Table of Contents

Page

Environmental Checklist

Introducti	on	
1.	Tiered Initial Study	
2.	WC2035 Specific Plan and FEIR	
3.	Tiering Process	
4.	Project Relationship to WC2035 Plan and WC2035 Plan FEIR	
5.	Public Review and Comment Period	
6.	Document Organization	
Attachme	nt A, Project Description	A-1
1.	Introduction	
2.	Project Location	A-2
3.	Surrounding Uses and Project Site Conditions	A-5
4.	Land Use and Zoning	
5.	Project Characteristics	
6.	Necessary Approvals	
Attachme	nt B, Explanation of Checklist Determinations	B-1
1.	Aesthetics	
2.	Agricultural and Forestry Resources	
3.	Air Quality	
4.	Biological Resources	
5.	Cultural Resources	
6.	Geology and Soils	
7.	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	
8.	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	
9.	Hydrology and Water Quality	
10.	Land Use and Land Use Planning	
11.	Mineral Resources	
12.	Noise	
13.	Population and Housing	
14.	Public Services	
15.	Recreation	B-230
16.	Transportation and Circulation	B-232
17.	Tribal Cultural Resources	
18.	Utilities and Service Systems	
19.	Energy	
20.	Mandatory Findings of Significance	
Reference	S	

Page

Appendices

- Appendix A Air Quality Calculations
- Appendix B Tree Survey
- Appendix C Cultural Resources Assessment
- Appendix D Paleontological Resources Assessment
- Appendix E Geotechnical Reports
- Appendix F Greenhouse Gas Emissions Calculations
- Appendix G Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
- Appendix H Surface Hydrology and Water Quality Technical Memorandum
- Appendix I Noise and Vibration Calculations
- Appendix J Public Services Responses
- Appendix K Traffic Volume Review
- Appendix L Tribal Cultural Resources Consultation Correspondence
- Appendix M Wastewater and Water Supply Technical Memorandum
- Appendix N Water Supply Assessment
- Appendix O Energy Calculations

Page

List of Figures

A-1	Project Location Map	
A-2	Aerial Photograph of Project Site	
A-3	Project Site Location within the Warner Center 2035 Plan Commerce District	
A-4	Building Project Statistics 1	A-9
A-5	Building Project Statistics 2	A-10
A-6	Conceptual Site Plan	A-18
A-7	Building 1 Site Plan	A-19
A-8	Buildings 2 and 3 Site Plan	A-20
A-9	Buildings 4 and 4a Site Plan	A-21
A-10	Buildings 5 and 7 Site Plan	A-22
A-11	Buildings 6, 8 and 9 Site Plan	A-23
A-12	Overall Site Rendering	A-24
A-13	Building 1 Rendering	A-25
A-14	Buildings 2 and 3 Rendering	A-26
A-15	Buildings 4 and 4a Rendering	A-27
A-16	Building 5 Rendering	A-28
A-17	Buildings 5 and 6 Courtyard Rendering	A-29
A-18	Building 6 Rendering	A-30
A-19	Building 7 Rendering	A-31
A-20	Buildings 8 and 9 Rendering	A-32
A-21	Buildings 8 and 9 Courtyard Rendering	A-33
A-22	South and East Elevations	A-34
A-23	West and North Elevations	A-35
A-24	Site Sections A, B and C	A-36
A-25	Site Sections D, E and F	A-37
A-26	Circulation and Connectivity Diagram	A-38
A-27	Internal Traffic and Parking Improvements	A-39
A-28	Publicly Accessible Open Space Diagram	A-40
A-29	Conceptual Ground Level Landscape Plan	
A-30	Conceptual Podium Level Landscape Plan	
A-31	Existing Site Conditions	
A-32	Project Construction – Phase 1	
A-33	Project Construction – Phase 2	
A-34	Project Construction – Phase 3	A-51
A-35	Project Construction – Phase 4	A-52
A-36	Project Construction – Phase 5	
A-37	Project Construction – Phase 6	A-54
A-38	Project Construction – Phase 7	A-55
A-39	Project Construction – Phase 8	
B-1	Winter Solstice – December 21	
B-2	Summer Solstice – June 21	B-12
B-3	Spring Equinox – March 21	B-13
B-4	Fall Equinox – September 21	
B-5	Noise Measurement Locations	B-181

