site is zoned C2-1 and designated for General Commercial land uses. The property is located 1.59 kilometers from the Puente Hills Blind Thrusts Fault Zone and located within the Methane Buffer Zone. The site is not within a designated hillside, airport hazard, coastal zone, farmland, fire hazard severity zone, hazardous waste site, Bureau of Engineering's (BOE) Special Grading Area, landslide, liquefaction, fault rupture, or tsunami inundation zone. There are three (3) non-protected trees on-site and two (2) street trees that will be removed as part of the project scope.

3.2.3 Surrounding Land Uses

The site is located within the Wilshire Community Plan Area, approximately 0.2 miles to the west of the 101 Freeway. The project site is located approximately 720 feet from the Vermont/Beverly Metro Red Line Station. Beverly Boulevard is designated as an Avenue II with a designated right-of-way width of 86 feet and designated roadway width of 56 feet. Heliotrope Drive is designated as a Local Street – Standard with a designated right-of-way width of 60 feet and designated roadway width of 36 feet. Berendo Street is designated as a Local Street – Standard with a designated right-of-way width of 60 feet and designated roadway width of 36 feet.

The surrounding area is characterized by leveled and slightly sloped topography and improved streets. Properties to the south, east, and west are zoned C2-1, located within Subarea B of the SNAP, and developed with one-story commercial buildings. Properties to the north are zoned R3-1, located within Subarea A (Neighborhood Conservation) of the SNAP, and developed with one- to three-story single- and multi-family residential buildings.

3.3 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

3.3.1 Project Overview

The project is the demolition of two (2) existing single-family dwellings and associated buildings, two (2) existing commercial buildings with an associated surface parking lot, and the construction, use, and maintenance of a new four-story above a partially subterranean parking level, 66-foot in height, 67-unit with 8,450 square feet of commercial retail space mixed-use building on a 30,567 square-foot lot. As part of the project, a minimum of 10 percent (seven (7) units) of the total dwelling units will be rent-restricted for Extremely Low Income Households, in accordance with a local land use covenant recorded with the Housing and Community Investment Department of Los Angeles (“HCIDLA”).

Of the total 67 new units, the project would include one (1) studio apartment, 50 on-bedroom apartments, and 16 two-bedroom apartments. The units range in size from approximately 515 square feet (studio) to 1,200 square feet (largest two-bedroom). The project would include common and private open space including but not limited to a courtyard in the rear yard which may include benches and lawns, and private balconies. The project will provide 34 residential parking spaces, 12 commercial parking spaces, 41 bicycle parking spaces on-site. The project would result in a total of 69,895 square feet of floor area with a FAR of 2.28:1.

The project will consist of 6,250 cubic yards of earth of export. The project will cut approximately 12 feet below the existing grade in order to accommodate the partially subterranean parking level.

The requested entitlements include a Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Affordable Housing Incentive Program, and Project Permit Compliance Review,

pursuant to Section 12.22 A.31 and Section 11.5.7 C of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) and the Vermont/Western SNAP Specific Plan Ordinance No. 184,888, respectively.

3.3.2 Design and Architecture

The project proposes the construction of a four-story above a partially subterranean parking level, 66-foot in height mixed-use building with a Modern architectural style. The building façade materials include plaster, wood siding, and aluminum. Glass windows will be accented to provide breaks in plane. Moreover, the building provides recessed and projecting balconies throughout multiple levels.

3.3.3 Open Space and Landscaping

The project proposes 5,595 square feet of open space, which includes the following areas: 1) a 2,245 square-foot rear yard courtyard, 2) 2,550 square feet of balconies, and 3) a 800 square-foot fitness room. The second floor will be landscaped with Southern Magnolia trees, bull grass, and 10 new street trees (species to be determined at a later date by Urban Forestry).

3.3.4 Access, Circulation, and Parking

Pedestrian access to the main lobby will be provided via the main entrance along Beverly Boulevard. Commercial retail entrances are found along Beverly Boulevard and Berendo Street. A public pedestrian thoroughway will be made available from the main entrance. The pedestrian thoroughway will lead pedestrians to the rear open space area and contains two (2) paths that lead towards Heliotrope Drive and Berendo Street. Vehicular access will be provided via a 19-foot ingress and egress driveway along Heliotrope Drive. The project will provide 34 residential parking spaces, 12 commercial parking spaces, 41 bicycle parking spaces on-site within the partially subterranean parking level and ground level.

3.3.5 Lighting and Signage

All lighting on the upper levels would be shielded and focused on the Project Site and directed away from the neighboring land uses. The project will include architectural features and facades with a low level of reflectivity. All future signs shall be reviewed by Project Planning staff for compliance with the Vermont/Western Station Neighborhood Area Plan (SNAP) Specific Plan and Design Guidelines. Any pole, roof or off-site sign, any sign containing flashing, mechanical or strobe lights (i.e Digital Signs) are prohibited.

3.3.6 Sustainability Features

The project is designed to meet the latest in California/Uniform building codes, Title 24, and Cal-Green. In accordance with new Cal-Green requirements, the project includes 2,213 square feet of total roof areas as solar ready.

3.4 REQUESTED PERMITS AND APPROVALS

The list below includes the anticipated requests for approval of the project. The Mitigation Negative Declaration will analyze impacts associated with the project and will provide environmental review sufficient for all necessary entitlements and public agency actions associated with the project. The discretionary entitlements, reviews, permits and approvals required to implement the project include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

- Pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 12.22 A.31, a Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Affordable Housing Incentive Program consisting of Base Incentives and two (2) additional incentives for 1) a 16-foot increase in overall height, an 11-foot height increase to the stepback requirement from 30 feet to 41 feet in height, transitional height per TOC and 2) a 25 percent reduction in the overall open space requirement for a property within Tier 3 of the TOC.
- Pursuant to LAMC Section 11.5.7 C, a Project Permit Compliance to allow the demolition of two (2) existing single-family dwellings and associated buildings, two (2) existing commercial buildings with an associated surface parking lot, and the construction, use, and maintenance of a new five-story with an at-grade parking level, 66-foot in height, 67-unit with 8,450 square feet of commercial retail space mixed-use building, located within Subarea B of the SNAP.
- Other discretionary and ministerial permits and approvals that may be deemed necessary, including, but not limited to, temporary street closure permits, grading permits, excavation permits, foundation permits, building permits, and sign permits.

INITIAL STUDY

4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

I. AESTHETICS

| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

Except as provided in Public

Resources Code Section 21099 would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Senate Bill (SB) 743 [Public Resources Code (PRC) §21099(d)] sets forth new guidelines for evaluating project transportation impacts under CEQA, as follows: “Aesthetic and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project on an infill site within a transit priority area (TPA) shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.” PRC Section 21099 defines a “transit priority area” as an area within 0.5 mile of a major transit stop that is “existing or planned, if the planned stop is scheduled to be completed within the planning horizon included in a Transportation Improvement Program adopted pursuant to Section 450.216 or 450.322 of Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations.” PRC Section 21064.3 defines “major transit stop” as “a site containing an existing rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail

transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.” PRC Section 21099 defines an “employment center project” as “a project located on property zoned for commercial uses with a floor area ratio of no less than 0.75 and that is located within a transit priority area. PRC Section 21099 defines an “infill site” as a lot located within an urban area that has been previously developed, or on a vacant site where at least 75 percent of the perimeter of the site adjoins, or is separated only by an improved public right-of-way from, parcels that are developed with qualified urban uses. This state law supersedes the aesthetic impact thresholds in the 2006 L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide, including those established for aesthetics, obstruction of views, shading, and nighttime illumination.

The related City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning Zoning Information (ZI) File ZI No. 2452 provides further instruction concerning the definition of transit priority projects and that “visual resources, aesthetic character, shade and shadow, light and glare, and scenic vistas or any other aesthetic impact as defined in the City’s CEQA Threshold Guide shall not be considered an impact for infill projects within TPAs pursuant to CEQA.”¹

PRC Section 21099 applies to the project. Therefore, the Project is exempt from aesthetic impacts. The analysis in this initial study, is for informational purposes only and not for determining whether the Project will result in significant impacts to the environment. Any aesthetic impact analysis in this initial study is included to discuss what aesthetic impacts would occur from the Project if PRC Section 21099(d) was not in effect. As such, nothing in the aesthetic impact discussion in this initial study shall trigger the need for any CEQA findings, CEQA analysis, or CEQA mitigation measures.

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

This discussion is for informational purposes only.

