

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

LEAD CITY AGENCY
City of Los Angeles

COUNCIL DISTRICT
CD 2 - PAUL KREKORIAN

PROJECT TITLE
ENV-2016-2613-ND

CASE NO.
CPC-2016-2612-VZC-SPR-DB

PROJECT LOCATION
13724-13732 W VICTORY BLVD

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project is the demolition of an existing car dealership that consists of four (4) commercial buildings and as well as one vacant single-family home onsite, and the construction of a mixed-use project with 67 residential units and 2,100 square feet of commercial space. The project is proposed for five (5) stories, 60 feet in height, and to provide four (4) parking spaces for the commercial use and 80 parking spaces for the residential units. The project requires 9,000 cubic yards of grading for cut and export to accommodate subterranean parking. The project is requesting a Vesting Zone Change, Site Plan Review for a project of over 50 units, and a Density Bonus incentive for increased height.

NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT IF OTHER THAN CITY AGENCY

Reign Investments, LLC
PO Box 56692
Sherman Oaks, CA 91413

FINDING:

The City Planning Department of the City of Los Angeles has Proposed that a negative declaration be adopted for this project. The Initial Study indicates that no significant impacts are apparent which might result from this project's implementation. This action is based on the project description above.

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

THE INITIAL STUDY PREPARED FOR THIS PROJECT IS ATTACHED.

NAME OF PERSON PREPARING THIS FORM

TITLE

TELEPHONE NUMBER

COURTNEY SCHOENWALD

City Planning Associate

(818) 374-9904

ADDRESS

SIGNATURE (Official)

DATE

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



09/20/2017

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

| | | |
|--|---|----------------------------|
| LEAD CITY AGENCY: City of Los Angeles | COUNCIL DISTRICT: CD 2 - PAUL KREKORIAN | DATE: 08/21/2017 |
| RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES: Department of City Planning | | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL CASE: ENV-2016-2613-ND | RELATED CASES: CPC-2016-2612-VZC-SPR-DB | |
| PREVIOUS ACTIONS CASE NO.: | <input type="checkbox"/> Does have significant changes from previous actions. <input type="checkbox"/> Does NOT have significant changes from previous actions | |
| PROJECT DESCRIPTION: (N) MIXED-USE PROJECT 50-FOOT, 5-STORY TALL BUILDING CONSISTING OF 2100 SF COMMERCIAL AND 67 MULTIPLE RESIDENTIAL UNITS INCLUDING 3 VERY LOW & 2 LOW AFFORDABLE UNITS. | | |
| ENV PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project is the demolition of an existing car dealership that consists of four (4) commercial buildings and as well as one vacant single-family home onsite, and the construction of a mixed-use project with 67 residential units and 2,100 square feet of commercial space. The project is proposed for five (5) stories, 60 feet in height, and to provide four (4) parking spaces for the commercial use and 80 parking spaces for the residential units. The project requires 9,000 cubic yards of grading for cut and export to accommodate subterranean parking. The project is requesting a Vesting Zone Change, Site Plan Review for a project of over 50 units, and a Density Bonus incentive for increased height. | | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL SETTINGS: <p>The project site consists of one flat lot, rectangular in shape that fronts the south side of Victory Boulevard with 90 feet of frontage. Victory Boulevard, is designated a Boulevard II, is dedicated to 110 feet at the project's frontage, and is improved to an 80 foot roadway. Woodman Avenue, designated an Avenue I, dedicated to 100 feet, and improved to a 70 foot roadway is approximately 225 feet to the east of the project site. The lot is approximately 280 feet deep. The property is located in the Airport Hazard Zone of a 450 foot height limit above elevation 790, is not mapped as farmland, and is approximately 7 kilometers from the Verdugo fault line. The property is also subject to liquefaction.</p> <p>The site is in the Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan, and currently has split zoning with [Q]C1.2-1VL on the north end of the site to a depth of approximately 150 feet; the south portion of the lot is zoned P-1VL. The property is subject to the General Plan Footnote No. 2 for commercial zones, which limits the height district to three stories. The property is currently subject to the Q conditions of Ordinance 174,075 also known as the Valley Glen Q conditions, which prohibits certain uses, places additional signage restrictions, and additional regulations for fences and walls, security grills, and exterior colors for multiple properties in the area.</p> <p>The project proposes a zone change for a uniform zone across the entire site of RAS4-1VL. The General Plan Land Use Designation is Neighborhood Office Commercial. The property is not in any specific plan or other overlay area and is within 500 feet of several schools, but not within 500 feet of a park.</p> <p>The property is currently improved with five structures constructed between 1940 and 1949. None of these structures have been identified as historic. The single-family home to the rear of the lot is vacant, and the four (4) other structures are currently used for the used car dealership. Five trees onsite will be removed for the project; all are over eight (8) inches in diameter and none are protected species.</p> <p>The adjacent properties along Victory Boulevard on the south and north sides of the street to the direct east and west, and along Woodman Avenue to the north and south are zoned [Q]C1.5-1VL improved with commercial uses, with many auto uses such as auto service, car wash, and gas stations. Four schools are east of the site to the north and south along Woodman Avenue. Directly south of the site the properties are zoned [Q]RD1.5-1 and are improved with multifamily structures, and further south and west the properties are zoned R1-1 and improved with single family homes. North of Victory Boulevard the properties are zoned [Q]R3-1 and [Q]RD2-1 and are developed multi-family. Further to the west along the north and south of Victory Boulevard the properties are zoned</p> | | |

