

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
INITIAL STUDY
AND CHECKLIST

October 15, 2010

Environmental Setting and Project Description

The proposed project is located on an approximately 61.5-acre site in the Harbor-Gateway Community Plan area, and is bordered by Western Avenue (State Route 213) to the west, Fitness Drive and multiple-family residential developments to the south, the U.S. Navy's Defense Fuel Supply Point (DFSP) to the north, and the campus for Mary Star of the Sea High School (a private high school) to the east. Land uses to the west across Western Avenue include the Green Hills Memorial Park cemetery and single-family homes.

The project site is currently improved with 245 residential units, a community center, and a retail convenience facility that were constructed in approximately 1962 by the U.S. Navy for the purpose of housing personnel stationed at the Long Beach Naval Shipyard. The Navy housing facility (formerly known as San Pedro Housing) was closed in 1999. A firefighting training facility was also located on the southwest portion of the site, and was subsequently closed. As part of the project, existing improvements will be removed from the site.

The project proposes the development of a residential community comprised of 1,135 residential units featuring a combination of for-sale and for-rent single-family, duplex, townhome, and flat units. The Project's residential units will range in size from 600 to approximately 2,000 square feet, within buildings constructed over and/or adjacent to residential parking garages. Up to 392 of the 1,135 units may be rental units. Project access will be provided through two entrances from Western Avenue. A road to provide access from Western Avenue to Mary Star of the Sea High School will also be included in the project.

When completed, the proposed project will include approximately 9% landscaped common areas and parks (excluding roads). It will be lushly landscaped, and will provide pedestrian amenities such as walking paths, benches, fountains, water features, distinctive light poles and street signage. The project will incorporate large internal open space and recreational areas including an approximately 2.8-acre park, 1.3-acre community clubhouse and pool/recreation area and an approximately 0.7-acre open space and trail network. Additional recreational amenities will be distributed throughout the site.

The Project's residential units will be comprised of single-family, duplex, townhome, flat, and apartment units ranging in size from 600 to approximately 2,000 square feet, within buildings constructed over and/or adjacent to residential parking garages. Up to 392 of the 1,135 units may be rental units.

Entitlements necessary for the project include the following: (1) A General Plan amendment; (2) A Zone Change and Specific Plan are proposed to provide zoning, architectural, landscape and streetscape standards to guide the project's development (at residential densities ranging from 11 units per acre to approximately 34 units per acre, the project will fall within the City of Los Angeles' Low-Medium I, Low-Medium II and Medium General Plan Land Use Designations; by way of comparison, the City of Los Angeles' medium-density multiple family residential zoning category, "R3", permits approximately 54 units per acre, while the City's lower density multi-family residential category, "RU 1.5", permits approximately 28 units per acre); and (3) A Vesting Tentative Tract Map. The project is anticipated to be completed within seven years of the time construction is commenced.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by the proposed project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages. As noted in this Initial Study, all “Potentially Significant Impacts” will be examined in further detail in the EIR.

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

Environmental Checklist and Analysis

1. Aesthetics. Would the project:

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	✓		
			✓
			✓
	✓		

Discussion:

- a) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** Viewshed impacts are typically characterized by the loss and/or obstruction of existing scenic vistas or other major views in the area of a site which are available to the general public. Within the San Pedro area, the most significant visual resource is the Pacific Ocean. However, the Pacific Ocean is located over three miles from the project site, and vistas of the ocean are accordingly limited by distance, the horizon, and intervening topographical features. The vast majority of views from and across the project site towards the coast (to the southeast) are characterized by manmade features typical of an urban industrial environment (e.g., storage tanks, refineries, industrial facilities, harbor infrastructure, cranes, freeways, bridges, roads, etc.), which generally are not considered scenic vistas.

The elevation of the project site ranges from approximately 101 to 249 feet above mean sea level (msl), sloping downward to the southeast. As one travels southbound on Western Avenue from the higher ground north of the project site, views towards the harbor area become available across open space portions of the Naval Fuel Supply Depot, which is anticipated to remain. As one approaches the project site, Western Avenue drops. Generally, views towards the harbor area from Western Avenue across the project site are obstructed due to topography, existing dilapidated buildings, vegetation, and fencing, except at the very northerly upper elevations of the property. Intermittent views are principally characterized by storage tanks, industrial (refinery) infrastructure, and distant views of harbor cranes and the Vincent Thomas Bridge. Views toward the harbor area across the southern portion of the project site from Western Avenue are generally not available due to topography, adjacent development, and existing vegetation.

The project would change the visual character of the property's frontage along Western Avenue by replacing existing one story buildings, overgrown landscaping, and fences with new entrances, landscaping, and residential buildings, as well as an approximately 2.8-acre park area. Intermittent views towards the harbor area along Western Avenue will continue to be available in the project area. However, the presence of the project on the site could potentially have an adverse effect on currently available scenic vistas from other public vantage points in the site's vicinity. For this reason, impacts related to scenic vistas will be evaluated in the EIR for the project.

- b) **No Impact.** The project site is not located within the view corridor of a city-designated scenic highway.¹ Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural features within a city-designated scenic highway. No further analysis of this issue is required.
- c) **No Impact.** The project site and surrounding area are characterized by both currently- and formerly-occupied residential uses, commercial uses, industrial uses, and institutional facilities (e.g., cemetery, DFSP). Views of the project site are limited because of topography, existing dilapidated buildings, vegetation, and fencing and barbed wire. Remnants of the site's past use as housing for the U.S. Navy are strewn throughout the project site. A baseball diamond overgrown with weeds and grass is located in the southwestern corner of the site, the remainder of which is largely open space. Vegetation typical of disturbed urban areas is present throughout the project site, such as ornamental trees and annual, non-native grasses. Overall, the visual condition of the project site is considered to be unpleasant. The project will change and upgrade the visual character of the property's frontage along Western Avenue by replacing existing dilapidated one-story buildings, overgrown landscaping, and fences with new entrances, landscaping, and residential buildings, as well as an approximately 2.8-acre park area. Given the unpleasant visual and aesthetic characteristics of the site in its existing state, the project is not expected to introduce any features that would substantially degrade the visual character of the site or its surroundings. Thus, no further analysis of this issue is necessary.
- d) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** The project site is located in an urban area with an ambient light environment that is typified by artificial lighting. The project site was used as a residential community and contains buildings and street lighting, but has been closed for several years. Implementation of the proposed project would introduce new sources of light, including multi-story buildings with interior and exterior building lighting, low-level security/courtesy lighting for parking areas, street lighting, vehicle headlights, reflective surfaces such as windows and light-colored paint, and other nighttime lighting. Given these new sources of light to be included within the project, the presence of the project on the site could potentially have an adverse effect with respect to light and glare. For this reason, impacts related to light and glare will be evaluated in the EIR for the project.