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. A scenic vista refers to views of focal points or panoramic views of broader geographic areas that have visual interest. A focal point view would consist of a view of a notable object, building, or setting. An impact on a scenic vista would occur if the bulk or design of a building or development contrasts enough with a visually interesting view, so that the quality of the view is permanently affected. The subject site is located along the northerly side of Beverly Boulevard, westerly side of Heliotrope Drive, and easterly side of Berendo Street. The project site is located approximately 720 feet from the Vermont/Beverly Metro Red Line Station and is identified as located within a transit priority area (City of Los Angeles Transit Priority Area Map, 2016) per SB 743. Surrounding properties are developed with one- to three-story single- and multi-family residential buildings and commercial buildings. The project proposes the construction, use, and maintenance of a new four-story above a partially subterranean parking level, 66-foot in height, 67-unit mixed-use building within Subarea B of the Vermont/Western SNAP. Due to existing topography and urban development, views from

¹ City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Zoning Information File ZA No. 2452, Transit Priority Areas (TPAs)/Exemptions to Aesthetics and Parking Within TPAs Pursuant to CEQA. Available at: <http://zimas.lacity.org/documents/zoneinfo/ZI2452.pdf>. Accessed Dec. 2, 2016.

within the vicinity of the Project Sites are limited to short- and mid-range views of existing structures; no scenic vistas are present from and/or near the Project Sites. Therefore, as an infill project within one-half mile from a major transit stop, the project will not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural feature within a state scenic highway?

This discussion is for informational purposes only.

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially damage scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway. The City of Los Angeles' General Plan Mobility Element (Citywide General Plan Circulation System Maps) as well as the CalTrans website² indicates that no State-designated scenic highways are located near the project site. Therefore, no impacts related to a State Scenic Highways would occur.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

This discussion is for informational purposes only.

Less than significant. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The surrounding project area is developed with one- to three-story single- and multi-family residential buildings to the north and one- to two-story commercial buildings along Beverly Boulevard to the south, east, and west. The project site meets the requirements for Senate Bill SB 743, as described in Section I(a) and is exempt from aesthetic impacts. In addition, potential for degradation to the visual character and quality of the site and surrounding area would be further reduced with the following applicable Regulatory Compliance Measures (RCM), RC-AE-3 which, pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 91.8104, requires that every building shall be maintained in a safe and sanitary condition and good repair, and free from debris, rubbish, garbage, trash, overgrown vegetation, or other similar material; and LAMC Section 91.8014.15, which requires that the exterior to all building and fences shall be free from graffiti when such graffiti is visible from a street or alley. Therefore, through the implementation of SB 743 and the above regulations and RCM, impacts to the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings would be less than significant. Refer to Response to Checklist Question I (a) above.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?

This discussion is for informational purposes only.

² <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways>

Less than significant. A significant impact would occur if light and glare substantially altered the character of off-site areas surrounding the site or interfered with the performance of an off-site activity. Light impacts are typically associated with the use of artificial light during the evening and night-time hours. Glare may be a daytime occurrence caused by the reflection of sunlight or artificial light from highly polished surfaces, such as window glass and reflective cladding materials, and may interfere with the safe operation of a motor vehicle on adjacent streets. Daytime glare is common in urban areas and is typically associated with mid- to high-rise buildings with exterior façades largely or entirely comprised of highly reflective glass or mirror-like materials. Nighttime glare is primarily associated with bright point-source lighting that contrasts with existing low ambient light conditions. The project site meets the requirements for Senate Bill SB 743, as described in Section I(a) and is exempt from aesthetic impacts. Due to the urbanized nature of the area, a moderate level of ambient nighttime light already exists. Nighttime lighting sources include street lights, vehicle headlights, and interior and exterior building illumination. The proposed project would include nighttime security lighting primarily along the perimeter of the project site. However, the security lighting would be night-friendly LEDs and would not substantially change existing ambient nighttime lighting conditions. The proposed project does not include any elements or features that would create substantial new sources of glare. Therefore, light and glare impacts would be less than significant. Refer to Response to Checklist Question I (a) above.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Would the project: | | | | |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would convert valued farmland to non-agricultural uses. The project site consists of six (6) lots containing two (2) existing single-family dwellings and associated buildings, two (2) existing commercial buildings with an associated surface parking lot. No Farmland, agricultural uses, or related operations are present within the project site or surrounding area. Due to its urban setting, the project site and surrounding area are not included in the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. In addition, the proposed project would not convert any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use. Therefore, no impact would occur.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project conflicted with existing agricultural zoning or agricultural parcels enrolled under the Williamson Act. The project site is not zoned for agricultural use or under a Williamson Contract. As the project site and surrounding area do not contain farmland of any type, the proposed project would not conflict with a Williamson Contract. Therefore, no impact would occur.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project conflicted with existing zoning or caused rezoning of forest land or timberland, or resulted in the loss of forest land or in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The project site and the surrounding area are not zoned for forest land or timberland. Accordingly, the proposed project would not conflict with forest land or timberland zoning or result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact would occur.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project conflicted with existing zoning or caused rezoning of forest land or timberland, or resulted in the loss of forest land or in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The project site and the surrounding area are not zoned for forest land or timberland. Accordingly, the proposed project would not conflict with forest land or timberland zoning or result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact would occur.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project caused the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. The project site does not contain farmland, forestland, or timberland. Therefore, no impact would occur.

III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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

No Impact. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the agency primarily responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in the South Coast Air Basin and reducing emissions from area and point stationary, mobile, and indirect sources. SCAQMD prepared the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) to meet federal and state ambient air quality standards. A significant air quality impact may occur if a project is inconsistent with the AQMP or would in some way represent a substantial hindrance to employing the policies or obtaining the goals of that plan. The proposed project is not expected to conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the AQMP and SCAQMD rules. The proposed project is also subject to the City’s Green Building Program Ordinance (Ord. No. 179,890), which was adopted to reduce the use of natural resources, create healthier living environments, and minimize the negative impacts of development on local, regional and global ecosystems. Therefore, no impact would occur.

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the air basin is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Based on published studies for similar projects, during the construction phase the proposed project would not likely exceed the regional SCAQMD significance thresholds for emissions of Carbon Monoxide (CO), Reactive Organic Compounds (ROG), Nitrogen Oxides (NOx), Particulate Matter (PM10 and PM2.5), and Sulfur Dioxide (SOx). Therefore, regional emission impacts for the proposed project would be less than significant for all construction phases. Motor vehicles that access the project site would be the predominant source of long-term project operations emissions. Additional emissions would be generated by area sources, such as energy use and landscape maintenance activities. The project would be subject to regulatory compliance measures, which reduce the impacts of operational and construction regional emissions. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project were to generate pollutant concentrations to a degree that would significantly affect sensitive receptors. The SCAQMD identifies the following as sensitive receptors: long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, and athletic facilities. The surrounding area is developed with developed with one- to three-story single- and multi-family residential buildings to the north and one- to two-story commercial buildings along Beverly Boulevard to the south, east, and west. The SCAQMD has developed localized significance thresholds (LSTs) that are based on the amount of maximum daily-localized construction emissions per day that can be generated by a project that would cause or contribute to adverse localized air quality impacts. These apply to projects that are less than or equal to five acres in size and are only applicable to Repairable Particulate Matter (PM10 and PM2.5), Carbon Monoxide (CO), and Nitrogen Oxides (NOx). The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has published guidance for locating new sensitive receptors (e.g., residences) away from nearby sources of air pollution. Relevant recommendations include avoiding siting new sensitive land uses within 500 feet of a freeway or 300 feet of a large gas station (defined as a facility with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater). The location of the proposed project would be consistent with the CARB recommendations for locating new sensitive receptors. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

No Impact. 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 immediate area surrounding the project site. The proposed project would utilize typical construction techniques, and the odors would be typical of most construction sites and temporary in nature. Construction of the proposed project would not cause an odor nuisance. 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 proposed land uses would not result in activities that create objectionable odors. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an impact related to objectionable odors.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact. A project would have a significant biological impact through the loss or destruction of individuals of a species or through the degradation of sensitive habitat. The project site is located in a highly urbanized area, along a prominent commercial street, Beverly Boulevard. There are three (3) non-protected trees on-site and two (2) street trees, all of which are proposed to be removed. There are no protected trees onsite. Nesting birds are protected under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (Title 33, United States Code, Section 703 et seq., see also Title 50, Code of Federal Regulation, Part 10) and Section 3503 of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Code. Thus, the project applicant shall comply with the regulatory compliance measures to ensure that no significant impacts to nesting birds or sensitive biological species or habitat would occur. Therefore, no impact would occur.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if any riparian habitat or natural community would be lost or destroyed as a result of urban development. The project site does not contain any riparian habitat and does not contain any streams or water courses necessary to support riparian habitat. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or the United States Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS), and no impacts would occur.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if federally protected wetlands would be modified or removed by a project. The project site does not contain any federally protected wetlands, wetland resources, or other waters of the United States as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The project site is located in a highly urbanized area and developed with residential, office, and commercial uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any 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, and no impacts would occur.