[Q]RD1.5-1 and R3-1 respectively, and improved with multi-family developments.

PROJECT LOCATION:

13724-13732 W VICTORY BLVD

COMMUNITY PLAN AREA:

VAN NUYS - NORTH SHERMAN OAKS

STATUS:



Does Conform to Plan



Does NOT Conform to Plan

AREA PLANNING COMMISSION:

SOUTH VALLEY

CERTIFIED NEIGHBORHOOD

COUNCIL:

GREATER VALLEY GLEN

EXISTING ZONING:

[Q]C1.5-1VL, P-1VL

MAX. DENSITY/INTENSITY

ALLOWED BY ZONING:

33 units; 1.5:1 FAR

GENERAL PLAN LAND USE:

NEIGHBORHOOD OFFICE COMMERCIAL

MAX. DENSITY/INTENSITY

ALLOWED BY PLAN

DESIGNATION:

63 units; 3:1 FAR

LA River Adjacent:

PROPOSED PROJECT DENSITY:

67 units; 3:1FAR

Determination (To Be Completed By Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

City Planning Associate

(818) 374-9904

Signature

Title

Phone

Evaluation Of Environmental Impacts:

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

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

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

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

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

Background

PROPONENT NAME:

Reign Investments, LLC

PHONE NUMBER:

(818) 822-7300

APPLICANT ADDRESS:

PO Box 56692

Sherman Oaks, CA 91413

AGENCY REQUIRING CHECKLIST:

Department of City Planning

DATE SUBMITTED:

07/25/2016

PROPOSAL NAME (if Applicable):

| Potentially significant impact | Less than significant with mitigation incorporated | Less than significant impact | No impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

I. AESTHETICS

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

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

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

III. AIR QUALITY

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

| Potentially significant impact | Less than significant with mitigation incorporated | Less than significant impact | No impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

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

VII. GREEN HOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

| Potentially significant impact | Less than significant with mitigation incorporated | Less than significant impact | No impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

| | | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|---|
| h. | Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | | | | ✓ |
|----|---|--|--|--|---|

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

| | | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|---|
| a. | Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | | | ✓ | |
| b. | Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | | | ✓ | |
| c. | Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | | | ✓ | |
| d. | Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | | | ✓ | |
| e. | Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | | | | ✓ |
| f. | Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | | | | ✓ |
| g. | Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | | | | ✓ |
| h. | Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | | | | ✓ |
| i. | Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | | | | ✓ |
| j. | Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | | | | ✓ |

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

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

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

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

XII. NOISE

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|--|
| a. | Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | | | ✓ | |
| b. | Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | | | ✓ | |
| c. | A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | ✓ | |
| d. | A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | ✓ | |

| Potentially significant impact | Less than significant with mitigation incorporated | Less than significant impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|
| e. | For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | | ✓ |
| f. | For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | | ✓ |
| XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING | | | | | |
| a. | Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | | | ✓ | |
| b. | Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | | ✓ |
| c. | Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | | ✓ |
| XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES | | | | | |
| a. | Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection? | | | ✓ | |
| b. | Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Police protection? | | | ✓ | |
| c. | Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Schools? | | | ✓ | |
| d. | Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Parks? | | | ✓ | |
| e. | Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Other public facilities? | | | ✓ | |
| XV. RECREATION | | | | | |
| a. | Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | | | ✓ | |
| b. | Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | | | ✓ | |
| XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC | | | | | |
| a. | Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | | | ✓ | |

| Potentially significant impact | Less than significant with mitigation incorporated | Less than significant impact | No impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