¹ CALTRANS, *California Scenic Highway Program*, website: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwyl.html>, map dated April 8, 2005.

2. **Agricultural & 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 Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.				✓
b.				✓
c.				✓
d.				✓
e.				✓

Discussion:

- a) **No Impact.** The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) designates the project site as “Out of Survey Area.”² However, there is no agricultural land located on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not convert any agricultural land to non-agricultural use, and no further analysis of this issue is required.
- b) **No Impact.** The project site is zoned R1-1XL (One-Family, Extra Limited Height District 1). Additionally, the project site is located in the County of Los Angeles, which currently does not participate

² California Division of Land Resource Protection, *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Overview*, website: http://www.consrv.ca.gov/dlrp/FMMP/overview/survey_area_map.htm, map dated November 23, 2004.

in the Williamson Act. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act Contract, and no further analysis of this issue is required.

- c) **No Impact.** No forest land or timberland is located on or in proximity to the project site. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production and no further analysis of this issue is required.
- d) **No Impact.** No forest land is located on or in proximity to the project site. Therefore, the project would not result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use, and no further analysis of this issue is required.
- e) **No Impact.** No agricultural or forest land uses are located on or in proximity to the project site. Therefore, the project would not result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use, and no further analysis of this issue is required.

3. **Air Quality.** The significance criteria established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan or Congestion Management Plan?
- b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
- c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the air basin is non-attainment (ozone, carbon monoxide, & PM 10) under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?
- d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	✓			
b.	✓			
c.	✓			
d.	✓			
e.			✓	

Discussion:

- a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s (SCAQMD) 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The air quality goals and policies identified in the AQMP are based on land use projections from local general plans and population growth projections; thus, projects that are consistent with local general plans are considered consistent with the AQMP. The project proposes a General Plan amendment. Accordingly, the EIR will address the potential for the proposed project to result in significant impacts related to conflicting with or obstructing implementation of the AQMP.
- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Short-term construction activities and traffic from long-term operation of the proposed project could result in the generation of criteria pollutant emissions that exceed thresholds established by SCAQMD. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the proposed project to result in

significant impacts related to violation of air quality standards or substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation.

- c) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The South Coast Air Basin is currently in non-attainment for ozone (O₃) and particulate matter 10 (PM₁₀). The emissions associated with short-term construction and/or long-term operation of the proposed project could contribute to cumulative air quality impacts related to these criteria pollutants. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the proposed project to contribute to a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment.

- d) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Certain land uses are generally considered to be more sensitive to air emissions than others. The SCAQMD defines typical sensitive receptors as residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, athletic facilities, long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, and retirement homes. Sensitive receptors within 500 feet of the project site include:
 - Mary of the Sea High School, located adjacent to the eastern border of the project site
 - Multiple-family residences located south of the project site
 - Single-family residences located west of the project site

The proposed project itself would also be considered a sensitive receptor. Sensitive receptors could be exposed to criteria pollutant emissions in excess of SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the proposed project to result in significant impacts related to exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations generated by both the proposed project and by certain adjacent land uses.

- e) **Less than Significant Impact.** According to the SCAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* (Figure 5-5), land uses associated with odor complaints include: agricultural facilities (farming and livestock), wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting facilities, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding facilities. The proposed project does not include any of these uses and would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. Therefore, project impacts related to odors would be less than significant, and no further analysis of this issue is required.

4. **Biological Resources.** Would the project::

- a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	✓			
b.	✓			

c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	✓			
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				✓
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?				✓
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				✓

Discussion:

- a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site has been previously disturbed and is located in a developed, urban environment. Along the northwest edge of the site, there is a previously graded area containing grassland patches. Although marginal in character as potential habitat, it is possible that the California Gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica*), and the Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly (*Glaucopsyche lygdamus palosverdesensis*) could be found in this area. In the southern portion of the project site, a drainage ditch enters the site from a subterranean culvert under Western Avenue and flows southeasterly until it exits the site through a subterranean culvert near the southern boundary of the site. The drainage ditch is lined on its northern side with concrete, and on its southern side with deteriorated asphalt. Although not identified as being present on site, the Least Bell’s Vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*) has been found on the Palos Verdes peninsula. Thus far, biological surveys conducted on the project site have not detected the presence of any of the abovementioned species. These issues will be further studied in the EIR.

- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The majority of the project site is occupied by abandoned homes, and does not support riparian habitat. In the southern portion of the project site, a drainage ditch enters the site from a subterranean culvert under Western Avenue and flows southeasterly until it exits the site through a subterranean culvert near the southern boundary of the site. The drainage ditch is lined on its northern side with concrete, and on its southern side with deteriorated asphalt. The drainage ditch is the remnant of a historical stream that was substantially modified between 1956 and 1965, during which time it was concretized, widened, and realigned. The drainage ditch is currently in a neglected and dilapidated state. Due to this neglect, a tree canopy has developed, which is believed to be less than 30 years old. Trees that line the drainage ditch include the California Fan Palm (*Washingtonia filifera*), a native of the desert areas of Southern California; Shamel Ash (*Fraxinus uhdei*), a non-native, invasive species; and Arroyo Willow (*Salix lasiolepis*), a native riparian species. The Arroyo Willow population is not considered indicative of a sensitive riparian habitat because the man-made drainage ditch has been substantially invaded by Shamel Ash and remains in a disturbed, fragmented condition. The channel does not contain any sensitive plant communities. However, the potential for the project to significantly impact these resources exists. Thus, this issue will be further studied in the EIR.