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?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would interfere with, or remove access to, a migratory wildlife corridor or impede use of native wildlife nursery sites. Due to the highly urbanized nature of the project site and surrounding area, the lack

of a major water body, and the limited number of trees, the project site does not support habitat for native resident or migratory species or contain native nurseries. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere with wildlife movement or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, and no impact would occur.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be inconsistent with local regulations pertaining to biological resources. The proposed project would not conflict with any policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Ordinance (No. 177,404). There are three (3) non-protected trees on-site and two (2) street trees, all of which are proposed to be removed. There are no protected trees onsite. The proposed project would be required to comply with the provisions of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the California Fish and Game Code (CFGC). Both the MBTA and CDFW protects migratory birds that may use trees on or adjacent to the project site for nesting, and may be disturbed during construction of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance (e.g., oak trees or California walnut woodlands), and no impacts would occur.

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?

No Impact. The project site and its vicinity are not part of any draft or adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan. The project site and its vicinity are not part of any draft or adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan, and no impacts would occur.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially alter the environmental context of, or remove identified historical resources. The project includes the demolition of two (2) commercial buildings built in 1919 and 1942, and two (2) residential buildings built in 1922. However, no structures have been identified as a historic resource by local or state agencies, and the project site has not been determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, the Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments Register, and/or any local register. In addition, the site was not found to be a potential historic resource based on SurveyLA, the citywide survey of Los Angeles or the City’s HistoricPlacesLA website. According to the Historic Resource Evaluation conducted by Kaplan Chen Kaplan on November 22, 2019, none of the four (4) existing buildings were found to have historic significance or have the potential to be a historic resource. The existing buildings are not associated with any historic events or patterns of history, associated with any historic persons, associated with work from a master architect, or are contributing to an eligible historic district. Moreover, the City of Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources concluded on January 30, 2020, that the project site is not a historical resource for purposes of CEQA after reviewing the Historic Resource Evaluation, building permits, and the improvements associated with the buildings. Therefore, no impact would occur.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if a known or unknown archaeological resource would be removed, altered, or destroyed as a result of the

proposed development. Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines significant archaeological resources as resources that meet the criteria for historical resources or resources that constitute unique archaeological resources. A project-related significant impact could occur if a project would significantly affect archaeological resources that fall under either of these categories. If archaeological resources are discovered during excavation, grading, or construction activities, work shall cease in the area of the find until a qualified archaeologist has evaluated the find in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Per regulatory compliance measures, personnel of the proposed project shall not collect or move any archaeological materials and associated materials. Construction activity may continue unimpeded on other portions of the project site. The found deposits would be treated in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if previously interred human remains would be disturbed during excavation of the project site. Human remains could be encountered during excavation and grading activities associated with the proposed project. While no formal cemeteries, other places of human interment, or burial grounds or sites are known to occur within the project area, there is always a possibility that human remains can be encountered during construction. If human remains are encountered unexpectedly during construction demolition and/or grading activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98. If human remains of Native American origin are discovered during project construction, compliance with state laws, which fall within the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) (Public Resource Code Section 5097), relating to the disposition of Native American burials will be adhered to. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

V. ENERGY

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the project would substantially increase demand for energy resources, which exceeds the available supply.

Short-Term Construction Impacts

Construction of the project would require the use of electric power for as-necessary lighting and electronic equipment. The amount of electricity used during construction would be minimal because typical energy demand stems from the use of electrically powered equipment. The majority of the energy used during construction would be from petroleum. Petroleum would be consumed throughout construction of the project. Fuel consumed by construction equipment would be the primary energy resource expended over the course of construction, and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) associated with the transportation of construction materials and construction worker commutes would also result in petroleum consumption. However, the project would be required to comply with CARB's Airborne Toxics Control Measure, which restricts heavy-duty diesel vehicle idling time to 5 minutes. In addition, the petroleum used during construction would be temporary and minimal, and would not be wasteful or inefficient. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Long-Term Operational Impacts

The proposed project would require electricity, natural gas, and petroleum during operations. For the reasons discussed below, the proposed project not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.

Electricity

The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) provides electrical service throughout the City of Los Angeles and many areas of the Owens Valley, serving approximately 4 million people within a service area of approximately 465 square miles, excluding the Owens Valley.

Electrical service provided by the LADWP is divided into two planning districts: Valley and Metropolitan. The Valley Planning District includes the LADWP service area north of Mulholland Drive, and the Metropolitan Planning District includes the LADWP service area south of Mulholland Drive. The Project site is located within LADWP's Metropolitan Planning District. According to LADWP's 2017 Power Strategic Long-Term Resource Plan, the LADWP has a generation capacity greater than 7,880 MW. In 2017, the LADWP power system experienced an instantaneous peak demand of 6,502 MW (LADWP 2017). Approximately 29 percent of LADWP's 2016 electricity purchases were from renewable sources, which is similar to the 25 percent statewide percentage of electricity purchases from renewable sources (CEC 2018).

Upon completion, the project's operational phase would require electricity for building operation (appliances, lighting, etc.). The project would also be required to comply with the 2016 Title 24 standards or the most recent standards at the time of building issuance. The energy-using fixtures within the project would likely be newer technologies, utilizing less electricity power. In addition, LADWP is required to procure at least 33 percent of their energy portfolio from renewable sources by 2020. The current sources procured by LADWP include wind, solar, and geothermal sources. These sources account for 29 percent of LADWP's overall energy mix in 2016, the most recent year for which data are available (CEC 2018). Therefore, the project would not result in a wasteful use of electricity and impacts would be less than significant.

Natural Gas

Natural gas is provided to the project site by the Southern California Gas Company (SoCal Gas). SoCal Gas is the principal distributor of natural gas in Southern California, serving residential, commercial, and industrial markets. SoCal Gas serves approximately 21.8 million customers in more than 500 communities encompassing approximately 24,000 square miles throughout Central and Southern California, from the City of Visalia to the Mexican border (SoCalGas 2018). The traditional, southwestern United States sources of natural gas will continue to supply most of SoCal Gas' natural gas demand. The Rocky Mountain supply is available but is used as an alternative supplementary supply source, and the use of Canadian sources provide only a small share of SoCal Gas supplies due to the high cost of transport (California Gas and Electric Utilities 2018). Additionally, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) regulates California natural gas rates and natural gas services, including in-state transportation over transmission and distribution pipeline systems, storage, procurement, metering, and billing. Most of the natural gas used in California comes from out-of-state natural gas basins (CPUC 2017).

Although the project would require natural gas for building heating, the project would comply with 2016 Title 24 building energy efficiency standards, reducing energy used in the state. Based on compliance with Title 24 and CPUC regulations, therefore, natural gas consumption impacts would be less than significant.

Petroleum

According to the California Energy Commission (CEC), transportation accounts for 38.5% of California's total energy consumption in 2015 (CEC 2018). In 2017, California consumed 15.6 billion gallons of gasoline and 2.82 billion gallons of diesel fuel (California Board of Equalization 2018). However, the State is now working on developing flexible strategies to reduce petroleum use. Over the last decade, California has implemented several policies, rules, and regulations to improve vehicle efficiency, increase the development and use of alternative fuels, reduce air pollutants and GHGs from the transportation sector, and reduce VMT. Accordingly, gasoline consumption in California has declined. The CEC predicts that the demand for gasoline will continue to decline over the next 10 years, and there will be an increase in the use of alternative fuels (CEC 2016).

During operation of the Project, the majority of fuel consumption would involve the use of motor vehicles traveling to and from the Project site. Over the lifetime of the Project, the fuel efficiency of vehicles being used by residents is expected to increase. As such, the amount of petroleum consumed as a result of vehicle trips to and from the Project site is expected to decrease during the lifetime of the Project. In addition, as discussed in more detail in Section 17, Transportation, the Project would not result in a substantial VMT, and thus, would not result in the inefficient or wasteful use of petroleum. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

No Impact. The project would be designed to comply with all applicable state and local codes, including the City's Green Building Ordinance and the California Green Building Standards Code. Design features that could be implemented would include, but not be limited to, use of efficient lighting technology; energy efficient heating, ventilation and cooling equipment; and Energy Star rated products and appliances.

Overall, the project would be designed and constructed in accordance with applicable state and local green building standards that would serve to reduce the energy demand of the project. In addition, based on the above, the project's energy demand would be within the existing and planned electricity and natural gas capacities of LADWP and SoCalGas, respectively. Use of petroleum-based fuels during construction and operation would also be minimized. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency and no impact would occur.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Directly or indirectly cause 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. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv. Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Be located on a geologic unit 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

The project will consist of 6,500 cubic yards of cut, 250 cubic yards of fill, zero cubic yards of import, and 6,250 cubic yards of export. The project will cut approximately 11.5 feet below the existing grade in order to accommodate the partially subterranean parking level.