Page

List of Tables

A-1	Project Site Addresses and APNs	A-4
A-2	Proposed Development Program	
B-1	Maximum Mitigated Daily Regional Construction Emissions	
B-2	Site-Specific LST Screening Criteria	B-36
B-3	Maximum Daily Localized Construction Emissions – LST Analysis for	
	Woodland Hills Academy Middle School	B-36
B-4	Maximum Daily Localized Construction Emissions – LST Analysis for	
	Closest Residential Area	B-37
B-5	Maximum Daily Localized Operational Emissions – LST Analysis for	
	Woodland Hills Academy Middle School	B-39
B-6	Maximum Daily Localized Operational Emissions – LST Analysis for	
	Closest Residential Area	
B-7	Existing Buildings Within the Project Site	B-55
B-8	State of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions	
B-9	Estimated GHG Emissions Reductions Required by HSC Division 25.5	B-98
B-10	Consistency with Applicable Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies	
B-11	Consistency with Applicable SCAG 2016 RTP/SCS Actions and Strategies	B-116
B-12	Consistency with City of Los Angeles GreenLA Plan	B-122
B-13	Consistency with City of Los Angeles Sustainable City Plan	B-125
B-14	Existing Site Greenhouse Gas Emissions	B-133
B-15	Unmitigated Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions	B-134
B-16	Annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions	B-135
B-17	Lowest Floor Elevations and Groundwater Elevations	B-153
B-18	Ambient Noise Measurements	B-181
B-19	Unmitigated and Mitigated Construction Noise Levels	B-185
B-20	Unmitigated and Mitigated Construction Noise Levels – Receptor 3 (LAUSD	
	Threshold)	B-190
B-21	WC2035 Plan and Project Future Traffic Noise Levels (dBA)	B-193
B-22	Off-site Vibration Impacts By Construction Phase	
B-23	On-site Vibration Impacts By Construction Phase	B-197
B-24	Estimated Number of Students Generated by the Project	
B-25	Phase 3 Peak Construction Activity Trip Generation	
B-26	Summary of AB 52 Consultation	B-257
B-27	Project Construction Fuel Usage	
B-28	Project Operational Energy Usage	B-292
B-29	Project Energy Usage and State and Regional Energy Supply	B-294

CITY OF LOS ANGELES OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

ROOM 360, CITY HALL LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT INITIAL STUDY AND CHECKLIST

LEAD CITY AGENCY	COUNCIL DISTRICT	DATE
Department of City Planning	3	December 19, 2019

RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES

City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Los Angeles Building and Safety Department, Los Angeles Department of Public Works

PROJECT TITLE/NO.	CASE NO.		
De Soto/Burbank Master Plan Project	ENV-2017-1706-MND		
PREVIOUS ACTIONS CASE NO.	☐ DOES have significant changes from previous actions.		
n/a	DOES NOT have significant changes from previous actions.		

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Applicant proposes to develop the Project, which would be developed on an approximately 24.4-acre site located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of De Soto Avenue and Burbank Boulevard (Project Site), in the Woodland Hills community of the City of Los Angeles (City). The Project Site is currently improved with a contemporary corporate office park (known as Warner Center Corporate Park), consisting of 12 low-rise commercial structures (Existing Buildings), each on a distinct parcel, ranging in height from one to three stories, supported by surrounding surface parking lots. The Existing Buildings include approximately 340,339 square feet of floor area.

The Project is located within the Commerce District of the Warner Center 2035 (WC2035) Plan area and includes the phased demolition of the Existing Buildings and other improvements and the phased construction of a mixed-use development consisting of ten new buildings (New Buildings), varying in height from approximately 35 feet (two stories) to 350 feet (24 stories) in height. The Project would be constructed in eight phases and includes a total of approximately 2,634,268 square feet of floor area, with approximately 1,175,513 square feet of residential floor area (approximately 45 percent of the total floor area) and approximately 1,458,755 square feet of non-residential floor area, consisting of office, retail and hotel uses (approximately 55 percent of the total floor area). The Project's residential uses consist of approximately 1,009 multi-family units, including 841 apartment units (approximately 35 of which will be Work-Live Units), as defined in Section 4 of the WC2035 Plan) and approximately 168 condominium units (approximately 15 of which will be Work-Live Units). The Project's non-residential uses include approximately 1,140,746 square feet of office space, approximately 7,731 square feet of ground-floor restaurant space, approximately 2,6762 square feet of ground-floor office and/or retail space, approximately 4,068 square feet of community space, and an approximately 157,535 square feet of community space, and an approximately 157,535 square feet of community space, and an approximately 157,535 square feet of community space, and an approximately 157,535 square feet of community space.

Project parking would be provided within subterranean and podium levels beneath and within nine of the ten New Buildings. No stand-alone parking structures are proposed. Upon Project completion, onsite parking structures would provide 1,627 residential spaces and 3,921 non-residential spaces, for a total of 5,548 parking spaces. The Project also includes 870 long-term bicycle parking spaces and 264short-term bicycle spaces, for a total of 1,134 bicycle parking spaces. In addition, a minimum of 280 parking spaces for motorcycles/scooters will be included as part of the Project.