- c) **Potentially Significant Impact.** As discussed in Checklist Question 4(b), a drainage ditch is located on the project site. Although the drainage ditch is a manmade flood control area, the potential exists for jurisdictional waters to be present within this corridor area. Therefore, this issue will be further discussed in the EIR.
- d) **No Impact.** The previously disturbed project site contains no on-site waterways capable of supporting a migratory fish or wildlife species. The project site is located in an urbanized area and is completely surrounded by industrial and residential development. As such, it is highly unlikely that the site is part of a movement corridor or habitat linkage system. Therefore, development of the proposed project would not interfere substantially with the movement of a native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. The closest native wildlife nursery to the project site is located in the DFSP to the north, where coastal sage scrub habitat has been restored for the Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly (*Glaucopsyche lygdamus palosverdesensis*) (see Checklist Question 4(a)). The proposed project would not impede the use of this site. Therefore, no impact would occur and no further analysis is required.
- e) **No Impact.** Tree preservation ordinances in the City of Los Angeles are limited to the Native Tree Preservation Ordinance (Ordinance No. 177,404), adopted by the City on April 23, 2006. There are no trees protected by the ordinance located on the project site. Thus, the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, and no further study is required.
- f) **No Impact.** The previously disturbed project site is zoned for residential use and is not located within an area designated as an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved habitat conservation plan. Therefore, no impact would occur to adopted conservation plans and no further discussion is required.

5. **Cultural Resources.** Would the project:

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	✓			
b.	✓			
c.	✓			
d.			✓	

Discussion:

- a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** A historical resources records search for the project site will be conducted by the South Central Coastal Information Center. The search will include reviews of the California Points of Historical Interest (PHI), California Historical Landmarks (CHL), California Register of Historic Places (CR), National Register of Historic Places (NR), California State Historic Resources Inventory (HRI), and City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments listings. The results of this records search and an analysis of the eligibility of existing structures on-site for historical designation will be presented in the project EIR.

- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** An archaeological resources records search for the project site will be conducted by the South Central Coastal Information Center. The search will include reviews of all recorded archaeological sites within a 1/2-mile radius of the project site, as well as a review of cultural resource reports on file. The project site has been extensively altered by grading and building construction, including the construction of the Navy Housing project over most of the site, the cutting of slopes throughout the site, the placement of fill over most of the site, the construction and removal of the former Navy firefighting school on the southern portion of the site, the installation of utilities and roads, and the construction of the existing baseball field on the southern portion. The results of the updated archaeological resources records search will be presented and evaluated in the project EIR.
- c) **Potentially Significant Impact.** A paleontological resources records search for the project site will be conducted. As discussed above, the project site has been extensively altered by previous grading, cutting and filling, and construction. While no significant impacts are anticipated, the results of the updated paleontological resources records search will be evaluated in the project EIR.

Lastly, there are no unique geological features on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature, and no impact would occur. Further evaluation of this issue is not required.

- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project site is not occupied by a cemetery, and has not been identified as the site of any archeological resources. In addition, the site has been subjected to substantial previous alteration including grading, cutting and filling, and the construction of improvements. Accordingly, it is not anticipated that human remains would be encountered during the construction phase of the proposed project. While no significant impacts are anticipated, the EIR will review this potential impact and prescribe appropriate mitigation.

6. **Geology & Soils.** Would the project:

- a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
 - ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 - iv. Landslides?
- b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
✓			
	✓		
	✓		
	✓		
		✓	

c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	✓		
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	✓		
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			✓

Discussion:

- a.i) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone.³ However, some degree of uncertainty exists over the location of the Palos Verdes Fault trace with respect to the project site. Therefore, analysis of this issue is required in the project EIR.
- a.ii) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** The project site is located in the Southern California region, which is a seismically-active area. Thus, the project site could experience strong ground shaking during a seismic event. Pursuant to existing law and applicable regulations, design and construction of the proposed project will be required to incorporate measures to ensure state-of-the-art seismic protection. These measures include compliance with the City of Los Angeles Uniform Building Code (UBC), the City’s building permit requirements, and site-specific engineering recommendations based upon the recommendations of a licensed geotechnical engineer and a geotechnical report approved by the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety. A preliminary geotechnical report and seismicity study has been prepared and will be presented and evaluated in the project EIR.
- a.iii) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** Liquefaction is the process in which loose granular soils below the groundwater table temporarily lose strength during strong ground shaking as a consequence of increased pore pressure and subsequently reduced effective stress. Significant factors that affect liquefaction include groundwater level, soil type, particle size and gradation, relative density, confining pressure, and intensity and duration of shaking. The south portion of the project site is identified on planning maps as within an area that is susceptible to liquefaction.⁴ A preliminary geotechnical report has been prepared and will be presented and evaluated with respect to this issue in the project EIR.
- a.iv) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** The project site is characterized by hillside terrain and is located within a Slope Stability Study Area as defined in the Seismic Safety Plan for the City of Los Angeles. Although the project site is relatively gentle in slope, it is identified on planning maps as within a potential landslide area.⁵ A preliminary geotechnical report has been prepared and will be presented and evaluated with respect to this issue in the project EIR.

³ *Environmental and Public Facilities Maps, Map No. 33: Alquist-Priolo Special Study Areas, Los Angeles City Planning Department, 1996, and City of Los Angeles Zoning Information and Map Access System (ZIMAS), website: <http://zimas.lacity.org/>, September 21, 2010.*

⁴ *Environmental and Public Facilities Maps, Map No. 32: Areas Susceptible to Liquefaction, Los Angeles City Planning Department, 1996, and City of Los Angeles Zoning Information and Map Access System (ZIMAS), website: <http://zimas.lacity.org/>, September 21, 2010.*

⁵ *City of Los Angeles Zoning Information and Map Access System (ZIMAS), website: <http://zimas.lacity.org/>, September 21, 2010.*

- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would increase the amount of impervious area on the project site by potentially introducing more impervious area as compared to existing conditions. The existing drainage pattern of the site may be altered by changing the direction, rate, and amount of surface runoff. However, all stormwater would be directed to onsite drainage infrastructure and then to the existing local stormdrain system. Drainage would be directed to the local storm drainage system and would not encounter unpaved or unprotected surfaces, thereby avoiding the potential for substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. (For potential stormdrain capacity impacts, see Checklist Questions 8(d) and 8(e)). Therefore, project impacts related to this issue would be less than significant, and no further analysis of this issue is required.
- c) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** Pursuant to existing law and applicable regulations, design and construction of the proposed project will be required to incorporate measures to protect against geologic instability risks. These measures include compliance with the City of Los Angeles Uniform Building Code (UBC), the City’s building permit requirements, and site-specific engineering recommendations based upon the recommendations of a licensed geotechnical engineer and a geotechnical report approved licensed geotechnical engineer approved by the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety. A preliminary geotechnical report has been prepared and will be presented and evaluated with respect to this issue in the project EIR.
- d) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** See Checklist Question 6(c).
- e) **No Impact.** The project site is located in a developed area of the City of Los Angeles that is served by a municipal wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment system. No septic tanks are proposed. Therefore, no further discussion of this issue is required.