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.

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would cause personal injury or death or result in property damage as a result of a fault rupture occurring on the project site and if the project site is located within a State-designated Alquist-Priolo Zone or other designated fault zone. The subject site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or other designated fault zone. The nearest Active Fault Near-Source Zone, Upper Elysian Park, is located approximately 0.67 km from the project site. Thus, the potential for fault rupture at the project site would be considered low. The project would involve the construction of a residential structure to be utilized for residential purposes in accordance with allowed uses under existing zoning and no proposed uses would have the potential to directly or indirectly exacerbate existing potential for fault rupture. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would cause personal injury or death or resulted in property damage as a result of seismic ground shaking. The entire Southern California region is susceptible to strong ground shaking from severe earthquakes. Consequently, development of the proposed project could expose people and structures to strong seismic ground shaking. However, the proposed project would be designed and constructed in accordance with State and local Building Codes to reduce the potential for exposure of people or structures to seismic risks to the maximum extent possible. The proposed project would be required to comply with the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG), which provides guidance for the evaluation and mitigation of earthquake-related hazards, and with the seismic safety requirements in the Uniform Building Code (UBC) and the LAMC. Compliance with such requirements would reduce seismic ground shaking impacts to the maximum extent practicable with current engineering practices. Therefore, impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a proposed project site is located within a liquefaction zone. Liquefaction is the loss of soil strength or stiffness due to a buildup of pore-water pressure during severe ground shaking. While the subject site is not located within a Liquefaction Zone, specific RCMs in the City of Los Angeles regulate the grading and construction of projects in these particular types

of locations and will reduce any potential impacts to less than significant. RCMs include the Uniform Building Code Chapter 18, Division 1, Section 1804.5: Liquefaction Potential and Soil Strength Loss. These RCMs have been historically proven to work to the satisfaction of the City Engineer to reduce any impacts from the specific environment the project is located. Furthermore, the applicant submitted a Geology and Soils Report to the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety (LADBS) for review. The LADBS, Grading Department issued a Soils Approval Letter dated August 7, 2017 (Log Reference No. 99122) with conditions that must be complied with during site development. Therefore, impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be less than significant.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be implemented on a site that would be located in a hillside area with unstable geological conditions or soil types that would be susceptible to failure when saturated. According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, the Seismic Hazard Zones Map for this area shows the project site is not located within a landslide hazard zone. The project site and surrounding area are relatively flat with a slight upward slope. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential effects resulting from landslides, and no impacts would occur.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if construction activities or future uses would result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Construction of the proposed project would result in ground surface disturbance during site clearance, excavation, and grading, which could create the potential for soil erosion to occur. The project will consist of 6,500 cubic yards of cut and 6,250 cubic yards of export. The project will cut approximately 11.5 feet below the existing grade in order to accommodate the partially subterranean parking level. In addition, excavation activities would be necessary to accommodate the proposed project, which would include one partially subterranean level of parking. Construction activities would be performed in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles Building Code and the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) through the City's Stormwater Management Division. In addition, the proposed project would be required to develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would require implementation of an erosion control plan to reduce the potential for wind or waterborne erosion during the construction process. In addition, all onsite grading and site preparation would comply with applicable provisions of Chapter IX, Division 70 of the LAMC. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur with respect to erosion or 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?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if any unstable geological conditions would result in any type of geological failure, including lateral

spreading, off-site landslides, liquefaction, or collapse. Development of the proposed project would not have the potential to expose people and structures to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslide; see Response to Checklist Question VII a-b for these issues. Subsidence and ground collapse generally occur in areas with active groundwater withdrawal or petroleum production. The extraction of groundwater or petroleum from sedimentary source rocks can cause the permanent collapse of the pore space previously occupied by the removed fluid. According to the Safety Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan, Critical Facilities and Lifeline Systems, Exhibit E and/or the Environmental and Public Facilities Map (1996), the project site is not identified as being located in an oil field or within an oil drilling district. Construction will be required by the Department of Building and Safety to comply with the City of Los Angeles Uniform Building Code (UBC) which is designed to assure safe construction and includes building foundation requirements appropriate to site conditions. Therefore, the potential for landslide lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse would be less than significant.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18 1 B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be built on expansive soils without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for project buildings, thus, posing a hazard to life and property. Expansive soils have relatively high clay mineral and expand with the addition of water and shrink when dried, which can cause damage to overlying structures. However, the proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements of the UBC, LAMC, and other applicable building codes. Compliance with such requirements would reduce impacts related to expansive soils, and impacts would be less than significant.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No Impact. A project would cause a significant impact if adequate wastewater disposal is not available. The project site is located in a highly urbanized area, where wastewater infrastructure is currently in place. The proposed project would connect to existing sewer lines that serve the project site and would not use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The proposed project would connect to existing sewer lines that serve the project site and would not use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, there would be no impact.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if excavation or construction activities associated with the proposed project would disturb paleontological or unique geological features. If paleontological resources are discovered during excavation, grading, or construction, the LADBS shall be notified immediately, and all work shall cease in the area of the find until a qualified

paleontologist evaluates the find. Construction activity may continue unimpeded on other portions of the project site. The paleontologist shall determine the location, the time frame, and the extent to which any monitoring of earthmoving activities shall be required. The found deposits would be treated in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less than Significant Impact. Greenhouse gases (GHG) are those gaseous constituents of the atmosphere, both natural and human generated, that absorb and emit radiation at specific wavelengths within the spectrum of terrestrial radiation emitted by the earth's surface, the atmosphere itself, and by clouds. The City has adopted the LA Green Plan to provide a citywide plan for achieving the City's GHG emissions targets, for both existing and future generation of GHG emissions. In order to implement the goal of improving energy conservation and efficiency, the Los Angeles City Council has adopted multiple ordinances and updates to establish the current Los Angeles Green Building Code (LAGBC) (Ordinance No. 181,480). The LAGBC requires projects to achieve a 20 percent reduction in potable water use and wastewater generation. Through required implementation of the LAGBC, the proposed project would be consistent with local and statewide goals and policies aimed at reducing the generation of GHGs. Therefore, the proposed project's generation of GHG emissions would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to emissions and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project conflicted with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG). The California legislature passed Senate Bill (SB) 375 to connect regional transportation planning to land use decisions made at a local level. SB 375 requires the metropolitan planning organizations to prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in their regional transportation plans to achieve the per capita GHG reduction targets. For the SCAG region, the SCS is contained in the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The 2016-2040 RTP/SCS focuses the majority of new housing and job growth in high-quality transit areas and other opportunity areas on existing main streets, in downtowns, and commercial corridors, resulting in more opportunity for transit-oriented

development. In addition, SB 743, adopted September 27, 2013, encourages land use and transportation planning decisions that reduce vehicle miles traveled, which contribute to GHG emissions, as required by AB 32. The project would provide infill development proximate to a major transportation corridor (i.e., Beverly Boulevard) and would not interfere with SCAG's ability to implement the regional strategies outlined in the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS. The proposed project, therefore, would be consistent with statewide, regional and local goals and policies aimed at reducing GHG emissions and would result in a less than significant impact related to plans that target the reduction of GHG emissions.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Construction of the proposed project would involve the temporary use of potentially hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. Operation of the project would involve the limited use and storage of common hazardous substances typical of those used in multi-family residential developments, including lubricants, paints, solvents, custodial products (e.g., cleaning supplies), pesticides and other landscaping supplies, and vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. No uses or activities are proposed that would result in the use or discharge of unregulated hazardous materials and/or substances, or create a public hazard through transport, use, or disposal. Significant hazards are not anticipated as long as residents and maintenance staff store, use, and dispose of hazardous materials in accordance with manufacturers' instructions and handle in compliance with applicable federal, State, and local regulations. Any associated risk would be adequately reduced to a less than significant level through compliance with these standards and regulations. The project is within the Methane Buffer Zone, however, this project falls under Design Level I of the LADBS Methane Code, with less than 2 inches of water-column gas-pressure. Therefore, as per said Methane Code Table I B, this project does not require any methane mitigation system. Moreover, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was conducted by Sun Environmental Service (SES) on October 28, 2016, which states that hazardous materials or waste was found on-site. Thus, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project created a significant hazard to the public or environment due to a reasonably foreseeable release of hazardous materials. The two (2) commercial buildings built in 1919 and 1942, and two (2) residential buildings built in 1922 currently existing on-site may contain asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paint (LBP). Demolition of these buildings would have the potential to release asbestos fibers into the atmosphere if such materials exist and they are not properly stabilized or removed prior to demolition activities. The removal of asbestos is regulated by SCAQMD Rule 1403; therefore, any asbestos found on-site would be required to be removed in accordance with applicable regulations prior to demolition. Similarly, it is likely that lead-based paint is present in buildings constructed prior to 1979. Compliance with existing State laws regarding removal would be required, resulting in a less than significant impact.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Less than Significant Impact. Construction activities have the potential to result in the release, emission, handling, and disposal of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing school. There are three (3) existing schools (Alexandria Elementary School, Virgil Middle School, and American Career College) located within one-quarter mile of the project site. The proposed project is an infill development for a new four-story above a partially subterranean parking level, 66-foot in height, 67-unit with 8,450 square feet of commercial retail space mixed-use building. Operation of the project would involve the limited use and storage of common hazardous substances typical of those used in multi-family residential and retail/commercial developments, including lubricants, paints, solvents, custodial products (e.g., cleaning supplies), pesticides and other landscaping supplies, and vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. All hazardous materials within the project site would be acquired, handled, used, stored, transported, and disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, State, and local requirements. Moreover, a Phase I ESA was conducted by SES on October 28, 2016, which states that hazardous materials or waste was found on-site. The Phase I ESA identified potential contaminated groundwater due to a California Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST)/Spills site at a car wash located at 4000 West Beverly Boulevard, across the street from the project site. According to the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker, the LUST case was closed with no further action required as of July 15, 2016. As such, the identified contamination at such site was mitigated to a degree that the governing agency believed that these sites do not pose apparent concern/threat to the subsurface environment of the neighboring area. Therefore, the proposed project would not emit hazardous emission, or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within on-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, resulting in less than significant impacts.