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

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|--|
| a. | 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), or | | | ✓ | |
| b. | 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. | | | ✓ | |

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

| | | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|--|
| a. | Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | | | ✓ | |
|----|---|--|--|---|--|

| Potentially significant impact | Less than significant with mitigation incorporated | Less than significant impact | No impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

| | | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|--|
| b. | Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | | | ✓ | |
| c. | Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | | | ✓ | |

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

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

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

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

The project as identified in the project description will not cause potentially significant impacts on the environment. Therefore, this environmental analysis concludes that a Negative Declaration shall be issued for the environmental case file known as **ENV-2016-2613-ND** and the associated case(s), **CPC-2016-2612-VZC-SPR-DB**.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

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

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

| PREPARED BY: | TITLE: | TELEPHONE NO.: | DATE: |
|---------------------|-------------------------|----------------|------------|
| COURTNEY SCHOENWALD | City Planning Associate | (818) 374-9904 | 08/21/2017 |

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

APPENDIX A: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS EXPLANATION TABLE

I. AESTHETICS

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| a. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT 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 property is located in the flatlands of the San Fernando Valley, near the intersection of Victory Boulevard and Woodman Avenue, and not near any identified scenic vista or focal points. Therefore, although the proposed project would substantially increase the height and massing of development on the project site, project implementation would not obstruct any views of unique scenic vistas or focal points. Therefore, impacts related to scenic vistas would be less than significant. Development of the proposed project would result in an incremental intensification of existing prevailing land uses in an already urbanized area of Los Angeles. Furthermore, development of the project and related projects is expected to occur in accordance with adopted plans and regulations. Therefore, cumulative aesthetic impacts would be less than significant. |
| b. | NO IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially damage scenic resources within a designated State Scenic Highway. The City of Los Angeles' General Plan Mobility Element (Citywide General Plan Circulation System Maps) as well as the CalTrans website at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/langeles.htm indicate that no State-designated scenic highways are located near the project site. Therefore, no impacts related to a State-designated scenic highway would occur. |
| c. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings. Significant impacts to the visual character of a site and its surroundings are generally based on the removal of features with aesthetic value, the introduction of contrasting urban features into a local area, and the degree to which the elements of the proposed project detract from the visual character of an area. The adjacent properties along Victory Boulevard on the south and north sides of the street to the direct east and west, and along Woodman Avenue to the north and south are improved with commercial uses, with many auto uses such as auto service, car wash, and gas stations. Many of the adjacent properties are underdeveloped, with older single-story buildings, and open parking lots. The proposed project includes a landscaped front area, and windows open to the street, which would enhance the visual quality of the area. Accordingly, the proposed project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact on visual quality. |
| d. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | 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 |

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

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | 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. 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 shielded and down-casted, 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. |
|--|--|---|

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

| | | |
|----|-----------|---|
| a. | NO IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would convert valued farmland to non-agricultural uses. The project site is developed with a surface parking lot, and five structures. 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. Therefore, the proposed project would not convert any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use, and no impact would occur. |
| b. | 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 impacts would occur. |
| c. | 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. | 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. | 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 impacts would occur. |

III. AIR QUALITY

| Impact? | Explanation | Mitigation Measures |
|---------|------------------------------|--|
| a. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>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 2012 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. The 2012 AQMP provides base year emissions and future baseline emission projections for the South Coast Air Basin. In doing so, the 2012 AQMP incorporates, in part, Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) 2012-2035 RTP/SCS socio-economic forecast projections of regional population and employment growth. A project would not conflict with the AQMP if it is consistent with the population, housing and employment assumptions that were used in the development of the AQMP. The levels of population for the project are consistent with population forecasts as adopted by SCAG. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the AQMP, and impacts would be less than significant.</p> |
| b. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>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. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to regional operational emissions. The project would be subject to regulatory compliance measures, which reduce the impacts of operational and construction regional emissions.</p> |
| c. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | <p>The project will produce fugitive dust and mobile source emissions as a result of construction activity. The proposed project and the entire Los Angeles metropolitan area are located within the South Coast Air Basin, which is characterized by relatively poor air quality. The Basin is currently classified as a federal and State non-attainment area for Ozone (O3), Respirable Particulate Matter (PM10 and PM2.5), and lead (Pb) and a federal attainment/maintenance area for Carbon Monoxide (CO). It is classified as a State attainment area for CO, and it currently meets the federal and State standards for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2), Sulfur Oxides (SOX), and lead (Pb). Because the Basin is designated as a State and/or federal nonattainment air basin for O3, PM10, PM2.5, and NO2, there is an on-going regional cumulative impact associated with these pollutants. However, an individual project can emit these pollutants without significantly contributing to this cumulative impact depending on the magnitude of emissions. This magnitude is determined by the project-level significance thresholds established by the SCAQMD. The project would be subject to regulatory compliance measures, which reduce the impacts of operational and construction regional emissions.</p> |