7. **Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** Would the project:

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	✓			
b.	✓			

- a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Short-term construction activities and traffic from long-term operation of the proposed project could result in the generation of both indirect and direct greenhouse gas emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the proposed project to result in significant impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions.
- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project could conflict with the policies within applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the proposed project to conflict with such plans, policies, or regulations.

8. **Hazards & Hazardous Materials.** Would the project:

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			✓
✓			
			✓
✓			
			✓
			✓
			✓
			✓

Discussion:

- a) **No Impact.** The proposed project includes the development of residential and recreational uses. The types of hazardous materials associated with routine, day-to-day operation of the proposed project would include landscaping chemicals that would be used in quantities typical for landscaped residential developments and typical cleaning solvents used for janitorial purposes. The transport, use, and disposal of these materials would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, significant impacts related to hazardous materials would not occur, and no further analysis of this issue is required.
- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Remediation investigation activities were conducted by the U.S. Navy on the southwestern portion of the project site at the former location of the fire fighter training facility.

Contaminants found in this location and at other areas of concern on the project site have been remediated, and former underground and aboveground storage tanks (USTs and ASTs) in this area have been removed. Recent groundwater tests indicate the subsurface contamination is not present. Due to these past remediation efforts, the risk of upset of subsurface contaminants within the project site boundaries is considered to be less than significant.

The project site is located adjacent to the Defense Fuel Supply Point (DFSP). The EIR will evaluate potential risk of upset associated with this facility to future project residents.

Evidence of hydrocarbon impacted soil was found at the project site. The type of contamination is not considered toxic, and can be easily removed and easily remediated, and thus does not pose an environmental threat. However, this issue will be evaluated in the project EIR.

In addition, a substantial amount of lead-based paint associated with the existing unoccupied residential buildings exists on the project site. These structures are also known to contain nonfriable asbestos containing materials (ACMs). If not properly removed and/or managed, construction workers and future residents at the project site could be exposed to these known sources of contamination. Prior to demolition of the existing structures, ACMs will be abated in compliance with the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 1403 as well as all other State and federal rules and regulations. Construction workers will be properly trained in lead-related construction in order to avoid exposure of such workers to lead containing material. These actions would prevent adverse environmental impacts related to these contaminants from occurring.

The project site is located within a City of Los Angeles Methane Buffer Zone.⁶ The City of Los Angeles has adopted the City of Los Angeles Methane Ordinance (No. 175,790; 2004), which requires compliance with the Methane Mitigation Standards in LAMC section 91.7102, and as directed and approved by the Department of Building and Safety (DBS) and Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD). If an applicant does not wish to comply with the standard mitigation measures required, the Methane Ordinance permits the building applicant to submit a detailed plan that demonstrates adequate protection against flammable gas incursion by providing the installation of suitable methane mitigation systems, if warranted, based on further site specific subsurface investigations. The project applicant will comply with the standard mitigation measures set forth in LAMC Section 91.7102. Compliance with such mandatory requirements will assure that potential risks from methane leaks would be mitigated with a less than significant level.

- c) **No Impact.** The Mary Star of the Sea High School is located within one-quarter mile of the project site. However, as discussed above in Checklist Question 7(a), the proposed project would not involve routine handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Therefore, no impact would occur and further investigation is not warranted.
- d) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project site is not included on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.⁷ However, a portion of the site was identified by its former owner, the U.S. Navy, as Installation Restoration Program Site 5, OU 2. This area is the location of the former fire fighters' training facility in the southwestern portion of the site. Investigation, tank removal, and remediation activities in this area were performed and completed by the

⁶ City of Los Angeles Zoning Information and Map Access System (ZIMAS), website: <http://zimas.lacity.org/>, September 21, 2010.

⁷ California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites, <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>, September 21, 2010.

U.S. Navy prior to the transfer of site ownership to the project applicant. However, this issue will be evaluated in the Draft EIR.

- e) **No Impact.** The project site is not within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.⁸ Therefore, the project would not expose persons to a safety hazard related to airports. No further analysis of this issue is required.
- f) **No Impact.** The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard associated with a private airstrip. No further analysis of this issue is required.
- g) **No Impact.** Because the project site is currently developed and the proposed project would not expand the development footprint on the site, the proposed project would not be expected to impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Furthermore, the proposed project would provide road access from Western Avenue for Mary Star of the Sea High School, which will improve emergency access to the school. Thus, no further analysis of this issue is required. (For potential impacts associated with additional area traffic, see Checklist Section 15).
- h) **No Impact.** The project site is located in an urbanized portion of the City of Los Angeles that does not include wildlands or high fire hazard terrain or vegetation. Furthermore, the project site does not lie within an identified fire hazard zone.⁹ Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss associated with wildland fires. Thus, no further discussion of this issue is required.

