

CITY OF LOS ANGELES CALIFORNIA



ERIC GARCETTI
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

COMMISSION OFFICE
(213) 978-1300

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

SAMANTHA MILLMAN
PRESIDENT

CAROLINE CHOE
VICE-PRESIDENT

DAVID H. J. AMBROZ
HELEN LEUNG
KAREN MACK
DANA M. PERLMAN
YVETTE LOPEZ-LEDESMA
AJAY RELAN
JENNA HORNSTOCK

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

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

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
DIRECTOR

KEVIN J. KELLER, AICP
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

VACANT
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

James Street Four (4) Single-Family Residences

Case Number: ENV-2018-1130-MND

Project Location: 434, 438, 442, and 458 West James Street, Los Angeles, California 90065

Community Plan Area: Northeast Los Angeles

Council District: 1—Cedillo

Project Description: The Project is the construction, use and maintenance of four (4) single-family dwellings, each with a total floor area of approximately 1,840 square feet on four (4) vacant lots with a total area of 15,142.6 square feet. The Project proposes to cut 2,000 cubic yards across the four lots and export a total of 2,000 cubic yards of soil. A haul route is required. No fill or import of soil is proposed. The removal of five (5) Protected Trees from three (3) of the four (4) lots is proposed. There is a total of 11 Southern California black walnut trees on-site, all of which are considered Protected Trees under the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC).

PREPARED BY:

City of Los Angeles
Los Angeles City Planning

APPLICANT:

David Haas
James Street Group, LLC

April 2021

INITIAL STUDY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. Introduction	5
2. Executive Summary.....	7
3. Project Description	12
3.1. Project Summary.....	12
3.2. Environmental Setting	12
3.3. Description of Project	14
3.4. Requested Permits and Approvals	15
4. Environmental Impact Analysis	16
I. Aesthetics	16
II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources	19
III. Air Quality	21
IV. Biological Resources.....	23
V. Cultural Resources.....	30
VI. Energy	32
VII. Geology and Soils	33
VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	37
IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	39
X. Hydrology and Water Quality	42
XI. Land Use and Planning.....	46
XII. Mineral Resources	47
XIII. Noise	48
XIV. Population and Housing	50
XV. Public Services.....	51
XVI. Recreation	54
XVII. Transportation/Traffic	55
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources.....	62
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems.....	65
XX. Wildfire	68
XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	70
5. Preparers and Persons Consulted	72

List of Figures

A-1	Project Location.....	13
A-2	Vicinity Map	14

List of Tables

B-1	Projects Within a 500-Foot Radius of the Subject site.....	71
-----	--	----

INITIAL STUDY

1 INTRODUCTION

This Initial Study (IS) document evaluates potential environmental effects resulting from construction and operation of the proposed four (4) Single-Family Residences Project (“Project”). The proposed Project is subject to the guidelines and regulations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Therefore, this document has been prepared in compliance with the relevant provisions of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines as implemented by the City of Los Angeles (City). Based on the analysis provided within this Initial Study, the City has concluded that the Project will not result in significant impacts on the environment. This Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration are intended as informational documents, and are ultimately required to be adopted by the decision maker prior to project approval by the City.

1.1 PURPOSE OF AN INITIAL STUDY

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

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

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

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

1.2. ORGANIZATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study is organized into four sections as follows:

1 INTRODUCTION

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

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

4 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

INITIAL STUDY

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROJECT TITLE	JAMES FOUR (4) SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCES
ENVIRONMENTAL CASE NO.	ENV-2018-1130-MND
RELATED CASES	DIR-2018-1129-SPP, DIR-2018-1132-SPP, DIR-2018-1133-SPP, DIR-2018-1134-SPP

PROJECT LOCATION	434, 438, 442, 458 WEST JAMES STREET
COMMUNITY PLAN AREA	NORTHEAST LOS ANGELES
GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION	LOW RESIDENTIAL
ZONING	R1-1
COUNCIL DISTRICT	1 - CEDILLO

LEAD AGENCY	City of Los Angeles
STAFF CONTACT	DYLAN LAWRENCE
ADDRESS	200 N. SPRING ST., ROOM 621 LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
PHONE NUMBER	(213) 978-1182
EMAIL	DYLAN.LAWRENCE@LACITY.ORG

APPLICANT	DAVID HAAS, JAMES STREET GROUP, LLC
ADDRESS	606 MONTEREY PASS ROAD, 2 ND FLOOR MONTEREY PARK, CA 91754
PHONE NUMBER	(213) 305-8888

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project involves the construction of four (4) single-family dwellings, each with a total floor area of approximately 1,840 square-feet on four (4) vacant lots with a total area of 15,142.6 square-feet. The Project proposes to cut 2,000 cubic yards across the four (4) lots and export 2,000 cubic yards of soil off-site. No fill or import of soil is proposed. The Project proposes removal of five (5) Protected Trees across three (3) of the four (4) lots and replacement at a 4:1 ratio, for a total of 20 replacement trees. There is a total of 11 existing trees on-site, all of which are Protected Trees.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Project site and vicinity are located within a residential area of the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan area. The Project site totals approximately 15,142.6 square feet (each of the four (4) lots is zoned R1-1 and their areas range from 3,690.6 square-feet to 4,003.7 square-feet). The surrounding area is zoned for single-family homes. The parcels along this section of James Street are a mix of undeveloped and developed lots with single-family homes and duplexes that were allowed prior to zone changes effectuated in 1990 and 1998. The Project site is not contiguous; three (3) of the four (4) lots are adjacent to each other while the remaining lot is located three (3) lots to the north. Areas to the south of the Project site are vacant or developed with single-family homes while single-family homes and duplexes are located to the north and east of the site. The area to the west of the Project site contains a mix of vacant lots and single-family homes.

A tree report (Appendix C) was prepared for all four (4) lots on the Project site and the arborist confirmed the presence of 11 trees on-site, all of which meet the definition of a Protected Tree. Five (5) of these trees are proposed for removal.

James Street is designated as a Local Street in the Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan. Isabel Street is the closest Collector Street to the Project site and is located approximately 0.07 miles away, at the south end of the same block.

No bodies of water are present on or adjacent to the Project site. The Project site is not located within a landslide area, a methane buffer zone, a flood zone, a tsunami inundation zone, or liquefaction area. The Project site is located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, a BOE Special Grading Area (Basic Grid Map A-13372), and an Urban Agriculture Incentive Zone; and is 2.18 kilometers away from the Upper Elysian Park fault.

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

OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED

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

Including, but not limited to the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety for permits, Board of Public Works for removal of Protected Trees.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forestry Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Dylan Lawrence
PRINTED NAME


SIGNATURE

Planning Assistant
TITLE

4/13/21
DATE

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

INITIAL STUDY

3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 PROJECT SUMMARY

The construction of four (4) single-family dwellings, each with a total floor area of approximately 1,840 square-feet on four (4) vacant lots with a total area of 15,142.6 square-feet. The Project proposes to cut 2,000 cubic yards across the four (4) lots and export 2,000 cubic yards of soil off-site. No fill or import of soil is proposed. The Project proposes removal of five (5) Protected Trees across three (3) of the four (4) lots. There is a total of 11 Protected Trees on-site.

3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.2.1 Project Location

The Project site is located at 434, 438, 442, and 458 West James Street (APN 5452011006, 5452011005, 5452011004, and 5452011013) in the Mount Washington-Glassell Park area of the Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan. The Project site is located west of Figueroa Street and north of Cypress Avenue.

3.2.2 Existing Conditions

The Project site, which is currently vacant, totals 15,142.6 square feet across four (4) lots, is zoned R1-1, and is designated in the Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan as Low Residential. The Project site and vicinity are located within a residential area of the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan, west of Figueroa Street and north of Cypress Avenue.