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

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|---|
| | | A project of this size (67 units) would not likely exceed the project-level SCAQMD localized significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants and the impact would be less than significant. |
| d. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | Based on the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide, 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, child care centers, and athletic facilities. There are four private schools to the east of the project within 500 feet- the Laurence School at 13639 Victory Boulevard, the Children's Circle Nursery School at 6328 Woodman Avenue, Erickson High School at 6305 Woodman Avenue, and the Montessori House of Children at 6202 Woodman Avenue. 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 Respirable Particulate Matter (PM10 and PM2.5), Carbon Monoxide (CO), and Nitrogen Oxides (NOx). With regulations in place, the localized emission impacts for the proposed project would be less than significant for all construction phases and the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial localized criteria pollutant emissions during construction. |
| e. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT 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 result in a less-than-significant impact related to objectionable odors. |

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|---|
| a. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT 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, immediately adjacent Victory Boulevard. Vegetation on the project site is limited to five unprotected trees at the rear of the lot, and weeds/small shrubs; the site is largely paved. All of the on-site trees will be removed during construction. 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 is not anticipated to have an impact to any individuals of a species or sensitive habitat. |
| b. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT 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 |

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

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|---|
| | | and Wildlife Services (USFWS), and no impacts would occur. |
| c. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT 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/previously 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. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT 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. 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. 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. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT 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). The project site does not contain locally-protected biological resources, such as oak trees, Southern California black walnut, western sycamore, and California bay trees. 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 (CFGF). 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. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT 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. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan, and no impacts would occur. |

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|---|
| a. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially alter the environmental context of, or remove identified historical resources. The project will demolish five structures constructed between 1940 and 1949. None of these 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 a discussion with the Planning Department's Office of Historic Resources, or on SurveyLA, the citywide survey of Los Angeles, or the City's HistoricPlacesLA website. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant. |
|----|------------------------------|---|

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

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|---|
| b. | 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. Personnel of the proposed Modified 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, the impact would be less than significant. |
| c. | 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 City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety 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, the impact would be less than significant. |
| d. | 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, the impact would be less than significant. |

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

| | | |
|----|-----------|---|
| a. | NO 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. According to the California Department of Conservation Special Studies Zone Map, the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone or Fault Rupture Study Area. The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects resulting from the rupture of known earthquake faults. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act is |
|----|-----------|---|

| Impact? | Explanation | Mitigation Measures |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | intended to mitigate the hazard of surface fault rupture on structures for human occupancy. Therefore, no impacts would occur. |
| b. 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. | |
| c. NO IMPACT | Based upon the criteria established in the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide, 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 located within a Liquefaction Zone, specific Regulatory Compliance Measures 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. Regulatory Compliance Measures (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. Therefore, impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be less than significant. | |
| d. 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. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential effects resulting from landslides, and no impacts would occur. | |
| e. 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. In addition, excavation activities would be necessary to accommodate the proposed project, which would include two subterranean levels 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, and conditions imposed by | |

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

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|---|
| | | the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur with respect to erosion or loss of topsoil. |
| f. | 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 have the potential to expose people and structures to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslide; see VI c-d 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 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 area. The proposed project would be required to implement standard construction practices that would ensure that the integrity of the project site and the proposed structures is maintained. 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. With the implementation of the Building Code requirements and the Department of Building and Safety's approval, the potential for landslide lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse would be less-than-significant. |
| g. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT 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. |
| h. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT 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. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. |

VII. GREEN HOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| a. | 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 |
|----|------------------------------|--|