9. **Hydrology & Water Quality.** Would the project:

- a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?
- b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?
- c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?
- d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or off-site?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	✓		
		✓	
		✓	
	✓		

⁸ Rand McNally, *Thomas Guide Digital Edition 2009/10, State of California.*

⁹ City of Los Angeles Zoning Information and Map Access System (ZIMAS), website: <http://zimas.lacity.org/>, September 21, 2010, and Environmental and Public Facilities Maps, Map No. 13: Selected Wildfire Hazard Areas, Los Angeles City Planning Department, 1996.

e.	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	✓		
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		✓	
g.	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			✓
h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			✓
i.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	✓		
j.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			✓

Discussion:

a) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** Implementation of the proposed project could affect the quality of runoff from the project site. During construction, sediment is typically the constituent of greatest potential concern. The greatest risk of soil erosion during the construction phase occurs when site disturbance peaks due to grading activity and removal and re-compaction or replacement of fill areas. (Sediment is not typically a constituent of concern during the long-term operation of developments similar to the proposed project because sites are usually paved, and proper drainage infrastructure has been installed.) Other pollutants that could affect surface water quality during the project construction phase include petroleum products (gasoline, diesel, kerosene, oil and grease), hydrocarbons from asphalt paving, paints and solvents, detergents, fertilizers, and pesticides (insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, rodenticides).

Once the project has been constructed, urban runoff might include all of the above contaminants, as well as trace metals from pavement runoff, nutrients and bacteria from pet wastes, and landscape maintenance debris. Runoff may be mobilized in wet-season storm conditions from roadway areas, parking areas, and landscaping, and in dry-season “nuisance flows” from landscape irrigation. Liquid product spills occurring at the project site could also enter the storm drain system. Dry product spills could enter the storm drain via runoff in wet weather conditions or dry-season “nuisance flows.”

Applicable laws and regulations require that, prior to obtaining a grading permit, the project applicant would be required to submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), in accordance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity. The SWPPP would detail the treatment measures and BMPs to control pollutants and an erosion control plan that outlines erosion and sediment control measures that would be implemented during the construction and post-construction phases of project development. In addition, the SWPPP would include construction-phase housekeeping measures for control of contaminants such as petroleum products, paints and solvents, detergents, fertilizers, and pesticides. It would also describe the post-construction BMPs used to reduce pollutant loadings in runoff and percolate site runoff once the site is occupied (e.g., grassy swales, wet ponds, and educational materials) and would set forth the

BMP monitoring and maintenance schedule and responsible entities during the construction and post-construction phases.

In addition, the project would be required to comply with the City of Los Angeles' Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit and related Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements. These requirements include the implementation of measures to conserve natural areas, minimize stormwater pollutants of concern, protect slopes and channels, provide storm drain stenciling and signage, properly design outdoor material storage areas, properly design trash storage areas, provide proof of ongoing BMP maintenance, mimic pre-development peak stormwater discharge rates, and install post-construction volume-based or flow-based treatment BMPs to filter, treat, or infiltrate stormwater runoff in accordance with specific design standards.

The following list of BMPs is recognized by the City of Los Angeles as being effective in controlling pollutants, sedimentation, and erosion caused by stormwater runoff: vegetated swales, infiltration basin/trenches, oil/water separators, catch basin inserts, foundation planting, bioretention, continuous flow deflection units, permeable pavement, and direction of rooftop runoff to pervious areas (yards, vegetated areas). These and other BMPs on the City's list will be evaluated for applicability to the proposed project and will form the basis for project compliance with the SUSMP requirements. The RWQCB would enforce compliance with the regulatory requirements of the MS4 Permit. Through compliance with both the construction SWPPP and the MS4 Permit/SUSMP requirements, project impacts related to water quality would be expected to be reduced to a less than significant level. However, additional analysis of this issue will be included in the project EIR.

- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project site is currently largely developed and, as such, contains impervious surfaces which convey runoff to the local stormwater drainage system. However, the proposed project may increase the amount of impervious surface on the site. This would increase the percentage of runoff that would be directed to onsite drainage infrastructure and then to the existing local stormdrain system rather than infiltrating to the local groundwater aquifer. However, the project would contain large areas of permeable surfaces and the magnitude of this impact in the context of regional groundwater recharge is expected to be minimal and without potential to substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Thus, project impacts related to groundwater would be less than significant and no further analysis of this issue is required.
- c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project site is currently largely developed and, as such, contains impervious surfaces which convey runoff to the local stormwater drainage system. However, the proposed project may increase the amount of impervious surface on the site as well as the amount of runoff that would be directed to onsite drainage infrastructure and then to the existing local stormdrain system. The project would contain large areas of permeable surfaces. However, since the portion of site drainage that is not infiltrated or otherwise directed to pervious areas would be directed to an impervious drainage system and would not encounter unpaved or unprotected surfaces, the alteration of the existing drainage pattern would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Therefore, project impacts related to this issue would be less than significant, and no further analysis of this issue is required.
- d) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** The project site is currently largely developed and, as such, contains impervious surfaces which convey runoff to the local stormwater drainage system. The proposed project may increase the amount of impervious surface on the site. Stormwater falling on previously impervious surfaces would instead either be directed to pervious areas on the redeveloped site (yards, vegetated swales) for infiltration or would be directed to onsite drainage infrastructure and then to the existing local stormdrain system. This would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site by changing

the direction, rate, and amount of surface runoff. The incremental change in runoff quantity and flow has not yet been calculated, although the project will contain large areas of permeable surfaces, and the precise plan for drainage has not been determined. Whether existing storm drain capacity structure is adequate to serve the site, and potential required improvements, if any, has not yet been determined. The EIR will include a storm drain capacity study and identify the need for improvements and impacts, if any. Potential effects, if any, are anticipated to be less than significant with appropriate mitigation.