The Project site is vacant. There are 11 Protected Trees and no Significant Trees, as defined by the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan, on-site. No bodies of water are present on or adjacent to the Project site. The Project site is not located within a fault zone area, earthquake landslide area, or liquefaction area but is located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.



Figure A-1: Project Location

Local access to the Project site is provided from the following neighborhood streets:

- Amabel Street
- Isabel Street
- Beech Street
- Glenalbyn Drive

3.2.3 Surrounding Land Uses

The surrounding area is zoned for single-family homes (R1 Zone). Areas to the south of the Project site are largely vacant or developed with single-family homes while single-family homes and duplexes are located to the north and east of the site. The area to the west of the Project site contains a mix of vacant lots and single-family homes. Local streets that provide access to the Project site also provide access to the adjacent developments. Figueroa Street, designated as an Avenue I per the City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035, provides access to the local streets.



Figure A-2: Vicinity Map

3.3 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

3.3.1 Project Overview

The proposed Project is located within a residential area of the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan area and is zoned R1-1. The proposed Project would consist of the construction of four (4) single-family dwellings, each with a total floor area of approximately 1,840 square-feet on four (4) vacant lots with a total area of 15,142.6 square feet. The Project proposes to cut 2,000 cubic yards across the four (4) lots and export 2,000 cubic yards of soil off-site. No fill or import of soil is proposed. The proposed Project would also consist of the construction of related improvements such as curb and gutters, retaining walls, driveways, and utilities. The proposed four (4) dwellings would be situated along James Street and would each be three (3) levels with an attached two (2)-car garage. The proposed Project also involves a haul route to export approximately 2,000 cubic yards of earth material and will also be governed by an approved haul route that conforms to requirements of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, which will regulate the travel route for hauling trucks and times at which they may leave the site. The Project proposes removal of five (5) Protected Trees across three (3) of the four (4) lots. There is a total of 11 Protected trees on-site.

3.4 REQUESTED PERMITS AND APPROVALS

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

- Pursuant to LAMC Section 11.5.7 C, four (4) Specific Plan Project Permit Compliance Reviews
 - To allow construction of four (4) single-family dwellings on four (4) lots in the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan.
- Other discretionary and ministerial permits and approvals that may be deemed necessary, including, but not limited to, temporary street closure permits, grading and hauling permits, tree removal permits, excavation permits, foundation permits, building permits, and sign permits.

INITIAL STUDY

4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

I. AESTHETICS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099 would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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.

A scenic vista generally provides focal views of objects, settings, or features of visual interest, or panoramic views of large geographic areas of scenic quality, primarily from a given vantage point. The proposed Project would meet the maximum height requirements per the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan. The nearest large open space area to the Project site is Carlin G.

Smith Recreation Center, which is situated to the northeast near Avenue 46 and Frontenac Avenue, approximately .78 miles from the Project site. The Project site is not within the view shed of this area.

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

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

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

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 proposed Project would construct four (4) single-family dwellings and related improvements within the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan area of the City of Los Angeles. The Project site is currently zoned R1-1, and the surrounding parcels are either vacant or developed with single-family residences and duplexes. The new single-family dwellings would each have a flat roof, unlike the majority of the homes in the surrounding area that have pitched roofs. In addition, existing homes on the west side of James Street are all situated on an upslope. The proposed homes will also be situated on an upslope and would be similar in scale to existing homes along the same right-of-way. Based on the above, the proposed Project would not introduce incompatible visual elements to the Project site or visual elements that would be incompatible with the character of the area surrounding the Project site, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

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 materials, and may interfere with the safe operation of a motor vehicle on adjacent streets. Daytime glare is common in urban areas and is typically associated with mid- to high-rise buildings with exterior façades largely or entirely comprised of highly reflective glass or mirror-like materials. Nighttime glare is primarily associated with bright point-source lighting that contrasts with existing low ambient light conditions.

The proposed Low Residential use would be compatible with existing Low Residential uses that the neighborhood is designated for. 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 have low intensity lighting and be consistent with lighting associated with similar residences in the surrounding area and neighborhood. Therefore, the proposed Project is not expected to create a new source of substantial light or glare that could adversely affect day or nighttime views, and impacts would be less than significant.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

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

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

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project would convert valued farmland to non-agricultural uses. The Project site is vacant but located in an urbanized area and surrounded by single- and multi-family residences. 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) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

III. AIR QUALITY

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

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would construct four (4) new single-family dwellings on four (4) different lots (one on each parcel). The Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan designates the Project site as Low Residential. Because the proposed Project would construct one (1) single-family dwelling on each parcel, it would be consistent with the Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan (Land Use element of the General Plan), and the Air Quality Element of the City's General Plan.

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. The AQMP incorporates planning projections from the City (consistent with its General Plan), and the proposed Project is not expected to conflict with the AQMP or obstruct its implementation. A significant air quality impact may occur if a project is inconsistent with the AQMP or would in some way represent a substantial hindrance to employing the policies or obtaining the goals of that plan. The proposed Project is not expected to conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the AQMP and SCAQMD rules. The proposed Project is also subject to the City's Green Building Program Ordinance (Ord. No. 179,890), which was adopted to reduce the use of natural resources, create healthier living environments, and minimize the negative impacts of

development on local, regional and global ecosystems. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. 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 PM_{2.5}), 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 (SO_x), and lead (Pb). Because the Basin is designated as a State and/or federal nonattainment air basin for O₃, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, 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. A project of this size (four units) would not likely exceed the project-level SCAQMD localized significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants and the impact would be less than significant.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project were to expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations. The SCAQMD identifies the following as sensitive receptors: long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, and athletic facilities. The Project site is surrounded by residential uses. The Project is subject to, grading, and construction standards to mitigate air pollution and dust impacts. Additionally, the Project is not expected to contribute to pollutant concentrations or expose surrounding residences and other sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The Project is required to meet SCAQMD District Rule 403 as well as the City's requirements for demolition, grading, and construction related to air pollution. Therefore, construction and operation of the Project would result in a less than significant impact for both localized and regional air pollution emissions.

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

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 Project does not include these land uses or industrial operations. Therefore, the proposed Project will not create new objectionable odors during operation.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Per the Biological Resources Report (Appendix A) submitted to the file dated October 15, 2018, by Johanna Page, Project Manager/Senior Biologist, no special-status wildlife species were observed within the Project site during the general biological reconnaissance survey that was undertaken on September 25, 2018. However, two (2) bat species, the Western Mastiff bat and the Big Free-tailed bat, may occasionally forage on the site during nighttime hours, and are not anticipated to be impacted the proposed Project activities. The Project site was also determined to have potential to support nesting birds, which 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 (CDFW) Code. In response to comments received from the CDFW, the Project shall also comply with the regulatory compliance measures detailed below, which would ensure that no significant impacts to nesting birds would occur.