The Project would be accessible from both Burbank Boulevard to the south and De Soto Avenue to the east. Vehicle access to the parking structures would be provided by an updated internal roadway network. Primary access through the Project Site would be provided by Warner Center Lane, which is a private street that would be reconfigured on a phased basis as part of the Project and qualifies as a "New Street" under the WC2035 Plan. Warner Center Lane would connect to two driveways – Commerce Drive to the west and Town Center Drive to the north. The internal circulation system also includes Adler Drive, a third driveway that would be directly accessible from Burbank Boulevard and Commerce Drive.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Project Site is currently developed with as Warner Center Corporate Park (Corporate Park), a commercial office park consisting of 12 low-rise office buildings constructed between 1981 and 1984, surface parking lots, and associated landscaping. The 12 office buildings are between one and three stories in height, and contemporary in design. Tenants of the Corporate Park include the U.S. Bankruptcy Court and a range of commercial establishments including but not limited to Adler Realty Investments, Inc., Farmers Insurance, Revolution Media, and Girls Scouts LA.

Vehicle access to the office buildings on the Project Site is provided via driveways on Warner Center Lane, a private drive that traverses the Corporate Park and terminates at stop controlled intersections at Burbank Boulevard and De Soto Avenue. Warner Center Lane provides a single travel lane and shoulder parking in each direction. Regional access to the Project Site is provided by the Ventura Freeway, approximately one-half mile south of the Project Site and accessed by Topanga Canyon Boulevard and De Soto Avenue.

PROJECT LOCATION

The Project Site is located at the northwest corner of Burbank Boulevard and De Soto Avenue, in the Warner Center 2035 Plan area (Commerce District).

PLANNING DISTRICT	TATUS	1			
Canoga Park – Winnetka – Woodland Hills – West Hills Community Plan			□ PRELIMINARY □ PROPOSED		
EXISTING ZONING	MAX. DENSITY ZONING				
Warner Center Specific Plan (WC)	Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) of 4.5:1 and graduated FAR		☑ DOES CONFORM TO PLAN		
GENERAL PLAN LAND USE & ZONE(S)	MAX. DENSITY PLAN				
Limited Industrial; CO (WC)-SN	3:1		DOES NOT CONFORM TO PLAN		
SURROUNDING LAND USES	PROJECT DENSITY				
See above Environmental Setting discussion and Attachment A, Project Description	2.52:1		□ NO DISTRICT PLAN		

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.

SIGNATURE

TITLE

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).
- All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less that significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of a mitigation measure has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analysis," cross referenced).
- 5) Earlier analysis must be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR, or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - 1) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A sources list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whichever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - 1) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - 2) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

Aesthetics	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	Air Quality
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology, Soils and Seismicity
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Hydrology and Water Quality
Land Use/ Planning	Mineral Resources	Noise
Population and Housing	Public Services	Recreation
Transportation and Traffic	Tribal Cultural Resources	Utilities and Service Systems
Energy	Mandatory Findings of Significance	

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST (To be completed by the Lead City Agency)					
C BACKGROUND					
PROPONENT NAME PHONE NUMBER					
LLJ Adler WCCI, LLC and LLJ Adler WCCII, LLC (818) 884-2200 Michael Adler					
PROPONENT ADDRESS					
21031 Warner Center Lane, Suite C, Woodland Hills	, California 91367				
AGENCY REQUIRING CHECKLIST	DATE SUBMITTED				
Department of City Planning December 19, 2019					
PROPOSAL NAME (If Applicable)					
De Soto/Burbank Master Plan Project					

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

(Explanations of all potentially and less than significant impacts are required to be attached on separate sheets)

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1.	AESTHETICS — Would the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			\boxtimes	
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural feature within a city- designated scenic highway?			\boxtimes	
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?		\boxtimes		
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?		\boxtimes		

2. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES -

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

Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
- 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?