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?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the project site is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) maintains a database (EnviroStor) that provides access to detailed information on hazardous waste permitted sites and corrective action facilities, as well as existing site cleanup information. EnviroStor also provides information on investigation, cleanup, permitting, and/or corrective actions that are planned, being conducted, or have been completed under DTSC's oversight. A review of EnviroStor on July 22, 2020, did not identify any records of hazardous waste facilities on the project site. Moreover, a Phase I ESA was conducted by SES on October 28, 2016, which states that no recognized environmental conditions were found on the property that cannot be addressed through regulatory compliance measures. Therefore, the proposed project would not be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites or create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, and no impact would occur.

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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project is located within a public airport land use plan area, or within two miles of a public airport, and subject to a safety hazard. The project site is not located in an airport land use plan area, or within two miles of any public or public use airports, or private airstrips. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area, and no impacts would occur.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project were to interfere with roadway operations used in conjunction with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan or would generate traffic congestion that would interfere with the execution of such a plan. The nearest emergency route is Beverly Boulevard, which is abutting the project site (City of Los Angeles, Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan, Critical Facilities and Lifeline Systems, Exhibit H, November 1996). The proposed project would not require the closure of any public or private streets and would not impede emergency vehicle access to the project site or surrounding area. Additionally, emergency access to and from the project site would be provided in accordance with requirements of the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD). Therefore, the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and no impact would occur.

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project exposed people and structures to high risk of wildfire. The project site is located in a highly urbanized area of the City and the area surrounding the project site is completely developed. The project site is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, nor is it located within a wildland fire hazard area.

Therefore, the project would not directly or indirectly expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, death as a result of exposure to wildland fires. As such, impacts related to wildland fires would be less than significant.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; | | | | |
| ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; | | | | |
| iii. 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; or | | | | |
| iv. Impede or redirect flood flows? | | | | |
| d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project discharges water that does not meet the quality standards of agencies which regulate surface water quality and water discharge into storm water drainage systems, or does not comply with all applicable regulations as governed by the LARWQCB. Stormwater runoff from the proposed project has the potential to introduce small amounts of pollutants into the stormwater system. Pollutants would be associated with runoff from landscaped areas (pesticides and fertilizers) and paved surfaces (ordinary household cleaners). Thus, the proposed project would be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) standards and the City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control regulations (Ordinance No. 172,176 and No. 173,494) to ensure pollutant loads from the project site are minimized for downstream receiving waters. The ordinances contain requirements for construction activities and operation of projects to integrate low impact development practices and standards for stormwater pollution mitigation, and maximize open, green and pervious space on all projects consistent with the City's landscape ordinance and other related requirements in the City's Development Best Management Practices (BMPs) Handbook. Conformance would be ensured during the City's building plan review and approval process. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially deplete groundwater or interferes with groundwater recharge. The proposed project would not require the use of groundwater at the project site. Potable water would be supplied by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), which draws its water supplies from distant sources for which it conducts its own assessment and mitigation of potential environmental impacts. Given the project proposes a partially subterranean level, excavation to accommodate the partially subterranean level is not proposed at a depth that would result in the interception of existing aquifers or penetration of the existing water table. Moreover, a Phase I ESA was conducted by SES on October 28, 2016, which states that no underground storage tanks were detected and there was no evidence of recognized environmental conditions. The Phase I ESA also indicated that, *"based on the conducted government records search, there was only one Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST)/Spills site (Beverly Catalina Car Wash, located southwest across Beverly Blvd at 4000 W. Beverly Blvd) within the immediate vicinity of the subject site being identified as of potentially environmental concern. The Beverly Catalina Car Wash site is listed on LUST/Spills databases with a "Completed – Case Closed" status. The former UST leakage/spill case at the Beverly Catalina Car Wash site was satisfactorily treated under the supervision of the lead agency to the degree that no apparently significant environmental concerns for its neighboring areas are likely being induced from remaining untreated UST leakage/spill, if any, at the Beverly Catalina Car Wash site. Closure summary for the Beverly Catalina Car Wash Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST)/Spills site*

included in Appendix D of the Phase I ESA indicated that first-encountered groundwater occurs at approximate depths of 3.81 to 13.31 feet below grade and with a flow direction generally towards northwest around the site area. In case any future planned development project of the site involves excavation of sub-grade soils to more than 3.5 feet deep, this shallow groundwater occurrence around the site area would need to be put into the project design's consideration." According to the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker, the LUST case was closed with no further action required as of July 15, 2016. As such, the identified contamination at such site was mitigated to a degree that the governing agency believed that these sites do not pose apparent concern/threat to the subsurface environment of the neighboring area. As such, environmental risk associated with the subject site was assessed as low and no Phase II ESA was required. Therefore, the project would not require direct additions or withdrawals of groundwater. Therefore, the impact on groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge would be less than significant.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially alter the drainage pattern of an existing stream or river such that flooding would result. There are no streams or rivers located in the project vicinity. During project operation, storm water or any runoff irrigation waters would be directed into existing storm drains that are currently receiving surface water runoff under existing conditions. Impermeable surfaces resulting from the development of the project would not substantially change the volume of stormwater runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. Accordingly, significant alterations to existing drainage patterns within the site and surrounding area would not occur. The existing site is improved with impermeable surface. The proposed project will include pervious area, as depicted in the Irrigation Hydrozone Plans. Furthermore, compliance with construction-related BMP and/or the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would control and minimize erosion and siltation. During project operation, storm water or any runoff irrigation waters would be directed into existing storm drains that are currently receiving surface water runoff under existing conditions. Additionally, the potential to alter an existing drainage pattern would be further reduced with the following applicable RCMs, which requires the applicant to submit LID Plans and/or Standard Urban Storm water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) to the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation (BOS) Watershed Protection Division for review and approval. As such, the new development would not substantially change existing drainage patterns. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to the alteration of drainage patterns and on- or off-site flooding.

- ii. **Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;**

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially alter the drainage pattern of an existing stream or river such that flooding would result. There are no streams or rivers located in the project vicinity. During project operation, storm water or any runoff irrigation waters would be directed into existing storm drains that are currently receiving surface water runoff under existing conditions. Impermeable surfaces resulting from the development of the project would not substantially change the volume of stormwater runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. Accordingly, significant alterations to existing drainage patterns within the site and surrounding area would not occur. The existing site is improved with impermeable surface. The proposed project will include pervious area, as depicted in the Irrigation Hydrozone Plans. Furthermore, compliance with construction-related BMP and/or the SWPPP control and minimize erosion and siltation. During project operation, storm water or any runoff irrigation waters would be directed into existing storm drains that are currently receiving surface water runoff under existing conditions. Additionally, the potential to alter an existing drainage pattern would be further reduced with the following applicable RCMs, which requires the applicant to submit LID Plans and/or SUSMP to the BOS Watershed Protection Division for review and approval. As such, the new development would not substantially change existing drainage patterns. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to the alteration of drainage patterns and on- or off-site flooding.

- iii. **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; or**

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if runoff water would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm drain systems serving the project site, or if the proposed project would substantially increase the probability that polluted runoff would reach the storm drain system. Site-generated surface water runoff would continue to flow to the City's storm drain system. Any project that creates, adds, or replaces 500 square feet of impervious surface must comply with the Low impact Development (LID) Ordinance or alternatively, the City's SUSMP, as an LAMC requirement to address water runoff and storm water pollution. As such, the new development would not substantially change existing drainage patterns. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to existing storm drain capacities or water quality.