Regulatory Compliance Measures (Nesting Native Birds, Hillside or Rural Areas)

The project will result in the removal of vegetation and disturbances to the ground and therefore may result in take of nesting native bird species. Migratory nongame native bird species are protected by international treaty under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (50 C.F.R Section 10.13). Sections 3503, 3503.5 and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code prohibit take of all birds and their active nests including raptors and other migratory nongame birds (as listed under the Federal MBTA). The following measures are as recommended by the California Department of Fish and Game:

- Proposed project activities (including disturbances to native and non-native vegetation, structures, and substrates) shall take place outside of the breeding bird season to avoid take (including disturbances which would cause abandonment of active nests containing eggs and/or young). The Applicant shall not perform any Project construction or activities or remove or otherwise disturb vegetation on the project site, or adjacent to the site, from February 15 to August 31, and as early as January 1, to avoid impacts to breeding/nesting birds and raptors. Take means to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture or kill (Fish and Game Code Section 86).*
- If project activities cannot feasibly avoid the breeding bird season, beginning thirty days prior to the disturbance of suitable nesting habitat, the applicant shall:*

- *Arrange for one bird survey 10 days prior and one bird survey three (3) days prior to detect any protected native birds in the habitat to be removed and any other such habitat within 300 feet of the construction work area (within 500 feet for raptors) as access to adjacent areas allows. The surveys shall be conducted by a Qualified Biologist with experience in conducting breeding bird surveys. Nesting bird surveys shall be conducted at appropriate nesting times and concentrate on potential roosting or perch sites. The last survey shall be conducted no more than three (3) days prior to the initiation of clearance/construction work.” If Project activities are delayed or suspended for more than 7 days after the last survey, surveys shall be repeated before work can resume.*
- *If an active nest is located, clearing and construction within 300 feet around active passerine (perching birds and songbirds) nests and 500 feet around non-listed raptor nests, or as determined by a qualified biological monitor, shall be postponed until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged and when there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. If an active nest is located, reports should also be sent directly to the Department of City Planning and the Department of Building and Safety so that a Stop Work Order may be issued if necessary. The buffer zone from the nest shall be established in the field with flagging and stakes. The qualified biologist shall retain the ability to increase buffers if needed to protect the nesting birds. Temporary fencing and signage shall be maintained for the duration of the Project. Construction personnel shall be instructed on the sensitivity of the area and be advised not to work, trespass, or engage in activities that would disturb nesting birds near or inside the buffer.*
- *The Applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures described above to document compliance with applicable State and Federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds. Such record shall be submitted and received into the case file for the associated discretionary action permitting the project.*

The 2006 City CEQA Guidelines on Page C-22, Exhibit C-6 includes a discussion of the open space resources and significant ecological areas (SEAs) within the City of Los Angeles. Specifically, the following is stated about the Mount Washington area:

Mount Washington and vicinity. In the area east of the Golden State Freeway (I-5) and between the Glendale (SR 2) and Pasadena (SR 11) Freeways, there occurs a number of small pockets of grassland and coastal scrub habitat in the mountainous area in the vicinity of Mount Washington. No specific details of biological resources present there could be found in the literature.

The site is adjacent to an area with a number of small pockets of grassland and coastal scrub habitat. As part of the Project Permit Compliance Requests, the Applicant provided Tree Reports prepared by an ISA (International Society of Arboriculture) Certified Arborist, dated February 16, 2018 and January 15, 2020. Upon comments received from CDFW dated November 9, 2020, the Applicant provided revised Tree Reports (dated January 1, January 7, and January 8, 2021) with additional information for the three (3) lots that propose removal of a Protected Tree. The surveys

of the sites found 11 Protected Trees on-site. The Project proposes removal of a total of 5 Protected black walnut trees and like-for-like replacement at a 4:1 ratio, as required by the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Ordinance (No. 177, 404), for a total of 20 replacement black walnut trees. The Tree Reports (Appendix C) also cite six (6) off-site Protected Trees on surrounding properties that will be enclosed by protected fencing during construction and will be unaffected by site development. The Project has been conditioned to provide 20 replacement trees as part of the construction of the four (4) new single-family homes to replace the five (5) Protected Trees being removed. The Project Applicant has also provided a tree plan detailing locations of proposed replacement trees as part of the Project Permit Compliance Review.

CDFW also noted that proposed replacement trees appeared to be grouped into a small planting area in the initial Tree Reports. In response to these comments, the revised Tree Reports dated January 2021 detailed spacing distances for proposed replacement trees and indicated them on an accompanying tree replacement plan. For 434 West James Street, the eight (8) replacement black walnut trees will be spaced between seven (7) to 25 feet between each tree and the proposed single-family dwelling; for 438 West James Street, the eight (8) replacement black walnut trees will be spaced between seven (7) feet to 25 feet between each tree and the proposed single-family dwelling; for 442 West James Street, the four (4) replacement black walnut trees will be spaced between eight (8) feet to 27 feet between each tree and the proposed single-family dwelling. Given the upsloping topography and relatively small area of each lot, these distances are adequate in addressing concerns related to replacement tree spacing. No other special-status plant species were identified on the Project site during the biological reconnaissance survey that was undertaken on September 25, 2018. The Project Applicant shall comply with regulatory compliance measures to ensure that no significant impacts to sensitive biological species or habitat would occur. The potentially significant impacts relating to proposed removal and replacement of Protected Trees will also be addressed by the imposition of multiple mitigation measures recommended by CDFW in its November 9, 2020 letter, including **Mitigation Measure (Long-Term Monitoring)** and **Mitigation Measure (Infectious Disease Evaluation)**, each of which is detailed below.

Mitigation Measure (Replacement Tree Long-Term Monitoring)

- *Southern California black walnut trees shall be monitored, maintained, and inspected as described in the Protected Tree Report. Long-term monitoring, maintenance, and inspection shall be provided until all planted trees survive to produce reproductive structures (i.e., catkins). If the Applicant observes changes, stress, or failure of planted Southern California black walnut trees, as recommended in the Protected Tree Report, the Applicant shall consult with a certified arborist or tree specialist to assess the tree and provide specific recommendations. There shall be no net loss of Southern California black walnut trees. If any replacement trees fail, Applicant shall replace those trees until a minimum of 20 total trees survive to produce catkins.*

Mitigation Measure (Existing Tree Infectious Disease Evaluation)

- *Prior to tree removal, the Applicant shall work with a certified arborist to evaluate the five existing Southern black walnut trees for infectious tree diseases including but not limited to: sudden oak death (*Phytophthora ramorum*), thousand canker fungus (*Geosmithia morbida*), Polyphagous shot hole borer (*Euwallacea* spp.), and goldspotted oak borer (*Agrilus auroguttatus*).*
 - *If the certified arborist determines trees are impacted by infectious pests or diseases, the Applicant shall work with the certified arborist to prepare an Infectious Tree Disease Management Plan or develop a detailed, robust, enforceable, and feasible list of preventative measures. A plan/list shall provide measures relevant for each tree pest or disease observed. To avoid the spread of infectious tree pests and diseases, infected trees shall not be transported from the Project site without first being treated using best available management practices described Infectious Tree Disease Management Plan or list of preventative measures.*
 - *All tree material, especially infected tree material, shall be left on site, chipping the material for use as ground cover or mulch.*
 - *Pruning and power tools shall be cleaned and disinfected before use to prevent introducing pathogens from known infested areas, and after use to prevent spread of pathogens to new areas.*

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

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

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

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if federally protected wetlands would be modified or removed by a project. The Project site does not contain any federally protected wetlands, wetland resources, or other waters of the United States as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The Project site is located in a highly urbanized area surrounded by land that is developed with residential uses. Therefore, the proposed Project would not have any effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means, and no impacts would occur.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

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. Per the Biological Resources Report (Appendix A) dated October 15, 2018, prepared by Johanna Page, Project Manager/Senior Biologist, the Project site does not occur within any designated wildlife corridors or habitat linkages and is generally isolated by residential development. Therefore, the proposed Project would not interfere with wildlife movement or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

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). Per the Arborist Reports dated February 16, 2018 and January 1, 7, and 8, 2021, by Lisa Smith, Certified Master Arborist #WE3782 (Appendix C), the Project site does not contain locally protected oak trees, western sycamore trees, or California bay trees. However, it does contain 11 Protected Southern California black walnut trees. The proposed Project is conditioned to comply with the Protected Tree Ordinance and the City's Regulatory Compliance Measures (RCMs); five (5) Protected Trees are proposed for removal and shall be replaced at a 4:1 ratio, for a total of 20 replacement Southern California black walnut trees. The Tree Reports include detailed replacement plans for replacing the Protected Trees on-site and were submitted to and approved for accuracy by the City's Urban Forestry Division. 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 CFGF 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 impacts would be less than significant.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact. The Project site and its vicinity are not part of any draft or adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The Project site and its vicinity are not part of any draft or adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local,

regional or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan, and no impacts would occur.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project would substantially alter the environmental context of or remove identified historical resources. The property is currently vacant and no such resources exist. No impact would occur.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if a known or unknown archaeological resource would be removed, altered, or destroyed as a result of the proposed development. Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines significant archaeological resources as resources that meet the criteria for historical resources or resources that constitute unique archaeological resources. A project-related significant impact could occur if a project would significantly affect archaeological resources that fall under either of these categories.