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

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| | | not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to emissions and impacts would be less than significant. |
| b. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | 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 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The 2012-2035 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 residential development proximate to a major transportation corridor (i.e., Victory Boulevard and Woodman Avenue) and would not interfere with SCAG's ability to implement the regional strategies outlined in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. The proposed project, therefore, would be consistent with statewide, regional and local goals and policies aimed at reducing GHG emissions and would result in a less-than-significant impact related to plans that target the reduction of GHG emissions. |

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| a. | 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 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. 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. As a residential and commercial development, the proposed project would not involve large quantities of hazardous materials that would require routine transport, use, or disposal. With compliance to applicable standards and regulations and adherence to manufacturer's instructions related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and impacts would be less than significant. |
| b. | 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 existing buildings on the project site were built between 1940 and 1949 and therefore 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. |

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

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|---|
| c. | 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 four schools to the east of the project within 500 feet- the Laurence School at 13639 Victory Boulevard, the Children's Circle Nursery School at 6328 Woodman Avenue, Erickson High School at 6305 Woodman Avenue, and the Montessori House of Children at 6202 Woodman Avenue. The proposed project would provide for a mixed-use, infill development that consists of residential and commercial uses. These types of uses would be expected to use and store very small amounts of hazardous materials, such as paints, solvents, cleaners, pesticides, etc. 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. With this compliance, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact. |
| d. | 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. GeoTracker provides information on underground storage facilities. A review of EnviroStor and GeoTracker did not identify any records of hazardous waste facilities on the project site. 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. | NO IMPACT | 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 air strips. 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. | NO IMPACT | 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 air strips. 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. |
| g. | NO IMPACT | The nearest emergency/disaster routes to the project site are Victory Boulevard to the north, Woodman Avenue to the east, and Oxnard Street 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 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. |
| h. | 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. Accordingly, the project site and the surrounding area are not subject to wildland fires. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, and no impact would occur. |

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

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| a. | 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 Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (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. | 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. Therefore, the project would not require direct additions or withdrawals of groundwater. Excavation to accommodate subterranean levels is not proposed at a depth that is expected to intercept an existing aquifer or penetrate the existing water table. Therefore, the impact on groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge would be less than significant. |
| c. | 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 so that erosion or siltation would result. There are no streams or rivers located in the project vicinity. Project construction would temporarily expose on-site soils to surface water runoff. However, compliance with construction-related BMPs 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. Significant alterations to existing drainage patterns within the project site and surrounding area would not occur. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impact related to the alteration of drainage patterns and on- or off-site erosion or siltation. |
| d. | 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. Therefore, the proposed project would |

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

| | | |
|----|-----------|--|
| | | result in less-than-significant impacts related to the alteration of drainage patterns and on- or off-site flooding. |
| e. | NO 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 Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), as an LAMC requirement to address water runoff and storm water pollution. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to existing storm drain capacities or water quality. |
| f. | NO IMPACT | A significant impact may occur if a project includes potential sources of water pollutants that would have the potential to substantially degrade water quality. The proposed project does not include potential sources of contaminants, which could potentially degrade water quality and would comply with all federal, state and local regulations governing stormwater discharge. Therefore, no impact would occur. |
| g. | NO 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. |
| h. | NO 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. |
| i. | NO IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be located within an area susceptible to flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. According to USGS topographic maps (https://viewer.nationalmap.gov/basic/) the site is not located near any reservoirs or bodies of water. The project site and the surrounding areas are not located within a flood hazard area. Accordingly, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact related to flooding. |
| j. | 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 12 miles northeast of the Pacific Ocean. Therefore, the project would have no impact related to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. |

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

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|---|
| a. | NO 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, the construction of new mixed-use, infill development in an urbanized area in Los Angeles, would not divide an established community. Therefore, no impact would occur. |
| b. | 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 Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan Area. The site currently has split zoning with [Q]C1.5-1VL on the north end of the site to a depth of approximately 150 feet; the south portion of the lot is zoned P-1VL, with a General Plan land use designation of Neighborhood Office Commercial across the site. The project proposes a zone change for a uniform zone across the entire site of RAS4-1VL, and project would be comprised of 67 residential dwelling units and 2,100 square feet of commercial space. Both Commercial and Residential uses are permitted in RAS4 zoned lots, and in conjunction with the State Density Bonus provisions, the proposed height and density is permitted. The proposed project would conform to the allowable land uses pursuant to the Los Angeles Municipal Code. Impacts related to land use have been mitigated elsewhere, or are addressed through compliance with existing regulations. Therefore, any impact would be less than significant. |
| c. | NO IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project were located within an area governed by a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. The project site is not subject to any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Therefore, no impact would occur. |