- e) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** With respect to polluted runoff, see Checklist Question 8(a). With respect to the project's potential to exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, as discussed above in Checklist Question 8(d), the proposed project would likely change the direction, rate, and amount of surface runoff from the project site by introducing a greater amount of impervious surface area to the site. Whether this alteration of the existing drainage pattern would cause runoff from the project site to exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems is unknown at this time. Therefore, the EIR will include a storm drain capacity study which will analyze the potential for the project to exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems.
- f) **Less than Significant Impact.** See Checklist Question 8(a), above.
- g) **No Impact.** The project site is not located within a 100-year or 500-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.¹⁰ Therefore, the project would not place housing within a 100-year or 500-year flood hazard area, and no further discussion of this issue is required.
- h) **No Impact.** See Checklist Question 8(g), above.
- i) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** Although no dams or levees are located on or in proximity to the project site, the Palos Verdes Reservoir is located approximately one mile northwest and up-gradient of the project site. Additionally, the drainage channel crossing the southerly portion of the site has been designated as a potential floodway for passing reservoir overflows downstream to the City of Los Angeles' stormdrain system. An engineering analysis of the capacity of this drainage and the associated stormdrain infrastructure both upstream and downstream of the project site has not yet been conducted. Therefore, the EIR will include an assessment of the degree to which the Palos Verdes Reservoir poses a threat to people or structures on the project site.
- j) **No Impact.** Seiches are standing waves created by seismically induced ground shaking (or volcanic eruptions or explosions) that occur in large, freestanding bodies of water. A tsunami is a series of waves that are caused by earthquakes that occur on the seafloor or in coastal areas. The project site is approximately 3 miles from the Pacific Ocean but is situated at an elevation of at least 100 feet above mean sea level and therefore would not be subject to inundation by seiche or tsunami. Furthermore, the project site is not located within an identified inundation or tsunami hazard area.¹¹ The project area is moderately sloping and does not contain any steep hillside terrain; therefore, there is no potential for the project site to be inundated by a mudflow. Thus, no further discussion of this issue is required.

¹⁰ FEMA, *Flood Insurance Rate Maps*, website: <http://msc.fema.gov/> September 21, 2010, and *Environmental and Public Facilities Maps, Map No. 35: 100 Year & 500 Year Flood Plans, Los Angeles City Planning Department, 1996.*

¹¹ *Environmental and Public Facilities Maps, Map No. 34: Inundation & Tsunami Hazard Areas, Los Angeles City Planning Department, 1996.*

10. Land Use and Planning. Would the project:

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			✓
	✓		
			✓

Discussion:

- a) **No Impact.** The project site contains an abandoned residential community that is no longer in use and is surrounded by areas that are developed with urban land uses, including industrial, commercial, and residential uses. The U.S. Navy has required that all existing residential improvements be removed from the site. The U.S. Navy property to the north is a separated facility that is not tied into other adjacent land uses in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project would include the development of residential uses on a lot that is designated for development and would not create a physical barrier within the community or otherwise divide contiguous land uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community, and no further discussion is necessary.
- b) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** As discussed initially, prior to 1980, the project site was located within the unincorporated area of the County of Los Angeles. It was annexed to the City of Los Angeles in 1980 (Ord. 154-525). When it was annexed by the City of Los Angeles, it was designated “Low Residential” under the City of Los Angeles’ Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan, and zoned “R1-1XL” (Single-Family; Height limited to 2-stories/30 feet). These designations basically reflected the use of the site of the time and the improvements then in place, and were not adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects.

In 1999, when the housing complex was closed, the Navy in conjunction with the City of Los Angeles processed a reuse plan for the project site, which was approved by the City Council in July 1999. It provided for the development of 200,000 square feet of biomedical research facilities, the refurbishment of 144 residential units, road access to Western Avenue to serve Mary Star of the Sea High School (a private high school east of the project site), and a transitional housing complex for homeless persons. The reuse plan would have required General Plan and zoning changes to be implemented, as well as environmental review, but the plan never went forward.

The project proposes a General Plan amendment and Specific Plan to address development criteria, landscaping, and streetscaping requirements. All streets within the project will continue to be private streets. The density of the project is approximately 18 units per acre. Approximately 9% of the project will be landscaped common area and parks. By way of comparison, the City’s medium-density multiple family residential zoning category, “R3”, permits approximately 54 units per acre, while the City’s lower-density multi-family residential category, “RD1.5”, permits approximately 28 units per acre. Multiple-family housing is not a new area use and is found throughout the area. For example, the project site is located directly adjacent to two multiple-family housing complexes located along Fitness Road that are developed

at densities of approximately 72 dwelling units per acre and 49 dwelling units per acre (respectively), as well as “The Gardens”, which is a multiple-family community zoned RD2.

The adoption of the proposed General Plan amendment and Specific Plan would eliminate conflicts between the existing General Plan and zoning designation and the proposed project. Relevant potential environmental impacts resulting from the project will be addressed in other sections of the EIR as discussed in this Initial Study. While the project is not anticipated to result in significant land use conflicts, potential land use impacts will be addressed in the EIR.

- c) **No Impact.** There are no habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans in effect for the previously disturbed project site. Therefore, no impact would occur, and further discussion of this issue is not necessary.

11. **Mineral Resources.** Would the project:

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			✓
			✓

Discussion:

- a) **No Impact.** The project site is not known to be the likely source for any mineral resources of value to the region, residents, or the state.¹² Furthermore, as the site is currently developed, the proposed project would not alter its status with respect to the availability of mineral resources. Thus, no impact would occur and no further discussion of the issue is required.
- b) **No Impact.** The project site is not located within a locally-important mineral resource recovery area delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.¹³ Thus, no impact would occur and no further discussion of the issue is required.

¹² *Environmental and Public Facilities Maps (Map No. 28: Areas Containing Significant Mineral Deposits, Map No. 29: Oil Field & Oil Drilling Areas, and Map No. 30: Oil Drilling & Surface Mining Zoning), Los Angeles City Planning Department, 1996.*

¹³ *Ibid.*

12. **Noise.** Would the project result in:

- a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
- c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?
- f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
✓			
✓			
✓			
✓			
			✓
			✓

Discussion:

- a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Due to the existing lack of activity on the project site, implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in ambient noise levels during both construction and long-term operation. The EIR will address the potential for the proposed project to expose people to excessive noise levels in excess of those established in the City’s General Plan and/or Noise Ordinance, although it is not anticipated that the project will have a significant construction noise impact because it will incorporate all available noise attenuating technology (e.g., mufflers, shields, etc.) in order to reduce construction noise levels to the maximum extent feasible per Section 112.05 of the City’s Noise Ordinance.
- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed project would include the use of typical construction equipment such as jackhammers, pneumatic tools, saws, and hammers, all of which would generate some groundborne vibration and groundborne noise during certain phases such as demolition and grading. Therefore, this issue will be further analyzed in the EIR. However, it is not anticipated that the project will have a significant construction noise impact because it will incorporate all available noise attenuating technology (e.g., mufflers, shields, etc.) in order to reduce construction noise levels to the maximum extent feasible per Section 112.05 of the City’s Noise Ordinance.
- c) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Long-term operation of the proposed project would result in an increase in ambient noise levels, mainly due to project-related traffic. The City of Los Angeles’ General Plan provides standards for acceptable ambient noise levels in residential areas such as the project site and the vicinity. The potential for the project to result in a permanent adverse ambient noise impacts will be addressed in the EIR.