If archaeological resources are discovered during excavation, grading, or construction activities, work shall cease in the area of the find until a qualified archaeologist has evaluated the find in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Per regulatory compliance measures, personnel of the proposed Project shall not collect or move any archaeological materials and associated materials. Construction activity may continue unimpeded on other portions of the Project site. The found deposits would be treated in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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

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

VI. ENERGY

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would be designed and operated in accordance with the applicable State Building Code Title 24 regulations and City of Los Angeles Green Building Code, which impose energy conservation measures. The majority of the energy usage in the proposed Project would consist of lighting, climate control, and appliance operation. Adherence to the aforementioned energy requirements will ensure conformance with the State's goal of promoting energy and lighting efficiency. As such, impacts of the proposed Project would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project involves the construction, use, and maintenance of four (4) single-family dwellings. As stated above, the proposed Project's improvements and operations would be in accordance with applicable State Building Code Title 24 regulations and City of Los Angeles Green Building Code, which impose energy conservation measures. As such, impacts of the proposed Project would be less than significant.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Be located on a geologic unit that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h. 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 waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Directly or indirectly cause 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.

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. The subject site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or other designated fault zone. The nearest fault zone, Upper Elysian Park, is located approximately 2.21 km from the Project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

than significant.

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

Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No Impact. A significant impact may occur if a proposed Project site is located within a liquefaction zone. Liquefaction is the loss of soil strength or stiffness due to a buildup of pore-water pressure during severe ground shaking. While the subject site is not located within a Liquefaction Zone, specific RCMs in the City of Los Angeles regulate the grading and construction of projects in these particular types of locations and will reduce any potential impacts to less than significant. RCMs include the Uniform Building Code Chapter 18, Division 1, Section 1804.5: Liquefaction Potential and Soil Strength Loss. These RCMs have been historically proven to work to the satisfaction of the City Engineer to reduce any impacts from the specific environment the project is located. Therefore, impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be less than significant.

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

Landslides?

Less Than Significant 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. While the subject site is located within the Hillside Area, it is not located within a Landslide Area. The applicant submitted a geology and soils report to the Department of Building and Safety for review. The Building and Safety, Grading Division issued Soils Approval Letters dated March 13, 2018 and March 14, 2018 (Log Reference #102269 and #102272) (Appendix B) and their conditions are incorporated herein, by reference. As such, impacts related to landslides would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if construction activities or future uses would result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Construction of the proposed Project would result in ground surface disturbance during site clearance, excavation, and grading, which could create the potential for soil erosion to occur. Nevertheless, 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 (LARWQBC) through the City's Stormwater Management Division. In addition, the Project would be required to develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which would require implementation of an erosion control plan to reduce the potential for wind or waterborne erosion during the construction process. Furthermore, all onsite grading and site preparation would comply with applicable provisions of Chapter IX, Division 70 of the LAMC, and conditions imposed by the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety. Therefore, project impacts would be less than significant.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if any unstable geological conditions would result in any type of geological failure, including lateral spreading, off-site landslides, liquefaction, or collapse. Development of the proposed Project would not have the potential to expose people and structures to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslide; see VII a-e for these issues. Subsidence and ground collapse generally occur in areas with active groundwater withdrawal or petroleum production. The extraction of groundwater or petroleum from sedimentary source rocks can cause the permanent collapse of the pore space previously occupied by the removed fluid. According to the Safety Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan, Critical Facilities and Lifeline Systems, Exhibit E and/or the Environmental and Public Facilities Map (1996), the Project site is not identified as being located in an oil field or within an oil drilling 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 Soils Report Approval Letter dated March 13, 2018 and March 14, 2018 (Log Reference #102269 and #102272) (Appendix B), the potential for landslide lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. There is a potential for buried paleontological resources to be found within the Project site. If paleontological resources are discovered during excavation, grading, or construction, the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety will be notified immediately, and all work will cease in the area of the find until a qualified paleontologist evaluates the find. Construction activity may continue unimpeded on other portions of the Project site. The paleontologist shall determine the location, the time frame, and the extent to which any monitoring of earthmoving activities shall be required. The found deposits would be treated in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Greenhouse gases (GHG) are those gaseous constituents of the atmosphere, both natural and anthropogenic (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 greenhouse effect compares the Earth and the atmosphere surrounding it to a greenhouse with glass panes. The glass panes in a greenhouse let heat from sunlight in and reduce the amount of heat that escapes. GHGs, such as carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O), keep the average surface temperature of the Earth close to 60 degrees Fahrenheit (°F). Without the greenhouse effect, the Earth would be a frozen globe with an average surface temperature of about 5°F. 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. 179,890). The LAGBC requires projects to achieve a 20 percent reduction in potable water use and wastewater generation. As the LAGBC includes applicable provisions of the State's CALGreen Code, a new project that can demonstrate it complies with the LAGBC is considered consistent with statewide GHG reduction goals and policies including AB32 (California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006). Through required implementation of the LAGBC, the proposed Project would be consistent with local and statewide goals and policies aimed at reducing the generation of GHGs. Therefore, the proposed Project's generation of GHG emissions would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to emissions. Impacts will be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The California legislature passed Senate Bill (SB) 375 to connect regional transportation planning to land use decisions made at a local level. SB 375 requires the metropolitan planning organizations to prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in their regional transportation plans to achieve the per capita GHG reduction targets. For the SCAG region, the SCS is contained in the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The 2016-2040 RTP/SCS focuses the majority of new housing and job growth in high-quality transit areas and other opportunity areas on existing main streets, in downtowns, and commercial corridors, resulting in more opportunity for transit-oriented development. In addition, SB 743, adopted September 27, 2013, encourages land use and transportation planning decisions that reduce vehicle miles traveled, which contribute to GHG emissions, as required by AB 32. The Project would provide infill residential development [proximate to a major transportation corridor (i.e., Figueroa Street)] and would not interfere with SCAG's ability to implement the regional strategies outlined in the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS. The proposed Project, therefore, would be consistent with statewide, regional and local goals and policies aimed at reducing GHG emissions and would result in a less than significant impact related to plans that target the reduction of GHG emissions.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Construction of the proposed Project would involve the temporary use of potentially hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. Operation of the Project would involve the limited use and storage of common hazardous substances typical of those used in residential developments, including lubricants, paints, solvents, custodial products (e.g., cleaning supplies), pesticides and other landscaping supplies, and vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. No uses or activities are proposed that would result in the use or discharge of unregulated hazardous materials and/or substances, or create a public hazard through transport, use, or disposal. As a residential 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) 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?

No 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. There are no existing structures on-site and all construction-related activities would be done in conformance with applicable regulations. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The nearest school to the Project site is Florence Nightingale Middle School located at 3311 North Figueroa Street, which is about 0.18 miles southwest of the Project site. The proposed Project is a residential development that would not emit hazardous emissions or hazardous materials, although it is located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Haul truck emissions are not expected to result in significant impacts to schools because the particulate matter from haul truck exhaust would not be substantial and construction would be short-term. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Project site is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The California Department of Toxic

Substances Control (DTSC) maintains a database (EnviroStor) that provides access to detailed information on hazardous waste permitted sites and corrective action facilities, as well as existing site cleanup information. EnviroStor also provides information on investigation, cleanup, permitting, and/or corrective actions that are planned, being conducted, or have been completed under DTSC's oversight. A review of EnviroStor 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) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. The Project site is not located in an airport land use plan area, or within two (2) 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) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. The nearest emergency route is Figueroa Street, approximately 0.2 miles to the southeast of the Project site (City of Los Angeles, Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan, Critical Facilities and Lifeline Systems, Exhibit H, November 1996.) The proposed Project would not require the closure of any public or private streets and would not impede emergency vehicle access to the Project site or surrounding area. Additionally, emergency access to and from the Project site would be provided in accordance with requirements of the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD). Therefore, the proposed Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and no impact would occur.