	\boxtimes
	\boxtimes
	\boxtimes
	\boxtimes
	\boxtimes

EN	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS (Explanations of all potentially and less than significant impacts are required to be attached on separate sheets)					
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.	AIR QUALITY — Where available, the significance criteria relied upon to make the following determi		y the South Coa	st Air Quality Mar	nagement District	(SCAQMD) may be
	Would the project:					
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation c Quality Management Plan or Congestion Management Plan?	f the Air			\boxtimes	
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contrib substantially to an existing or projected air violation?			\boxtimes		
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net any criteria pollutant for which the air bas attainment (ozone, PM_{10} , and $PM_{2.5}$) unde applicable federal or state ambient air qu standard?	in is non- er an	*			
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations?	pollutant		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a su number of people?	bstantial			\boxtimes	
4.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES — Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either through habitat modifications, on any spe identified as a candidate, sensitive, or sp species in local or regional plans, policies regulations, or by the California Departme and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Servi	cies ecial status s, or ent of Fish				\boxtimes
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any habitat or other sensitive natural commun- identified in local or regional plans, policie regulations or by the California Departme and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Servi	iity ∋s, nt of Fish				
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on fede protected wetlands as defined by Section Clean Water Act (including, but not limiter vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct r filling, hydrological interruption, or other n	404 of the d to, marsh, emoval,				
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement native resident or migratory fish or wildlife with established native resident or migrat corridors, or impede the use of native wild sites?	e species or ory wildlife				
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinand protecting biological resources, such as a preservation policy or ordinance (e.g., oa California walnut woodlands)?	tree		\boxtimes		

EN	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS (Explanations of all potentially and less than significant impacts are required to be attached on separate sheets)						
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservatior Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?						
5.	CULTURAL RESOURCES — Would the project:						
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?			\boxtimes			
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?		\boxtimes				
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontologica resource or site or unique geologic feature?		\boxtimes				
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?						
6.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS — Would the project:						
a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:						
i)	Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			\boxtimes			
ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?		\boxtimes				
iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		\boxtimes				
iv)	Landslides?			\boxtimes			
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			\boxtimes			
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?						
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?		\boxtimes	\boxtimes			
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?						

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS — Would the project:				
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?	*			
8.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS — Would the project:				
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?		\boxtimes		
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?		\boxtimes		
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				\boxtimes
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?				\boxtimes
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	
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?				\boxtimes

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY —	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
	Would the project:				
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		\boxtimes		
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		\boxtimes		
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?			\boxtimes	
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?				\boxtimes
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				\boxtimes
10.	LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING — Would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?			\boxtimes	
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?				\boxtimes

EN	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS (Explanations of all potentially and less than significant impacts are required to be attached on separate sheets)				impacts are
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11.	MINERAL RESOURCES — Would the project:				
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				\boxtimes
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?				\boxtimes
12.	NOISE — Would the project result in:				
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?			\boxtimes	
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?		\boxtimes		
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 located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
13.	POPULATION AND HOUSING -				
a)	Would the project: 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)?			\boxtimes	
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				\boxtimes
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				\boxtimes

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS (Explanatio

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14.	PUBLIC SERVICES				
	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:				
a)	Fire protection?		\boxtimes		
b)	Police protection?		\boxtimes		
c)	Schools?		\boxtimes		
d)	Parks?		\boxtimes		
e)	Other public facilities?		\boxtimes		
15.	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 facilities would occur or be accelerated?		\boxtimes		
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?				
16.	TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC — Would the project:				
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?				
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?				

			Less Than	,010)	
		Potentially Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			\boxtimes	
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?			\boxtimes	
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?			\boxtimes	
g)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?			\boxtimes	
17.	TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – The evaluation of potential impacts on tribal cultural resources consists of two parts: (1) identification of tribal cultural resources within the project site or immediate vicinity through AB 52 consultation and the review of pertinent records and literature, and (2) a determination of whether the project may result in a "substantial adverse change" in the significance of any identified resources. In accordance with Appendix G, the Project would have a significant impact related to Cultural Resources if it would:				
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)?				
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?				
18.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS — Would the project:				
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			\boxtimes	

			Less Than	,010)	
		Potentially Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?		\boxtimes		
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?		\boxtimes		
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?		\boxtimes		
40	ENERGY				
19.	ENERGY – In accordance with Appendix F of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City has determined that the Project would have a significant impact with regard to energy if the project would:				
a)	Conflict with an adopted energy conservation plan?		\boxtimes		
b)	Violate State or federal energy standards?			\boxtimes	
c)	Cause wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy during construction or operation?			\boxtimes	
d)	Result in an increase in demand for electricity or natural gas that exceeds available supply or distribution infrastructure capabilities that could result in the construction of new energy facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
20.	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?				

(Explanations of all potentially and less than significant impacts are **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS** required to be attached on separate sheets) Less Than Significant Potentially with Less Than Significant Mitigation Significant Impact Incorporated Impact No Impact \square b) Does the project have impacts that are individually L 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)? \square \boxtimes

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

*As previously determined in the WC2035 Plan Final EIR.

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

PREPARED BY	TITLE	TELEPHONE #	DATE
Heidi Rous ESA 80 South Lake Avenue, Suite 570 Pasadena, CA 91101	Director	(626) 204-6170	December 19, 2019