- d) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Noise generated during the proposed project’s construction phase could, on a temporary basis, substantially increase noise levels at nearby land uses. Therefore, the EIR will address the proposed project’s potential to create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.
- e) **No Impact.** As discussed above in Checklist Question 7(e), the project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose persons to excessive noise levels associated with a public airport or public use airport. No further analysis of this issue is required.
- f) **No Impact.** As discussed above in Checklist Question 7(f) above, the project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose persons to excessive noise levels associated with a private airstrip. No further analysis of this issue is required.

13. **Population and Housing.** Would the project:

- a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
- b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- c. Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
✓			
			✓
			✓

Discussion:

- a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would induce direct population growth by adding 1,135 residential units to the project site. Compared to the most recent use of the site, in which 245 residential units and approximately 880 residents occupied the property (based on Community Plan demographic estimates), the proposed project would represent a net increase of 890 units. Therefore, the potential for the project to induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly, will be addressed in the EIR.
- b) **No Impact.** The former military housing on the site is required to be demolished by the U.S. Navy. The project proposes a low-medium density (between Low Medium I, Low Medium II, and Medium General Plan land use designations) residential community containing 1,135 units. In doing so, the proposed project would help to address the housing needs of the region. At present, the project site is one of the few large developable parcels of land remaining in the San Pedro area of the City of Los Angeles. SCAG has identified a housing shortfall in both the City of Los Angeles as a whole and the San Pedro-Wilmington area of the City in particular. Thus, the project site represents an important option for addressing identified housing needs in the San Pedro area. This issue will be addressed further in the land use analysis of the EIR. No further discussion of housing displacement is required.
- c) **No Impact.** See answer to Checklist Question 12(b) above.

14. Public Services.

- a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
 - i. Fire protection?
 - ii. Police protection?
 - iii. Schools?
 - iv. Parks?
 - v. Other public facilities?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
✓			
✓			
✓			
✓			
✓			

Discussion:

- a.i) **Potentially Significant Impact.** As discussed in Checklist Question 12(a), the proposed project would introduce 1,135 new residential units and new residents to the project site. Although the existing 245 homes on the project site are currently unoccupied, they were once occupied and served by the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD). The project’s net impact on LAFD services equates to an additional 890 units to be served at the site. It is possible that the demand for fire protection services associated with the proposed project could require the need for new or physically altered fire facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Therefore, the EIR will address this issue.
- a.ii) **Potentially Significant Impact.** As discussed above in Checklist Question 13(a.i), the proposed project would introduce 1,135 new residential units and new residents to the project site. Although the existing 245 homes on the project site are currently unoccupied, they were once occupied and served by the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD). The project’s net impact on LAPD services equates to an additional 890 units to be served at the project site. It is possible that the demand for police protection services associated with the proposed project could require the need for new or physically altered police facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Therefore, the EIR will address this issue.
- a.iii) **Potentially Significant Impact.** As discussed above in Checklist Question 13(a.i), the proposed project would introduce 1,135 new residential units and new residents to the project site, thereby inducing direct population growth and increasing the number of school-aged children in the area who would attend local Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) schools. The project will pay all statutorily required school fees. However, it is possible that the demand for school services associated with the proposed project could require the need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Therefore, the EIR will address this issue.

- a.iv) **Potentially Significant Impact.** As discussed above in Checklist Question 13(a.i), the proposed project would introduce 1,135 new residential units and new residents to the project site, thereby inducing direct population growth and increasing the number of people who could potentially use local parks and recreational facilities maintained by the City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks (DRP). Although the increased demand for local parks and recreational facilities would be markedly offset by the inclusion of on-site recreational amenities and the project applicant would pay applicable Quimby fees implemented by the DRP to mitigate development impacts, it is possible that the demand for parks and recreational facilities associated with the proposed project could require the need for new or physically altered parks and recreational facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Therefore, the EIR will address this issue.

- a.v) **Potentially Significant Impact.** As discussed above in Checklist Question 13(a.i), the proposed project would introduce 1,135 new residential units and new residents to the project site, thereby inducing direct population growth and increasing the number of people who could potentially use local libraries operated by the City of Los Angeles Public Library (LAPL). It is possible that the demand for library services associated with the proposed project could require the need for new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which could subsequently result in environmental impacts. Therefore, the EIR will address this issue.

15. **Recreation.**

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		✓	
		✓	

Discussion:

- a) **Less than Significant Impact.** As discussed above in Checklist Question 13(a.iv), the proposed project would introduce 1,135 new residential units and new residents to the project site, thereby inducing direct population growth and increasing the number of people who could potentially use local parks and recreational facilities maintained by the City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks (DRP). Although the increased demand for local parks and recreational facilities would be markedly offset by the inclusion of on-site recreational amenities and the project applicant would pay applicable Quimby fees implemented by the DRP to mitigate development impacts, it is possible that the usage of existing parks and recreational facilities could be increased. However, the amount of projected usage would not be enough to result in substantial physical deterioration of these facilities due to the provision of park area and recreational facilities within the project itself and the availability of multiple off-site parks and recreational facilities capable of absorbing the excess demand. Thus, no further analysis of this issue is necessary.

- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** See Checklist Questions 13(a.iv) and 14(a).