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

Less Than Significant 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 Very High Fire Severity Zone in the hills, which is subject to wildland fires. However, the proposed Project would be designed and constructed in accordance with State and local Building and Fire Codes, including installing sprinklers and planting fire resistant landscaping as appropriate, to reduce the potential for exposure of people or structures to wildfires to the maximum extent possible. Therefore, the impact of the Project in exposing people or structures to a risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, would be less than significant.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project discharges water that does not meet the quality standards of agencies which regulate surface water quality and water discharge into storm water drainage systems, or does not comply with all applicable regulations as governed by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB). As is typical of most nonindustrial urban development, 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 Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control Ordinances contain requirements for construction activities and operation of development and redevelopment projects to integrate low impact development practices and standards for stormwater pollution mitigation, and maximize open, green and pervious space on all developments and redevelopments consistent with the City's landscape ordinance and other related requirements in the City's Development BMPs Handbook. Conformance would be ensured during the permitting process with the Department of Building & Safety. Therefore, the Project would not violate water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, or stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise substantially degrade water quality, and project impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project would substantially deplete groundwater or interferes with groundwater recharge. The proposed Project would not require the use of groundwater at the Project site. Potable water would be supplied by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), which draws its water supplies from distant sources for which it conducts its own assessment and mitigation of potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the Project would not require direct additions or withdrawals of groundwater. Excavation to accommodate subterranean levels is not proposed at a depth that would result in the interception of existing aquifers or penetration of the existing water table. In addition, the City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control regulations (Ordinance No. 172,176 and No. 173,494) contain requirements for construction activities and operation of development and redevelopment projects to integrate low impact development practices and standards for stormwater and to maximize open, green and pervious space on all developments and redevelopments consistent with the City's landscape ordinance and other related requirements in the City's Development BMPs Handbook. Conformance would be ensured during the permitting process with the Department of Building & Safety. Therefore, the Project would not impact groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge, and project impacts would be less than significant. c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project would substantially alter the drainage pattern of an existing stream or river 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. Therefore, alterations to existing drainage patterns within the Project site and surrounding area such that it would cause significant on- or off-site erosion or siltation would not occur, and project impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project would substantially alter the drainage pattern of an existing stream or river such that flooding would result. As discussed above, there are no streams or rivers located in the project vicinity. During operation of the Project, storm water or any runoff irrigation waters would be directed into existing storm drains that are currently receiving surface water runoff under existing conditions. Therefore, alterations to existing drainage patterns within the site and surrounding area such that it would cause significant on- or off-site flooding would not occur, and project impacts would be less than significant.

iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if runoff water would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm drain systems serving the Project site, or if the proposed Project would substantially increase the probability that polluted runoff would reach the storm drain system. The City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control regulations (Ordinance No. 172,176 and No. 173,494) contain requirements for construction activities and operation of development and redevelopment projects to integrate low impact development practices and standards for stormwater and other related requirements in the City's Development BMPs Handbook. Such regulations and practices are designed in consideration of existing and planned stormwater drainage systems. Conformance would be ensured during the permitting process with the Department of Building & Safety. Therefore, water runoff during construction activities and operation of the Project would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned drainage systems, and project impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project included housing and would be located within a 100-year or 500-year floodplain or would impede or redirect flood flows. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map, the subject property is not located within a Flood Zone; and according to the Safety Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan, 100-Year & 500-Year Flood Plains, Exhibit F, the subject property is not located within a 100-year or 500-year flood plain. Therefore, while the Project does include housing, it is not located within a 100-year or 500-year flood plain, and no impact would occur.

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

No Impact. The property is not in a tsunami inundation zone or flood zone (ZIMAS), and no water bodies (subject to seiche) are located in the project area. In addition, the proposed Project is a residential project that would not store hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in a risk of pollutant releases resulting from inundation. No impact would occur.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Potential pollutants generated by the Project would be typical of residential land uses and may include sediment, nutrients, pesticides, pathogens, trash and debris, oil and grease, and metals. The implementation of BMPs required by the City's Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance would target these pollutants that could potentially be carried in stormwater runoff. Implementation of the LID measures on the Project site would result in an improvement in surface water quality runoff as compared to existing conditions. As such, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct any water quality control plans. In addition, with implementation of the Project's proposed landscaping, impervious surfaces would marginally decrease. The decrease in impervious areas would improve the groundwater recharge capacity of the Project site over existing conditions. With compliance with existing regulatory requirements and implementation of LID BMPs, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or a sustainable groundwater management plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The existing parcels that comprise the four (4) vacant lots of the Project site are zoned R1-1 (designated for single-family dwellings). The proposed Project would develop a new single-family dwelling on each parcel. 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 four (4) four new single-family homes in an urbanized area in Los Angeles, would not divide an established community. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

No 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 Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan Area. The site is zoned R1-1, with a General Plan land use designation of Low Residential. The proposed Project would be comprised of four (4) single-family dwellings. Residential uses are permitted in R1 zoned lots within the Mount Washington-Glassell Park Specific Plan with a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.5:1 for lots less than 5,000 square-feet in area. 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, no impact would occur.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project would result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources of regional value or locally-important mineral resource recovery site. 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) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project would result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources of regional value or locally-important mineral resource recovery site. 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.

XIII. NOISE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels are in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. The City of Los Angeles has established policies and regulations concerning the generation and control of noise that could adversely affect its citizens and noise-sensitive land uses. Construction activity would result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the project area on an intermittent basis. Noise levels would fluctuate depending on the construction phase, equipment type and duration of use, distance between the noise source and receptor, and presence or absence of noise attenuation barriers. Construction noise for the Project will cause a temporary increase in the ambient noise levels, but will be subject to the LAMC Sections 112.05 (Maximum Noise Level of Powered Equipment or Powered Hand Tools) and 41.40 (Noise Due to Construction, Excavation Work – When Prohibited) regarding construction hours and construction equipment noise thresholds. Construction and demolition shall be restricted to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturday. The potential for excessive noise would be further reduced with compliance with the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance No. 161,574, and any subsequent ordinances which prohibits the emission of creation of noise beyond certain

levels at adjacent uses unless technically infeasible. Therefore, project impacts would be less than significant.

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

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) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from a public airport or public use airport. The proposed Project is not located within two (2) miles of a public airport or public use airport. The Project site is outside of the Los Angeles International Airport Land Use Plan. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not expose people working or residing in the project area to excessive noise levels from a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Less Than Significant Impact. A potentially significant impact would occur if the proposed Project would induce substantial population growth that would not have otherwise occurred as rapidly or in as great a magnitude. The proposed Project would result in the development of four (4) residential units. The increase in residential population resulting from the proposed Project would not be considered substantial in consideration of anticipated growth for the Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan, and is within the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) 2020 population projections for the City in their 2016-2040 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) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. The proposed Project would construct four (4) new single-family homes on four (4) vacant lots. The Project site is currently vacant and does not contain existing housing, and as such, no housing would be demolished. No impact would occur.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

a) Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) could not adequately serve the proposed Project, necessitating a new or physically altered station. The Project site is located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The Project site and the surrounding area are currently served by Los Angeles Fire Department Station 44 located at 1410 Cypress Avenue, approximately 0.9 miles northwest of the Project site. As part of the project planning process, the applicant has coordinated with the Fire Department to incorporate emergency service vehicle and infrastructure requirements.