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|---|
| a. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT 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. In addition, the project site is not identified by the City as being located in an oil field or within an oil drilling area. 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. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT 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. In addition, the project site is not identified by the City as being located in an oil field or within an oil drilling area. 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. |

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

XII. NOISE

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|---|
| a. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | 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 along Victory Boulevard, 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 project shall comply with the City of Los Angeles General Plan Noise Element and Ordinance No. 161,574, which prohibits the emission of creation of noise beyond certain levels at adjacent uses unless technically infeasible. Therefore, the noise exposure impact would be less than significant. |
| b. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | 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. |
| c. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the project caused a substantial permanent increase in noise levels above existing ambient levels. New stationary sources of noise, such as rooftop mechanical HVAC equipment, would be installed on the proposed development. The design of the equipment will be required to comply with LAMC Section 112.02, which prohibits noise from air conditioning, refrigeration, heating, pumping, and filtering equipment from exceeding the ambient noise level on the premises of other occupied properties by more than five dBA. With implementation of the regulations that address rooftop mechanical equipment, a substantial permanent increase for nearby sensitive receptors would be reduced to a less than significant level. |
| d. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the project resulted in substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels. As discussed above, impacts are expected to be less than significant for construction and operational noise and vibration. |
| e. | 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. |
| f. | 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 private airstrip. The proposed project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Accordingly, the proposed project would not expose people working or residing in the project area to excessive noise levels from a private airstrip. Therefore, no impact would occur. |

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| a. | 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 as what was anticipated by the General Plan. 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 Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan, and is within the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) 2020 population projections for the City in their 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan. The project would meet a growing demand for housing near jobs and transportation centers, consistent with State, regional and local regulations designed to reduce trips and greenhouse gas emissions. 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 mitigated in other portions of this document. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant. |
| b. | NO 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 five (5) buildings, none of which house people. No impact is anticipated. |
| c. | NO 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 five (5) buildings, none of which house people. No impact is anticipated. |

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| a. | 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 two LAFD stations -- Fire Station 39 at 14415 Sylvan Street, Los Angeles, CA 91401 (approximately 1.6 miles to the west of the project site) and Fire Station 102 located at 13200 Burbank Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 91401 (located approximately 1.1 miles to the south of the project site). The proposed project would result in a net increase of 66 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 are 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. |
|----|------------------------------|--|

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

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| b. | 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 67 units and could increase demand for police service. The project site and the surrounding area are currently served by LAPD's Van Nuys Police Station, located at 6240 Sylmar Ave, Van Nuys, CA 91401 (approximately 1.6 miles west of the project site). In combination with the safety features already incorporated into the proposed project, the proposed project would neither create capacity/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 police protection. Regarding operations, in the event a situation should arise requiring increased staffing or patrol units, additional resources can be called in. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to police protection services. |
| c. | 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 add 66 residential units, which could 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. | 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 66 units, which could result in increased demand for parks and recreation facilities. Pursuant to Section 21.10 of the LAMC, the applicant shall pay the Dwelling Unit Construction Tax for construction of apartment buildings. Therefore, the proposed project would not create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial physical impacts associated with the provision of new or altered parks facilities. Accordingly, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact on park facilities. |
| e. | 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 66 units, which could result in increased demand for library services and resources of the Los Angeles Public Library System. However, 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. |

XV. RECREATION

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| a. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | Refer to Response to Checklist Question XIV (d) above. |
|----|------------------------------|--|

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

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| b. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | Refer to Response to Checklist Question XIV (d) above. |
|----|------------------------------|--|