16. **Transportation/Traffic.** Would the project:

- a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?
- b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
- c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?
- d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- e. Result in inadequate emergency access?
- f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?
- g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
✓			
✓			
			✓
			✓
			✓
	✓		
		✓	

Discussion:

- a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Currently, the project site is developed with unoccupied residential duplexes. Implementation of the proposed project would create 1,135 new homes which would generate vehicle trips to and from the project site. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the proposed project to cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.
- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** As discussed above, the proposed project would increase the number of vehicle trips traveling to and from the project site. Therefore, the EIR will address the potential for the project to exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.
- c) **No Impact.** Due to the nature and scope of the proposed project, implementation of the project would not have the potential to result in a change in air traffic patterns at any airport in the area. Therefore, no further discussion of this issue is required.
- d) **No Impact.** The proposed project would alter access to the project site and would create a new circulating road system within the residential portion of the site. The project will also provide road access for Mary Star of the Sea High School to Western Avenue. In addition, roadway and/or intersection improvements may be required in order to mitigate any potentially significant traffic impacts that could be identified in the EIR. The proposed circulation system would be designed in accordance with the site plan review requirements of the LAFD and the LAPD, and would not include any hazardous design features. All access

roads, driveways, and parking areas would be made accessible to emergency service vehicles as needed. Through implementation of the site plan review process and incorporation of any conditions mandated by applicable agencies (e.g., Caltrans) and departments (e.g., LAFD, LAPD), adequate emergency and evacuation access would be ensured. The proposed project would therefore not result in inadequate emergency access and no adverse impacts would result. In addition, no agricultural land uses are located in proximity to the project site. Therefore, the project would not result in traffic hazards associated with incompatible uses such as farm equipment. No further discussion is required.

- e) **No Impact.** See Checklist Question 15(d).
- f) **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** Parking would be provided by surface and above-grade parking on-site. The amount of parking required to serve residents and visitors will be addressed in the EIR.
- g) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would incorporate measures that support alternative transportation for the purpose of reducing vehicle trips. Bicycle racks would be distributed throughout the site. Ingress and egress would be designed to encourage bus and other mass transit access to all portions of the project site, with particular emphasis on mass transit access to the adjacent Mary Star of the Sea High School. Residents of the proposed project would have direct access to bus routes along Western Avenue. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation, (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks), and impacts would be less than significant. Although further analysis of this issue is not required, the EIR will include a discussion of alternative transportation.

17. **Utilities & Service Systems.** Would the project:

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.			✓	
b.	✓			
c.	✓			
d.	✓			
e.	✓			
f.	✓			

g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

		✓	
--	--	---	--

Discussion:

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) enforces wastewater treatment and discharge requirements for properties in the project area. The project site is not served by a private on-site wastewater treatment system, but instead conveys wastewater via municipal sewage infrastructure to a local treatment plant. Treatment plants in the County and City of Los Angeles are subject to the State’s wastewater treatment requirements. Wastewater from the project site would therefore be treated according to the wastewater treatment requirements enforced by the LARWQCB. Therefore, project impacts related to exceeding wastewater treatment requirements would be less than significant, and no further discussion of this issue is required.

b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would introduce 1,135 new residential units to the project site. Although the existing 245 homes on the project site are currently unoccupied, they once consumed treated water and produced wastewater that was sent to a local treatment plant. As such, the project’s net impact on existing water and wastewater treatment facilities equates to an additional 890 units. Whether the proposed project’s demand for treated water and wastewater can be accommodated by existing treatment facilities and regional planning efforts will be addressed in the EIR.

c) **Potentially Significant Impact.** As discussed in Checklist Question 8(e), the proposed project would alter the existing drainage pattern on the project. Whether this alteration would cause runoff from the project site to exceed the capacity of the existing stormwater drainage system is unknown at this time. Therefore, a storm drain capacity study will be prepared, and the potential for the proposed project to require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects, will be addressed in the EIR.

d) **Potentially Significant Impact.** As discussed above in Checklist Question 16(b), implementation of the proposed project would increase the demand for potable water. Water could be supplied to the proposed project by the California Water Service Company (CWS Co.) which has supplied water to the project site in the past, or by the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (DWP) which supplies water to much of the Los Angeles area. However, whether the project’s demand for water can be accommodated by existing facilities and regional planning efforts will be addressed in the EIR.

In addition, in accordance with state law, a water supply assessment will be prepared for the proposed project in order to investigate water availability. The results of the water supply assessment will be presented in the EIR.

e) **Potentially Significant Impact.** As discussed above in Checklist Question 16(b), implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in on-site wastewater generation. Whether the project’s demand for wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment can be accommodated by existing facilities and regional planning efforts will be addressed in the EIR.

f) **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would introduce 1,135 new residential units to the project site. Although the existing 245 homes on the project site are currently unoccupied, they once produced solid waste that was transported by local waste haulers to local landfills; therefore, existing local landfill capacity to serve the project site has previously been planned for 245 units. As such, the project’s net impact on local landfills equates to an additional 890 units. Whether the project’s demand for landfill

capacity can be accommodated by existing facilities and regional planning efforts will be addressed in the EIR.

- g) **Less than Significant Impact.** The construction and operation of the proposed project would be required to adhere to all applicable federal, State, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, project impacts regarding compliance with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste would be less than significant, and no further discussion of this issue is required.

18. Mandatory Findings of Significance.

- a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, 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?
- b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?
- c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Yes	No
✓	
✓	
✓	

Discussion:

- a) **Yes.** As noted in this Initial Study, implementation of the proposed project could have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. The EIR will address potential impacts with respect to relevant issues and will identify mitigation measures and alternatives, as well as unavoidable adverse environmental effects, if any. This Initial Study also identifies issue areas where potential environmental effects are less than significant, or will be mitigated to a less-than-significant level by applicable laws and regulations; such issues will not be further studied in the EIR. The following issue areas will be addressed in the EIR:
- Aesthetics
 - Air Quality
 - Biological Resources
 - Cultural Resources
 - Geology/Soils
 - Greenhouse Gas Emissions
 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials
 - Hydrology and Water Quality
 - Land Use and Planning
 - Noise
 - Population and Housing
 - Public Services

- Transportation/Traffic
 - Utilities and Service Systems
- b) **Yes.** As noted in this Initial Study, the proposed project could contribute to cumulative environmental impacts. The proposed project's potential cumulative impacts on the environment will be further scrutinized in the EIR.
- c) **Yes.** As noted throughout this Initial Study, implementation of the proposed project could cause indirect adverse effects on human beings by adversely impacting the environment. The proposed project's potential adverse impacts on human beings will be further scrutinized as part of the overall environmental impact analysis included in the EIR.