The proposed Project would result in a net increase of four (4) 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.

b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) could not adequately serve the proposed Project, necessitating a new or physically altered station. The proposed Project would result in a net increase of four (4) units and could increase demand for police service. The Project site and the surrounding area are currently served by LAPD's the Northeast Community Police Station located at 3353 San Fernando Road, approximately 2.6 miles northwest of the Project site. Given that there is a police station 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 police station to serve the proposed Project and maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection. Therefore, the proposed Project would result in a less-than-significant impact.

c) Schools?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project would include substantial employment or population growth, which could generate a demand for school facilities that would exceed the capacity of the school district. The proposed Project would add four (4) 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) Parks?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project would exceed the capacity or capability of the local park system to serve the proposed Project. The City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) is responsible for the provision, maintenance, and operation of public recreational and park facilities and services in the City. The proposed Project would result in a net increase of four (4) units, which could result in increased demand for parks and recreation facilities. In addition, the payment of required impact fees by the proposed residential development within the City of Los Angeles per LAMC Sections 12.33 (and 17.12 and the City's Dwelling Unit Construction Tax) could offset some of the increased demand by helping fund new facilities, as well as the expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, the 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, and project impacts would be less than significant.

e) Other public facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would add four (4) single-family dwellings in a residential hillside area, which could result in increased demand for library services and

resources of the LAPL System. The Cypress Park Branch Library is located approximately 0.6 miles northwest of the Project site. 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 four (4) units, which could result in increased demand for library services and resources of the Los Angeles Public Library System. While the increase in population as a result of the proposed Project may create a demand for other public facilities, the Project would not create substantial capacity or service level problems that would require the provision of new or physically altered public facilities in order to maintain an acceptable level of other government services. Therefore, project impacts would be less than significant.

XVI. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The provision of private recreation space and the payment of required impact fees by the proposed development per LAMC Section 12.33 would further offset some of the increased demand for recreational facilities by helping fund new facilities, as well as the expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, the Project would not create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial physical impacts associated with the provision or new or altered parks facilities, and project impacts would be less than significant.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond the limits of the Project site. Although the proposed Project would place some additional demands on park facilities, the increase in demand would be met through a combination of on-site amenities and existing parks in the project area. The proposed residential use's increased demands upon recreational facilities would not in and of itself result in the construction of a new park, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Thus, impacts to park and recreational facilities would be less than significant.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

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

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. As the proposed Project represents a discretionary request for new hillside construction greater than 1,000 square feet on a street less than 24 feet in width, the Project Applicant was required to submit a Construction Traffic Management Plan for review by the City's Department of Transportation (LADOT), in conjunction with LADOT's Hillside Development Construction Traffic Management Guidelines released on June 16, 2020. These guidelines state the purpose of a Construction Traffic Management Plan is to address transportation concerns specific to hillside communities, including narrow streets, limited emergency access, and location in a Very High Fire Severity Zone. The proposed Project will be subject to the measures detailed in the Project's Construction Traffic Management Plan reviewed and stamped-approved by LADOT on June 24, 2020 (Appendix D). Compliance with the Construction Traffic Management Plan will ensure that the proposed Project does not conflict with any programs, plans, ordinances, or policies addressing the City's circulation system. The proposed measures in the Construction Traffic Management Plan include, but are not limited to, limiting construction to the hours allowed by the LAMC; the appointment of a Construction Liaison Officer (CLO) to respond to inquiries or concerns of surrounding residents as well as the general public; a project hotline for complaints or inquiries; on-site construction across four (4) separate

phases; on-site parking for employees; construction barriers in accordance with City requirements; site security; and unobstructed emergency access to and from the site.

The potentially significant impacts relating to narrow hillside streets, limited emergency access, and location in a Very High Fire Severity Zone will also be addressed by the imposition of multiple mitigation measures, including **Mitigation Measure VIII-40; Mitigation Measure VIII-70; Mitigation Measure XVI-30; Mitigation Measure XVI-40; Mitigation Measure XVI-60; and Mitigation Measure XVI-80**, all of which are detailed below. Additionally, as the Project proposes to export 2,000 cubic yards of earth, it will be required to obtain a Haul Route Permit from LADBS prior to construction activities. The proposed Project will be required to comply with all conditions attached to the Haul Route Permit in order to perform export activities. Therefore, the measures proposed in the Construction Traffic Management Plan dated June 24, 2020 (Appendix D), along with the mitigation measures below and transportation-related regulatory compliance measures, will reduce any impacts to the City's circulation system to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure VIII-40 Hillside Construction Staging and Parking Plan

- *Prior to the hearing for a Haul Route Approval, the applicant shall submit a Construction Staging Plan and a Construction Parking Plan for review and approval by the Board of Building and Safety Commissioners. Each plan shall be designed to prevent the blockage of two-way traffic on streets in the vicinity of the construction site.*
- *The Construction Staging Plan shall include, but not be limited to: identifying where all construction materials, equipment, machinery, and vehicles will be stored on-site and/or out of the public right-of-way through the grading and construction phases of the project; and identifying the proposed locations of all on-site and off-site staging areas for soil haulers and construction delivery vehicles. This plan shall also include the following:*
 - *No construction equipment or material shall be permitted to be stored within the public right-of-way.*
 - *During the Excavation and Grading phases, only one truck hauler shall be allowed on the site at any one time.*
 - *On substandard hillside streets, only one hauling truck shall be allowed on the street at any time.*
 - *Delivery drivers for construction materials shall be required to follow the designated travel plan or approved Haul Route.*
 - *Truck traffic directed to the project site for the purpose of delivering materials, construction-machinery, or removal of graded soil shall be limited to off-peak traffic hours, Monday through Friday only. No truck deliveries shall be permitted on Saturdays, Sundays, or City Holidays.*
 - *All deliveries during construction shall be coordinated so that only one vendor/delivery vehicle is at the site at one time, and that a construction supervisor is present at such time.*
 - *A radio operator shall be on-site to coordinate the movement of material and personnel, in order to keep the roads open for emergency vehicles, their apparatus, and neighbors.*

- *A minimum of two flag persons are required. One flag person is required at the entrance to the project site and one flag person at the next intersection along the haul route.*
 - *Truck crossing signs are required within 300 feet of the exit of the project site in each direction.*
 - *The owner or contractor shall keep the construction area sufficiently dampened to control dust caused by grading and hauling, and at all times shall provide reasonable control of dust caused by wind.*
 - *Loads shall be secured by trimming and watering or may be covered to prevent the spilling or blowing of the earth material.*
 - *Trucks and loads are to be cleaned at the export site to prevent blowing dirt and spilling of loose earth.*
 - *No person shall perform grading within areas designated "hillside" unless a copy of the permit is in the possession of a responsible person and available at the site for display upon request.*
 - *Soil import and export activity shall be performed under the continuous inspection of a Registered Deputy Grading Inspector.*
 - *48-hours prior to start of import or export of soil material, a Registered Deputy Grading Inspector shall notify the LADBS haul route monitoring inspector and provide him with the construction schedule and approved travel route.*
 - *The Registered Deputy Grading Inspector shall be required to keep a log book noting the dates of hauling, the number of trips (i.e. trucks) per day, approved travel route, and operation hours. The inspector shall note loads of import or export soil or demolition material where appropriate. Failure to maintain a log book or discrepancies in the log book may result in suspension or revocation of license of the Registered Deputy Inspector.*
 - *A log documenting the dates of hauling and the number of trips (i.e. trucks) per day shall be available on the job site at all times.*
 - *The applicant shall identify a construction manager and provide a telephone number for any inquiries or complaints from residents regarding construction activities. The telephone number shall be posted at the site readily visible to any interested party during site preparation, grading and construction.*
- *The Construction Parking Plan shall identify where all contractor, subcontractor, and laborers will park their vehicles so as to prevent blockage of two-way traffic on streets in the vicinity of the construction site.*
 - *During all phases of site development, all construction vehicle parking and queuing related to the project shall be in substantial compliance with the approved Construction Staging and Parking Plans, to the satisfaction of the Department of Building and Safety and the Department of Transportation.*