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|---|
| a. | 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. In a letter dated December 30, 2016 the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) reviewed the traffic analysis prepared by KOA Corporation, dated October 14, 2016, for the proposed project. Future traffic has been analyzed for impact at two intersections: Victory Boulevard and Ranchito Avenue, and Victory Boulevard and Woodman Avenue. The project is estimated to generate a net increase of 436 daily trips, 34 trips in the a.m. peak hour, and 42 trips in the p.m. peak hour. In order to evaluate the effects of the project's traffic on the available transportation infrastructure, LADOT measured the significance of the impacts in terms of change to the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio with the proposed project. Based on LADOT traffic impact criteria, the proposed project is not expected to generate significant traffic impacts at any of the two intersections identified for detailed analysis. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. |
| b. | 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. In a letter dated December 30, 2016 the LADOT reviewed the traffic analysis prepared by KOA Corporation, dated October 14, 2016, for the proposed project. Future traffic has been analyzed for impact at two intersections: Victory Boulevard and Ranchito Avenue, and Victory Boulevard and Woodman Avenue. The project is estimated to generate a net increase of 436 daily trips, 34 trips in the a.m. peak hour, and 42 trips in the p.m. peak hour. The project is not expected to add more than 50 trips during both the a.m. or p.m. peak hours. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. |
| c. | NO IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would cause a change in air traffic patterns that would result in a substantial safety risk. The proposed project does not include an aviation component or include features that would interfere with air traffic patterns. Therefore, no impact would occur. |
| d. | 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. However, the project may have potentially significant impacts on pedestrians on the street during construction phases. With implementation of the referenced mitigation measure, the potential impacts related to hazards would be reduced to less-than-significant. |
| e. | NO 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 Victory Boulevard to the north, Woodman Avenue to the east, and Oxnard Street 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 |

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

| | | |
|----|-----------|--|
| | | 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. |
| f. | NO IMPACT | A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would conflict with adopted policies or involve modification of existing alternative transportation facilities located on- or off-site. The proposed project would not require the disruption of public transportation services or the alteration of public transportation routes. Since the proposed project would not modify or conflict with any alternative transportation policies, plans or programs, it would have no impact on such programs. |

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|---|
| a. | 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 10 tribes known to have resources in this area, on March 16, 2017, describing the Project and requesting any information regarding resources that may exist on or near the Project site. On March 28, 2017, one tribal response was received from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians- Kizh Nation who requested consultation. The consultation took place on April 12, 2017 where verbal testimony was entered as information. On June 6, the City forwarded a more site-specific Cultural Records Report to the tribe and requested any further evidence from the tribe be received by July 6, 2017. On July 13, given a lack of response from the tribe, the City concluded the consultation with the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation. No known tribal cultural resources were identified onsite, and no impact is anticipated. However, in the event of an inadvertent discovery, the decision will include a condition to address that circumstance. |
| b. | 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 10 tribes known to have resources in this area, on March 16, 2017, describing the Project and requesting any information regarding resources that may exist on or near the Project site. On March 28, 2017, one tribal response was received from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians- Kizh Nation who requested consultation. The consultation took place on April 12, 2017 where verbal testimony was entered as information. On June 6, the City forwarded a more site-specific |

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

Cultural Records Report to the tribe and requested any further evidence from the tribe be received by July 6, 2017. On July 13, given a lack of response from the tribe, the City concluded the consultation with the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation. No known tribal cultural resources or religious and/or cultural significance resources were identified onsite, and no impact is anticipated. However, in the event of an inadvertent discovery, the decision will include a condition to address that circumstance.

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|---|
| a. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB). All wastewater from the project would be treated according to requirements of the NPDES permit authorized by the LARWQCB. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to wastewater treatment requirements. |
| b. | 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 Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) conducts water planning based on forecast population growth. The addition of 66 units 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 Bureau of Sanitation (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. |
| c. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would increase surface water runoff, resulting in the need for expanded off-site storm water drainage facilities. Development of the proposed project would maintain existing drainage patterns; site-generated surface water runoff would continue to flow to the City's storm drain system. The proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exacerbate any existing deficiencies in the storm drain system or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to existing storm drain capacities. |
| d. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | Refer to Response to Checklist Question XVII (b). |
| e. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | Refer to Response to Checklist Question XVII (b). |
| f. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | A significant impact would occur if the proposed project's solid waste generation exceeded the capacity of permitted landfills. The Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation (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 |

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

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|
| | | less-than-significant impact related to solid waste. |
| g. | LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT | Refer to Response to Checklist Question XVII (f). |
| XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE | | |
| a. | 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. Implementation of the mitigation measures identified and compliance with existing regulations would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. |
| b. | 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. Although projects may be constructed in the project vicinity, the cumulative impacts to which the proposed project would contribute would be less than significant. Implementation of the mitigation measures identified would reduce cumulative impacts to less-than-significant levels. |
| c. | 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 mitigation measures have been prescribed, where applicable, to reduce all potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. Upon implementation of mitigation measures 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. |