- iv. **Impede or redirect flood flows?**

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be located within a 100-year or 500-year floodplain or would impede or redirect flood flows. According to the Safety Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan, Critical

Facilities and Lifeline Systems, Exhibit F and NavigateLA, the project site is not located within a 100-year or 500-year floodplain. Therefore, the proposed project would not be located in such areas, and no impact related to flood zones would occur.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be located within an area susceptible to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. A seiche is an oscillation of a body of water in an enclosed or semi-enclosed basin, such as a reservoir, harbor, or lake. A tsunami is a great sea wave produced by a significant undersea disturbance. Mudflows result from the down slope movement of soil and/or rock under the influence of gravity. The project site and the surrounding areas are not located near a water body to be inundated by seiche. Similarly, the project site and the surrounding areas are located approximately 13 miles east of the Pacific Ocean. Therefore, the project would have no impact related to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

No Impact. Potential pollutants generated by the project would be typical of residential and commercial land uses and may include sediment, nutrients, pesticides, pathogens, trash and debris, oil, grease, and metals. The implementation of BMPs required by the City's LID Ordinance would target these pollutants that could potentially be carried in stormwater runoff. Implementation of the LID measures on the project site would result in an improvement in surface water quality runoff as compared to existing conditions. As such, the project would not conflict with or obstruct any water quality control plans for the Los Angeles River. In addition, with implementation of the project's proposed landscaping, impervious surfaces would marginally decrease. The decrease in impervious areas would improve the groundwater recharge capacity of the project site over existing conditions. With compliance with existing regulatory requirements and implementation of LID BMPs, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or a sustainable groundwater management plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

Would the project:

- a. Physically divide an established community?
- b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

a) Physically divide an established community?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be sufficiently large or configured in such a way so as to create a physical barrier within an established community. A physical division of an established community is caused by an impediment to through travel or a physical barrier, such as a new freeway with limited access between neighborhoods on either side of the freeway, or major street closures. The proposed project would not involve any street vacation or closure or result in development of new thoroughfares or highways. The proposed project is for the construction of a 67-unit mixed-use infill development on an existing lot in an urbanized area in Los Angeles, would not divide an established community. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project is inconsistent with the General Plan or zoning designations currently applicable to the project site, and would cause adverse environmental effects, which the General Plan and zoning ordinance are designed to avoid or mitigate. The site is located within the Wilshire Community Plan Area. The site is zoned C2-1, with a General Plan land use designation of General Commercial. The project proposes the demolition of two (2) existing single-family dwellings and associated buildings, two (2) existing commercial buildings with an associated surface parking lot, and the construction, use, and maintenance of a new four-story above a partially subterranean parking level, 66-foot in height, 67-unit with 8,450 square feet of commercial retail space mixed-use building within Subarea B of the Vermont/Western SNAP.

The project proposes a mixed-use building containing 67 dwelling units in an area zoned and designated for such development, through the use a 70% density increase through use the TOC Affordable Housing Incentive Program in exchange for affordable housing. All surrounding lots are developed with commercial and single- and multi-family buildings.

The project proposes a FAR of 2.28:1 in conjunction with the TOC Affordable Housing Incentive Program, which allows a maximum FAR increase of up to 45 percent, allowing a maximum FAR of 2.9:1 in lieu of the 2:1 FAR otherwise permitted by the SNAP Subarea B, for setting aside seven (7) units for Extremely Low Income Households. The proposed building will be four-stories above a partially subterranean parking level, in an area that is developed with apartment buildings and commercial buildings that range in height from one- to three-stories. In conjunction with the TOC Affordable Housing Incentive Program, the proposed building will not be unusual for the vicinity of the subject site, and will be similar in scope to other residential or mixed-use buildings in the area that use the TOC Affordable Housing Incentive Program in exchange for affordable housing. Thus, there are no unusual circumstances which may lead to a significant effect on the environment. The proposed project would conform to the allowable land uses pursuant to the Los Angeles Municipal Code, Vermont/Western SNAP, and TOC Affordable Housing Incentive Program. Impacts related to land use have are addressed through compliance with existing regulations. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Would the project: | | | | |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources of regional value or locally-important mineral resource recovery site. According to the Conservation Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan, Mineral Resources, Exhibit A, the project site is not classified by the City as containing significant mineral deposits nor is it designated for mineral extraction land use. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any known, regionally- or locally-valuable mineral resource, and no impact would occur.

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?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources of regional value or locally-important mineral resource recovery site. According to the Conservation Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan, Mineral Resources, Exhibit A, the project site is not classified by the City as containing significant mineral deposits nor is it designated for mineral extraction land use. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any known, regionally- or locally-valuable mineral resource, and no impact would occur.

XIII. NOISE

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Would the project result in: | | | | |
| a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. A significant impact would occur if exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels are in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. The City of Los Angeles has established policies and regulations concerning the generation and control of noise that could adversely affect its citizens and noise-sensitive land uses. Construction activity would result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the project area on an intermittent basis. Noise levels would fluctuate depending on the construction phase, equipment type and duration of use, distance between the noise source and receptor, and presence or absence of noise attenuation barriers. Construction noise for the project will cause a temporary increase in the ambient noise levels, but will be subject to the LAMC Sections 112.05 (Maximum Noise Level of Powered Equipment or Powered Hand Tools) and 41.40 (Noise Due to Construction, Excavation Work – When Prohibited) regarding construction hours and construction equipment noise thresholds. The potential for excessive noise would be further reduced with the following applicable RCM RC-NO-1, which requires compliance with the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance No. 161,574, and any subsequent ordinances which

prohibits the emission of creation of noise beyond certain levels at adjacent uses unless technically infeasible. Furthermore, according to the Noise and Vibration Study conducted by Terry A. Hayes Associates Inc on October 2019, the proposed project would be required to comply with the Mitigation Measures N-1 through N-6, which are feasible measures to control noise levels, including engine mufflers and noise blanket barriers during construction. These mitigation measures would reduce noise levels associated with individual pieces of equipment and combined construction noise levels. The mitigation measures would reduce heavy-duty equipment noise levels by at least 5 dBA, would reduce ground-level construction noise by 15 dBA for ground-level receptors, and would also help control other types of noise levels associated with the construction and operations of the project. Therefore, with implementation of the referenced RCM, other applicable noise RCMs, and Mitigation Measures N-1 through N-6, potentially significant impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measures N-1 through N-6

- N-1: Power construction equipment (including combustion engines), fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with muffling devices consistent with manufacturers' standards. All equipment shall be properly maintained to assure that no additional noise, due to worn or improperly maintained parts, would be generated.
- N-2: Barriers, such as, but not limited to, plywood structures or flexible sound control curtains extending eight feet in height shall be erected around the Project site's northern, western, and eastern boundaries to minimize the amount of noise during construction on the nearby noise-sensitive uses located offsite. These barriers shall be capable of reducing noise levels by at least 15 decibels.
- N-3: Project construction shall not include the use of driven (impact) pile systems.
- N-4: When possible, the construction contractor shall use on-site electrical sources to power equipment rather than diesel generators.
- N-5: Noise and vibration construction activities whose specific location on the Project site may be flexible (e.g., operation of compressors and generators) shall be conducted as far away as possible from the nearest sensitive land uses, and natural and/or manmade barriers (e.g., intervening construction trailers) shall be used to screen propagation of noise from such activities towards these land uses. The construction contractor shall locate construction staging areas away from noise-sensitive uses.
- N-6: A "noise disturbance coordinator" shall be established. The disturbance coordinator shall be responsible for responding to local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and shall be required to implement reasonable measures such that the complaint is resolved. All notices that are sent to residential units within 500 feet of the construction site and all signs posted at the construction site shall list the telephone number for the disturbance coordinator.

b) Generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less than Significant with Mitigation. Construction activities can generate varying degrees of vibration, depending on the construction procedures and the type of construction equipment used. The operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish with distance from the source. Unless heavy construction activities are conducted extremely close (within a few feet) to the neighboring structures, vibrations from construction activities rarely reach the levels that damage structures. By complying with regulations, the project would result in a less than significant impact related to construction vibration. According to the Noise and Vibration Study conducted by Terry A. Hayes Associates Inc on October 2019, the proposed project would be required to comply with Mitigation Measure N-7, which is a feasible measure to reduce vibration effects. The study states that, "*The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has published guidance stating that engineered concrete and masonry buildings (e.g., typical commercial buildings) can withstand peak particle velocity levels of at least 0.3 inches per second without experiencing damage. Vibration is a localized event and attenuates rapidly with distance and at this distance vibration damage would not occur. Heavy-duty equipment operating within 12 feet of a structure would generate vibration levels that exceed 0.3 inches per second. Construction equipment would operate within 12 feet of the building located directly north of the project site. In order to ensure the adjacent structure would not be irreparably damaged by construction-related vibration a qualified structural engineer shall survey the foundation of each building foundation its structural integrity before, during, and after construction, as stated in Mitigation Measure N-7.*" Therefore, with implementation of applicable noise RCMs and Mitigation Measure N-7, potentially significant impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measures N-7

N-7: Prior to issuance of a grading/shoring permit, a qualified structural engineer shall survey the existing foundation and structural integrity of the adjacent structure located to the north, subject to property owner granting access to conduct the survey and shall submit a pre-construction survey letter establishing baseline conditions at these buildings to the lead agency and to the mitigation monitor. At the conclusion of vibration causing activities, and prior to the issuance of any temporary or permanent certificate of occupancy for the proposed project building, the qualified structural engineer shall issue a follow-on letter describing damage, if any, to the adjacent structures. The letter shall identify recommendations for any repair and certify the completion of any repairs as necessary to confirm the integrity of the foundation and structure of the adjacent structures.