Mitigation Measure VIII-70 Emergency Evacuation Plan

Environmental impacts may result from project implementation due to possible interference with an emergency response plan. However, these potential impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level by the following measure:

- *Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall develop an emergency response plan in consultation with the Fire Department. The emergency response plan shall include but not be limited to the following: mapping of emergency exits, evacuation routes for vehicles and pedestrians, location of nearest hospitals, and fire departments.*

Mitigation Measure XVI-30 Transportation

- *The developer shall install appropriate traffic signs around the site to ensure pedestrian and vehicle safety.*
- *The applicant shall be limited to no more than two trucks at any given time within the site's staging area.*
- *There shall be no staging of hauling trucks on any streets adjacent to the project, unless specifically approved as a condition of an approved haul route.*
- *No hauling shall be done before 9 a.m. or after 3 p.m.*
- *Trucks shall be spaced so as to discourage a convoy effect.*
- *On substandard hillside streets, only one hauling truck shall be allowed on the street at any time.*
- *A minimum of two flag persons are required. One flag person is required at the entrance to the project site and one flag person at the next intersection along the haul route.*
- *Truck crossing signs are required within 300 feet of the exit of the project site in each direction.*
- *The owner or contractor shall keep the construction area sufficiently dampened to control dust caused by grading and hauling, and at all times shall provide reasonable control of dust caused by wind.*
- *Loads shall be secured by trimming and watering or may be covered to prevent the spilling or blowing of the earth material.*
- *Trucks and loads are to be cleaned at the export site to prevent blowing dirt and spilling of loose earth.*
- *No person shall perform grading within areas designated "hillside" unless a copy of the permit is in the possession of a responsible person and available at the site for display upon request.*
- *A log documenting the dates of hauling and the number of trips (i.e. trucks) per day shall be available on the job site at all times.*
- *The applicant shall identify a construction manager and provide a telephone number for any inquiries or complaints from residents regarding construction activities. The telephone number shall be posted at the site readily visible to any interested party during site preparation, grading and construction.*

Mitigation Measure XVI-40 Safety Hazards

Environmental impacts may result from project implementation due to hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses. However, the potential impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant level by the following measure:

- *The developer shall install appropriate traffic signs around the site to ensure pedestrian, bicycles, and vehicle safety.*
- *The applicant shall submit a parking and driveway plan that incorporates design features that reduce accidents, to the Bureau of Engineering and the Department of Transportation for approval.*

Mitigation Measure XVI-60 Inadequate Emergency Access (Hillside Streets – Construction Activities)

- *No parking shall be permitted on the street during Red Flag Days in compliance with the "Los Angeles Fire Department Red Flag No Parking" program.*
- *All demolition and construction materials shall be stored on-site and not within the public right-of-way during demolition, hauling, and construction operations.*

Mitigation Measure XVI-80 Pedestrian Safety

- *Applicant shall plan construction and construction staging as to maintain pedestrian access on adjacent sidewalks throughout all construction phases. This requires the applicant to maintain adequate and safe pedestrian protection, including physical separation (including utilization of barriers such as K-Rails or scaffolding, etc) from work space and vehicular traffic and overhead protection, due to sidewalk closure or blockage, at all times.*
- *Temporary pedestrian facilities shall be adjacent to the project site and provide safe, accessible routes that replicate as nearly as practical the most desirable characteristics of the existing facility.*
- *Covered walkways shall be provided where pedestrians are exposed to potential injury from falling objects.*
- *Applicant shall keep sidewalk open during construction until only when it is absolutely required to close or block sidewalk for construction staging. Sidewalk shall be reopened as soon as reasonably feasible taking construction and construction staging into account.*

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the adopted Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation authority (Metro) thresholds for a significant project impact would be exceeded. The Congestion Management Program (CMP) was adopted to regulate and monitor regional traffic growth and transportation improvement programs. The CMP designates a transportation network that includes all state highways and some arterials within the County of Los Angeles. The amount of trips the Project would generate is below the threshold needed for further evaluation. The Project will increase the number of daily trips for the site; however, as the Project includes construction of four (4) single-family homes, it is not anticipated to generate the 250 or more daily vehicle trips that would require a traffic study. Therefore, it is not expected to contribute significantly to any traffic congestion or affect any congestion management program. Impacts will be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project would substantially increase an existing hazardous design feature or introduce incompatible uses to the existing traffic pattern. The proposed Project would not include unusual or hazardous design features and the proposed Project is compatible with existing uses. The Project proposes a land use that complements the surrounding urban development and utilizes the existing roadway network. Access to on-site parking areas is provided through four (4) proposed driveways for each of the four (4) proposed single-family dwellings, all located on James Street. Additionally, any potential hazards are also addressed in the Project's Construction Traffic Management Plan stamped-approved June 24, 2020 (Appendix D) by LADOT. This plan includes safety measures such as construction barricades, signage, lighting, and fencing, that would reduce any potential hazards resulting from construction of the Project. Corresponding mitigation measures intended to address potential hazards would also be imposed, including **Mitigation Measure VIII-40: Hillside Construction Staging and Parking Plan; Mitigation Measure XVI-40: Safety Hazards; and Mitigation Measure XVI-80: Pedestrian Safety** (all described in Checklist Item XVII.a above). The Project will conform to the City's design standards and would provide adequate sight distance, sidewalks, and pedestrian movement controls meeting the City's requirements to protect pedestrian safety. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. A significant impact would occur if the Project impaired implementation of or physically interfered with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The Project would not require the closure of any public or private streets during construction or operation 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).

The closest disaster route is Figueroa Street; accessible via James Street and Amabel Street, approximately 0.18 miles from the Project site. The measures proposed in the Project's Construction Traffic Management Plan stamped-approved June 24, 2020 (Appendix D), including unobstructed emergency access, a project hotline for complaints and inquiries, and a Construction Liaison Officer tasked with responding to inquiries and concerns, will also ensure that all emergency access adjacent to the Project site remains free and unobstructed. Mitigation measures will be imposed corresponding to those proposed in the Construction Traffic Management Plan in order to reduce potential impacts relating to inadequate emergency access to less than significant levels. These mitigation measures include **Mitigation Measure VIII-40: Hillside Construction Staging and Parking Plan; Mitigation Measure VIII-70: Emergency Evacuation Plan; Mitigation Measure XVI-30 Transportation; and Mitigation Measure XVI-60 Inadequate Emergency Access (Hillside Streets – Construction Activities)**, all of which are detailed in Checklist Item XVII.a above. Therefore, the proposed Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and project impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Project would 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, which 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). 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 Project. The Tribe must respond in writing within 30 days of the City's AB 52 notice.

An informational letter was mailed to tribes on August 29, 2018, describing the Project and requesting any information regarding resources that may exist on or near the Project site. The City did not receive a response to request a consultation within 30 days of mailing. Therefore, the consultation period was closed on September 28, 2018. A "Note to File," which details the date the letter was sent, the 30-day period, and states that no request for consultation was received was added to the environmental case file upon closing of the consultation period.

While there are no known recorded archaeological sites within the Project site or surrounding area, buried resources could potentially be unearthed during Project activities. As such, the Proposed Project would be subject to the Department of City Planning's standard conditions of approval for addressing inadvertent finds. In the unlikely event any suspected archaeological or tribal cultural resources are discovered during surface grading or construction activities, standard operating procedures dictate that 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. Adherence to regulatory compliance measures would ensure that if any archaeological or tribal cultural resources are encountered during construction, impacts to such resources would remain less than significant.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) established a formal consultation process for California Native American Tribes to identify potential significant impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources, as defined in Public Resources Code §21074, as part of CEQA. As specified in AB 52, lead agencies must provide notice inviting consultation to California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed Project if the Tribe has submitted a request in writing to be notified of proposed projects. The Tribe must respond in writing within 30 days of the City's AB 52 notice. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) provided a list of Native American groups and individuals who might have knowledge of the religious and/or cultural significance of resources that may be in and near the Project site. In compliance with AB 52, the City provided notice to tribes soliciting requests for consultation on August 29, 2018. The City did not receive a response to request a consultation within 30 days of mailing. Therefore, the consultation period was closed on September 28, 2018. A "Note to File," which details the date the letter was sent, the 30-day period, and states that no

request for consultation was received was added to the environmental case file upon closing of the consultation period.

While there are no known recorded archaeological sites within the Project site or surrounding area, buried resources could potentially be unearthed during Project activities. As such, the Proposed Project would be subject to the Department of City Planning's standard conditions of approval for addressing inadvertent finds. In the unlikely event any suspected archaeological or tribal cultural resources are discovered during surface grading or construction activities, standard operating procedures dictate that 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. Adherence to regulatory compliance measures would ensure that if any archaeological or tribal cultural resources are encountered during construction, impacts to such resources would remain less than significant.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project would increase surface water runoff, resulting in the need for expanded off-site storm water drainage facilities. As discussed above, the City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control regulations (Ordinance No. 172,176 and No. 173,494) contain requirements for construction activities and operation of development and redevelopment projects to integrate low impact development practices and standards for stormwater and other related requirements in the City's Development BMPs Handbook. Such regulations and practices are designed in consideration of existing and planned stormwater drainage systems. Conformance would be ensured during the permitting process with the Department of Building & Safety. Therefore, surface water runoff

during construction activities and operation of the Project would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned drainage systems, and project impacts would be less than significant.

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

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. A significant impact would also 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. Wastewater from the subject property would enter into and be treated by the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP), which is a part of the Hyperion Treatment System, which includes the Tilman Water Reclamation Plant and the Los Angeles–Glendale Water Reclamation Plant. The wastewater generated by the Project would be typical of residential uses. As the HTP is in compliance with the State’s wastewater treatment requirements, the Project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Furthermore, as a proportion of total average daily flow experienced by the HTP, the wastewater generation of the proposed Project would account for a small percentage of average daily wastewater flow. This increase in wastewater flow would not jeopardize the HTP to operate within its established wastewater treatment requirements. Therefore, project impacts would be less than significant.

c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

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. A significant impact would also 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. Wastewater from the subject property would enter into and be treated by the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP), which is a part of the Hyperion Treatment System, which includes the Tilman Water Reclamation Plant and the Los Angeles–Glendale Water Reclamation Plant. The wastewater generated by the Project would be typical of residential uses. As the HTP is in compliance with the State’s wastewater treatment requirements, the Project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Furthermore, as a proportion of total average daily flow experienced by the HTP, the wastewater generation of the proposed Project would account for a small percentage of average daily wastewater flow. This increase in wastewater flow would not jeopardize the HTP to operate within its established wastewater treatment requirements. Therefore, project impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed Project's solid waste generation exceeded the capacity of permitted landfills. The 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 less than significant impact related to solid waste.

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

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 less than significant impact related to solid waste.

XX. WILDFIRE

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

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

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

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

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

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

No Impact. (Response to Checklist Questions XX.a through XX.d). As discussed above, in Response to Checklist Question IX.f, the Project would not cause an impediment along the City's designated disaster routes or impair the implementation of the City's emergency response plan. Impacts related to the implementation of the City's emergency response plan would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required. In addition, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.01(a), analysis of the impacts related to wildfire are related to the development of projects located on a site which is classified as state responsibility areas, as

defined in Section 4102, and on very high fire hazard severity zones, as defined in subdivision (i) of Section 51177 of the Government Code. While the Project is in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, the Project site is also located within an urbanized area of the Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan area and is not designated as state responsibility area as defined in Section 4102. The Project is also not located within a City-designated fire buffer zone. Furthermore, as discussed in Response to Checklist Question VII.a.iv, the Project site is not located in a landslide area as mapped by the state or the City of Los Angeles. As such, the Project would not substantially impair an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, would not expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or uncontrolled spread of a wildfire, would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk, or expose people or structure to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project area is not known to contain sensitive or special-status species or habitat. Moreover, the Project site has not been identified as being a Significant Ecological Area (LA County Significant Ecological Areas Program, 2020). The Project site does not contain riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community in the vicinity nor does it contain any wetlands.

Per the Arborist Reports dated February 16, 2018 and January 1, 7, and 8 2021, by Lisa Smith, Certified Master Arborist #WE3782 (Appendix C), the Project site contains 11 Protected Trees and will require the removal of five (5) Protected Trees on-site. Each tree will be replaced at a 4:1 ratio, totaling 20 replacement trees.

The Project site is not identified as a site or an area of historical significance. Therefore, it is unlikely that the proposed Project would have impacts on important examples of the major periods of California history. In addition, the Project site is not in the vicinity of an Archaeological Survey Area, Archaeological site, or Vertebrate Paleontological Area (LA City, 1996). Therefore, the proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the proposed Project, in conjunction with the related projects, would result in impacts that are less than significant when viewed separately but significant when viewed together. The following projects were or are filed with the Department of City Planning within the last 10 years and within a 500-foot radius:

PROJECTS WITHIN A 500-FOOT RADIUS OF THE SUBJECT SITE			
Address	Case Number	Date Filed	Scope of Work
448 West Beech Street	ZA-2016-952-ZAD-SPP	3/18/16	New single-family dwelling
535 West Vista Gloriosa Drive	ZA-2016-4936-ZAD-SPP	12/23/16	New single-family dwelling
321 West Isabel Street	DIR-2016-2261-SPP	6/7/16	New single-family dwelling
469 West Ulysses Street	ZA-2017-2788-ZAD-SPP	7/14/17	New single-family dwelling
446 West James Street	DIR-2017-3923-SPP	9/28/17	New single-family dwelling
454 West James Street	DIR-2017-4149-SPP	10/13/17	New single-family dwelling
446 West Vista Gloriosa Drive	DIR-2018-7335-SPP	12/12/18	New single-family dwelling

Table B-1: Projects Within a 500-Foot Radius of the Subject site

Per the table above, there were seven (7) other projects filed that included construction of a single-family dwelling. While there are multiple projects within the vicinity of the Project site, each project is subject to specific RCMs that, when considered cumulatively, reduce any potential impacts to less than significant. Additionally, all nearby active projects were proposed at different times over

a two-year period, resulting in staggered construction staging times and timelines. According to Navigate LA, there are also no other haul route applications that cross within 500 feet of the Project site. Although projects may be constructed in the project vicinity, the cumulative impacts to which the proposed Project would contribute would be less than significant.

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

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

5 PREPARERS AND PERSONS CONSULTED

Lead Agency

City of Los Angeles
Department of City Planning
200 North Spring Street, Room 621
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Dylan Lawrence, Planning Assistant

Project Applicant

David Haas
James Street Group, LLC
606 Monterey Pass Road, 2nd Floor
Monterey Park, CA 91754

Project Representative

Brittney Hummel
James Street Group, LLC
606 Monterey Pass Road, 2nd Floor
Monterey Park, CA 91754

APPENDIX A

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES REPORT

APPENDIX B

SOILS APPROVAL LETTER

APPENDIX C

TREE REPORTS

APPENDIX D

CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN