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from a public airport or public use airport. The proposed project is not located within two miles of a public airport

or public use airport. The project site is outside of the Los Angeles International Airport Land Use Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project would not expose people working or residing in the project area to excessive noise levels from a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Induce substantial unplanned 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)?? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

a) Induce substantial unplanned 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)?

Less than Significant Impact. A potentially significant impact would occur if the proposed project would induce substantial population growth that would not have otherwise occurred as rapidly or in as great a magnitude. The proposed project would result in the development of 67 residential units. The increase in residential population resulting from the proposed project would not be considered substantial in consideration of anticipated growth for the Wilshire Community Plan area, and is within the SCAG 2020 population projections for the City in their 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan. Operation of the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in the project area, either directly or indirectly. The physical secondary or indirect impacts of population growth such as increased traffic or noise have been adequately lessened in other portions of this document. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Less than Significant Impact. A potentially significant impact would occur if the proposed project would displace a substantial quantity of existing residences or a substantial number of people. The proposed project would result in the demolition of two (2) single-family dwellings that are not subject to the Rent Stabilization Ordinance. The project would introduce a net increase of 65 units for a total of 67 units. A total of seven (7) units will be set aside for Extremely Low Income Households pursuant to the TOC Affordable Housing Incentive Program. Compliance with these requirements, including the provision of notice and payment of relocation fees and the Housing + Community Investment Department's (HCID) AB2556 Determination Letter, would reduce displacement impacts to less than significant.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Fire protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

a) Fire protection?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) could not adequately serve the proposed project, necessitating a new or physically altered station. The project site and the surrounding area are currently served by Fire Station 6, located at 326 North Virgil Avenue (approximately 0.5 miles east of the project site). The proposed project would result in a net increase of 65 residential units, which could increase the number of emergency calls and demand for LAFD fire and emergency services. To maintain the level of fire protection and emergency services, the LAFD may require additional fire personnel and equipment. However, given that there are existing fire stations in close proximity to the project site, it is not anticipated that there would be a need to build a new or expand an existing fire station to serve the proposed project and maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection. By analyzing data from previous years and continuously monitoring current data regarding response times, types of incidents, and call frequencies, LAFD can shift resources to meet local demands for fire protection and emergency services. The proposed project would neither create capacity or service level problems nor result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact.

b) Police protection?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) could not adequately serve the proposed project, necessitating a new or physically altered station. The proposed project would result in a net increase of 65 residential units and could increase demand for police service. The project site and the surrounding area are currently served by LAPD's Rampart Police Station, located at 1401 West 6th Street (approximately 2.1 miles southeast of the project site). However, given that there are existing police stations in close proximity to the project site, it is not anticipated that there would be a need to build a new or expand an existing fire station to serve the proposed project and maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact.

c) Schools?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would include substantial employment or population growth, which could generate a demand for school facilities that would exceed the capacity of the school district. The proposed project would result in a net increase of 65 residential units, which would not exponentially increase enrollment at schools that serve the area. However, development of the proposed project would be subject to California Government Code Section 65995, which would allow LAUSD to collect impact fees from developers of new residential and commercial space. Conformance to California Government Code Section 65995 is deemed to provide full and complete mitigation of impacts to school facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact to public schools.

d) Parks?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would exceed the capacity or capability of the local park system to serve the proposed project. The City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) is responsible for the provision, maintenance, and operation of public recreational and park facilities and services in the City. The proposed project would result in a net increase of 65 residential units. While the proposed use can have the potential to increase demand for parks and recreation facilities, the increase will not be substantial. Moreover, the project is providing 5,595 square feet of usable open space. This usable open space on the subject site would help alleviate the City's existing park system. Therefore, the proposed project would not create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial physical impacts associated with the provision or new or altered parks facilities. Accordingly, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact on park facilities.

e) Other public facilities?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would result in substantial employment or population growth that could generate a demand for other public facilities, including libraries, which exceed the capacity available to serve the project site, necessitating new or physically altered public facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts. The proposed project would result in a net increase of 65 residential units. While the proposed use can

have the potential to increase demand for library services and resources of the Los Angeles Public Library System, the increase will not be substantial. The proposed project would not create substantial capacity or service level problems that would require the provision of new or expanded public facilities in order to maintain an acceptable level of service for libraries and other public facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact on other public facilities.

XVI. RECREATION

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated?

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to Response to Checklist Question XV (d) above.

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?

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to Response to Checklist Question XV (d) above.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the project conflicts with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The project does not exceed the threshold criteria established by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) for preparing a traffic study as a 67-unit mixed use development. Moreover, the City of Los Angeles Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Calculator resulted in the proposed project having a net loss of 124 daily vehicle trips and a net loss of 660 daily VMT. These numbers did not result in the project requiring a VMT analysis. Furthermore, LADOT provided an email dated August 8, 2019, which concluded that no VMT Analysis was required. Therefore, the project will not have any significant impacts to traffic. Based on LADOT traffic impact criteria, the proposed project is not expected to generate significant traffic impacts. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other

standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the proposed project individually or cumulatively exceeded the service standards of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Congestion Management Program (CMP). This program was created Statewide as a result of Proposition 111 and has been implemented locally by Metro. The CMP for Los Angeles County requires that the traffic impacts of individual development projects of potential regional significance be analyzed. Specific arterial roadways and all State highways comprise the CMP system, and a total of 164 intersections are identified for monitoring throughout Los Angeles County. The local CMP requires that all CMP monitoring intersections be analyzed where a project would likely add more than 50 trips during either the a.m. or p.m. peak hours. The project does not exceed the threshold criteria established by the LADOT for preparing a traffic study as a 67-unit mixed-use development. Therefore, the project will not have any significant impacts to traffic. The project is not expected to add more than 50 trips during both the a.m. or p.m. peak hours. Moreover, the City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator resulted in the proposed project having a net loss of 124 daily vehicle trips and a net loss of 660 daily VMT. These numbers did not result in the project requiring a VMT analysis. Furthermore, LADOT provided an email dated August 8, 2019, which concluded that no VMT Analysis was required. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially increase an existing hazardous design feature or introduce incompatible uses to the existing traffic pattern. The proposed project would not include unusual or hazardous design features and the proposed project is compatible with existing uses. The project proposes a land use that complements the surrounding urban development and utilizes the existing roadway network. The project would have a vehicular access point along Heliotrope Drive, which would lead into the partially subterranean parking area for the residential and commercial uses. The project's driveways would conform to the City's design standards and would provide adequate sight distance, sidewalks, and pedestrian movement controls meeting the City's requirements to protect pedestrian safety. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the project design threatened the ability of emergency vehicles to access and serve the project site or adjacent uses. The nearest emergency/disaster routes to the project site are Western Avenue to the west, Melrose Avenue to the north, Vermont Avenue to the east, and Beverly Boulevard to the south (City of Los Angeles, General Plan Safety Element Exhibit H, Critical Facilities & Lifeline Systems, 1996). The proposed project would not require the closure of any public or private streets and would not impede emergency vehicle access to the project site or surrounding area. Additionally, emergency access to and

from the project site would be provided in accordance with requirements of the LAFD. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access, and no impact would occur.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k)?

Less than Significant Impact. Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) established a formal consultation process for California Native American Tribes to identify potential significant impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources, as defined in Public Resources Code §21074, as part of CEQA. As specified in AB 52, lead agencies must provide notice inviting consultation to California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project if the Tribe has submitted a request in writing to be notified of proposed projects. The Tribe must respond in writing within 30 days of the City's AB 52 notice. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) provided a list of Native American groups and individuals who might have

knowledge of the religious and/or cultural significance of resources that may be in and near the project site. An informational letter was mailed to a total of 11 Tribes known to have resources in this area, on April 2, 2020, describing the project and requesting any information regarding resources that may exist on or near the project site. On April 9, 2020, one tribal response was received from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation who requested a formal request for tribal consultation under the provisions of CEQA for the mitigation of potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. On June 19, 2020, at approximately 3:00 pm, the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning (Lead Agency) and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation conducted an AB 52 Tribal Consultation that lasted one hour. No mutual agreement was reached during the tribal consultation and the Tribe provided the City with additional maps, documents, and proposed mitigation measures for the proposed project. Upon further analysis of the submitted material, the City (on June 30, 2020) requested that substantial evidence be provided in follow up to the information that was provided during the telephone consultation and previous emails. The City requested the Tribe provide substantial evidence in writing that the project location and trade route relative to the project site is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, or in a local register of historic resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k) OR that this resource was determined by the Lead Agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. No substantial evidence was presented, no further consultation was conducted and the consultation was closed 30 calendar days after the City's response of June 30, 2020. Because the project site has been subject to ground disturbance activities in the past and is not known to be associated with any cultural or sacred sites, the probability for the discovery of a known site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe is considered low. Thus, in the absence of any known cultural resources, adherence to the Regulatory Compliance Measures for archeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains would ensure impacts associated with the accidental discovery of any archaeological resources or human remains, including Native American resources would be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels. The required compliance would ensure any found deposits are treated in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in to PRC Section 21083.2. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

Less than Significant Impact. Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) established a formal consultation process for California Native American Tribes to identify potential significant impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources, as defined in Public Resources Code §21074, as part of CEQA. As specified in AB 52, lead agencies must provide notice inviting consultation to California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project if the Tribe has submitted a request in writing to be notified of proposed projects. The Tribe must respond in writing within 30 days of the City's AB 52 notice. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) provided a list of Native American groups and individuals who might have knowledge of the religious and/or cultural significance of resources that may be in and near the project site. An informational letter was mailed to a total of 11 Tribes known to have resources in this area, on April 2, 2020, describing the project and requesting any information regarding resources that may exist on or near the project site. On April 9, 2020, one tribal response was received from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation who requested a formal request for tribal consultation under the provisions of CEQA for the mitigation of potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. On June 19, 2020, at approximately 3:00 pm, the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning (Lead Agency) and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation conducted an AB 52 Tribal Consultation that lasted one hour. No mutual agreement was reached during the tribal consultation and the Tribe provided the City with additional maps, documents, and proposed mitigation measures for the proposed project. Upon further analysis of the submitted material, the City (on June 30, 2020) requested that substantial evidence be provided in follow up to the information that was provided during the telephone consultation and previous emails. The City requested the Tribe provide substantial evidence in writing that the project location and trade route relative to the project site is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, or in a local register of historic resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k) OR that this resource was determined by the Lead Agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. No substantial evidence was presented, no further consultation was conducted and the consultation was closed 30 calendar days after the City's response of June 30, 2020. Because the project site has been subject to ground disturbance activities in the past and is not known to be associated with any cultural or sacred sites, the probability for the discovery of a known site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native

American Tribe is considered low. Thus, in the absence of any known cultural resources, adherence to the Regulatory Compliance Measures for archeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains would ensure impacts associated with the accidental discovery of any archaeological resources or human remains, including Native American resources would be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels. The required compliance would ensure any found deposits are treated in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in PRC Section 21083.2. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would increase water consumption or wastewater generation to such a degree that the capacity of facilities currently serving the project site would be exceeded. The LADWP conducts water planning based on forecast population growth. The addition of 67

residential units and 8,450 square feet of commercial space as a result of the proposed project would be consistent with Citywide growth, and, therefore, the project demand for water is not anticipated to require new water supply entitlements and/or require the expansion of existing or construction of new water treatment facilities beyond those already considered in the LADWP 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). Prior to any construction activities, the project applicant would be required to coordinate with the City of Los Angeles BOS to determine the exact wastewater conveyance requirements of the proposed project, and any upgrades to the wastewater lines in the vicinity of the project site that are needed to adequately serve the proposed project would be undertaken as part of the project. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact related to water or wastewater infrastructure.

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Refer to Response to Checklist Question XIX (a).

c) 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?

Refer to Response to Checklist Question XIX (a).

d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project's solid waste generation exceeded the capacity of permitted landfills. The BOS and private waste management companies are responsible for the collection, disposal, and recycling of solid waste within the City, including the project site. Solid waste during the operation of the proposed project is anticipated to be collected by the BOS and private waste haulers, respectively. As the City's own landfills have all been closed and are non-operational, the destinations are private landfills. In compliance with Assembly Bill (AB) 939, the project applicant would be required to implement a Solid Waste Diversion Program and divert at least 50 percent of the solid waste generated by the project from the applicable landfill site. The proposed project would also comply with all federal, State, and local regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact related to solid waste.

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Refer to Response to Checklist Question XIX (d).

XX. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

No Impact (Response to Checklist Questions XX.a through XX.d). As discussed above, in Response to Checklist Question IX.f, the project would not cause an

impediment along the City's designated disaster routes or impair the implementation of the City's emergency response plan. Impacts related to the implementation of the City's emergency response plan would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required. In addition, pursuant to PCR Section 21083.01(a), analysis of the impacts related to wildfire are related to the development of projects located on a site which is classified as state responsibility areas, as defined in Section 4102, and on very high fire hazard severity zones, as defined in subdivision (i) of Section 51177 of the Government Code. The project site is located within an urbanized area of the Wilshire Community Plan area and is not designated as state responsibility area as defined in Section 4102 or in a very high fire hazard severity zone as defined in subdivision (i) of Section 51177 of the Government Code. The project is also not located within a City-designated fire buffer zone. Furthermore, as discussed in Response to Checklist Question VII.a.iv, the project site is not located in a landslide area as mapped by the state or the City of Los Angeles. As such, the project would not substantially impair an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, would not expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or uncontrolled spread of a wildfire, would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk, or expose people or structure to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?

Less than Significant Impact. Based on the analysis in this Initial Study, the proposed project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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)?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the proposed project, in conjunction with the related projects, would result in impacts that are less than significant when viewed separately but significant when viewed together. The following projects were or are filed with the Department of City Planning:

| PROJECTS WITHIN A QUARTER-MILE FROM THE SUBJECT SITE (filed or filed and approved prior to the CEQA baseline, May 9, 2019) | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Address | Case Number | Date Filed | Scope of Work |
| 200 N Vermont Ave | DIR-2019-848-TOC-SPP-SPPA-SPR | 2/11/19 | New 490 unit mixed-use building |
| 4055-4065 ¾ W Oakwood Ave | CPC-2018-3029-CU-DB-SPP | 5/24/18 | New 68 unit residential building |
| 240 N Catalina St | DIR-2019-1076-SPP | 2/21/19 | New six (6) unit residential project |
| 4136-4138 ½ W Rosewood Ave | DIR-2019-287-SPP | 1/15/19 | New 16 unit residential project |
| 246 N Catalina St | DIR-2017-223-SPP | 1/19/17 | New six (6) unit residential project |
| 226 N Berendo St | DIR-2017-2810-SPP | 7/17/17 | New nine (9) unit residential project |
| 439 N Heliotrope Dr | DIR-20019-380-SPP | 1/17/19 | New six (6) unit residential project |
| 146 N Berendo St | DIR-2019-399-TOC-SPP | 1/18/19 | New 15 unit residential project |

Per the table above, there were seven (7) projects filed with the City Planning Department that were approved, which involved the demolition and construction of new residential units or commercial square-footage, but have not yet received a Certificate of Occupancy from LADBS. Two (2) of the projects are currently finalizing their Certificate of Occupancy. As such, their demolition and construction process has taken place. However, the remaining five (5) projects listed above, in conjunction with the proposed project, would not result in cumulative impact related to aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems. Although projects may be constructed in the project vicinity, construction would occur at different timeframes and the cumulative impacts to which the proposed project would contribute would be less than significant.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the proposed project has the potential to result in significant impacts, as discussed in the preceding sections. All potential impacts of the proposed project have been identified, and RCMs have been identified, where applicable, to reduce all potential impacts to less than significant levels. Upon implementation of the RCMs identified and compliance with existing regulations, the proposed project would not have the potential to result in substantial adverse impacts on human beings either directly or indirectly. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant

5 PREPARERS AND PERSONS CONSULTED

Lead Agency

City of Los Angeles
Department of City Planning
200 North Spring Street, Room 621
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Jason Hernández, City Planning Associate

Project Applicant

David Pourbaba
Beverly Berendo, LLC
8271 Melrose Ave #200
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Project Representative

Erika Diaz
Woods, Diaz Group, LLC
1142 S Diamond Bar Blvd #437
Diamond Bar, CA 91765