

Environmental Checklist Form (Initial Study)

County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning



Project title: Animo Pat Brown Charter High School
Project No. R2013-00160-(2)
Conditional Use Permit No. 201300015
Environmental Assessment No. 201300039

Lead agency name and address: Los Angeles County, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 91020

Contact Person and phone number: Tyler Montgomery, Planner; 213-974-6462

Project sponsor's name and address: Pacific Charter School Development, Inc., 316 West 2nd Street Suite 900, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Project location: 8145 - 8205 Beach Street, Florence-Firestone, unincorporated Los Angeles County
APN: 6027-015-003; 6027-015-004 USGS Quad: South Gate

Gross Acreage: 3.02 ac (2 parcels)

General plan designation: Industrial (I)

Zoning: M-1 (Light Manufacturing)

Description of project:

Pacific Charter School Development ("PCSD"), on behalf of Green Dot Public Schools ("GD") requests a conditional use permit ("CUP") to entitle and operate a public charter high school ("Beach II") at 8145-8205 Beach Street for 650 students and 39 faculty. The site is currently occupied by warehouses utilized for furniture storage and assembly. It is located directly north of the existing Animo Pat Brown Public Charter High School at 8255 Beach Street, operated by GD ("Beach I"), with occupancy of 582 students. The existing Beach I high school will become a public charter middle school for grades 6 through 8 upon the opening of the Beach II high school. There will be no changes to any of the operations or as-built conditions of Beach I once it is converted to a GD operated middle school by the prior CUP entitlement in 2008 (RCUP 200700168). The Beach II high school project entails the demolition and removal of all existing industrial structures on the 3.02-acre site and the construction of three buildings, totaling 56,211 square feet. Two classroom buildings, containing 34 classrooms, and one multi-purpose room would be constructed. A 48-space paved parking lot would be located on the northern portion of the site. A drop-off/pick-up area on private property will be constructed parallel to Beach Street, consisting of one queuing lane for drop-off and pick-up during designated hours in the morning and afternoon and would be used for parking the remainder of the time. A total of 5,703 cubic yards of cut and 4,689 cubic yards of fill will occur during grading activities, resulting in a net export of 1,014 cubic yards of earth from the project site.

The project is financed by State Proposition 55 bond financing, and all school improvements will be reviewed by the State of California Division of State Architect ("DSA"). Construction permits of all on-site improvements will be reviewed by DSA. The Los Angeles Unified School District ("LAUSD") has

approved the charter for the high school, which will be evaluated every five years to maintain its charter school designation. Like Beach I, and the proposed middle school, Beach II will have open enrollment. Approximately 90 percent of current students live less than one mile from the existing site, according to the applicant.

Surrounding land uses and setting:

The project site is located in the relatively densely developed, urban community of Florence-Firestone. Beach II will be located immediately north of Beach I—an existing public charter school that is proposed for conversion to a middle school upon the approval of Beach II. Further to the south is a mixture of multiple-family residences, light industrial, and restaurant/retail uses. Furniture warehouse and assembly buildings are located immediately to the north, while single-family and multiple-family residences are located to the east, across Beach Street. An active railroad right-of-way for Union Pacific and the Metro Blue Line is located immediately to the west. Further to the west are additional single-family and multiple-family residences.

Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<i>Public Agency</i>	<i>Approval Required</i>
<u>California Dept. of Toxic Substances Control</u>	<u>Preliminary environmental assessment of school site</u>
<u>California Dept. of General Services, Division of the State Architect.</u>	<u>School construction and grading permits.</u>
<u>California Dept. of General Services, Office of Public School Construction</u>	<u>Approval of Proposition 55 apportionment.</u>
<u>California Department of Education</u>	<u>Concurrent site plan approval for educational facilities</u>
<u>Los Angeles County Dept. of Public Works</u>	<u>Street improvement and access plans (potentially), sewer connection, SUSMP and NPDES permits</u>

Major projects in the area:

<i>Project/ Case No.</i>	<i>Description and Status</i>
<u>Beach I - 8255 Beach St R2007-02480-(2) / RCUP 200700168</u>	<u>Public charter school for 570 students, and 32 faculty in 26 classrooms Approved March 11, 2008</u>

Reviewing Agencies: [See [CEQA Appendix B](#) to help determine which agencies should review your project]

Responsible Agencies

- None
- Regional Water Quality Control Board: **
 - Los Angeles Region
 - Lahontan Region
- Coastal Commission
- Army Corps of Engineers

**RWQCB may defer to the DTSC

Special Reviewing Agencies

- None
- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- National Parks
- National Forest
- Edwards Air Force Base
- Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mountains Area
- Los Angeles Unified School District

Regional Significance

- None
- SCAG Criteria
- Air Quality
- Water Resources
- Santa Monica Mtns. Area
- Other

Trustee Agencies

- None
- State Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- State Dept. of Parks and Recreation
- State Lands Commission
- University of California (Natural Land and Water Reserves System)

County Reviewing Agencies

- Dept. of Public Works:
 - LDD-Grading & Drainage
 - GMED
 - Engineering Division
 - Watershed Management Division (NPDES)
 - Traffic and Lighting Division
 - Environmental Programs Division
 - Waterworks Division
 - Sewer Maintenance Division

- Fire Department
 - Forestry, Environmental Division
 - Planning Division
 - Land Development Unit
 - Health Hazmat
- Sanitation District
- Public Health/Environmental Hygiene (Noise)
- Sheriff's Department
- Parks and Recreation
- Subdivision Committee

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project.

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Department.)
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 in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that 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 the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature (Prepared by)

Date

Signature (Approved by)

Date

1. AESTHETICS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<p>Would the project:</p> <p>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project site is not located in proximity to any known scenic vista.

<p>b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

There are no designated riding or hiking trails in the vicinity.

<p>c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

There are no scenic resources, historic buildings, or state scenic highways in the vicinity of the project site.

<p>d) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Proposed maximum building heights visible from Beach Street are 24 feet for the modular buildings and 35 feet for the multipurpose building. These heights are consistent with surrounding land uses and lower than the existing warehouses. Residences along the east side of Beach Street will continue to be buffered by the existing width of the 40-foot-wide right-of-way, plus an additional 5-foot dedication area along the site's west frontage.

<p>e) Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Proposed maximum building heights visible from Beach Street are 24 feet for the modular buildings and 35 feet for the multipurpose building. These heights are consistent with surrounding land uses and lower than the existing warehouses. Visibility into the property looking west from Beach Street will be increased by the addition of open space between structures.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The proposed school is not located in the vicinity of a scenic highway, corridor, hillside or ridgeline. The project site has no relation to any scenic, riding or trail resources. The school will be located next to an existing public charter school located immediately to the south. The project would be similar in terms of

height, massing, and setback with Beach I to the south, the existing industrial uses to the north, rail lines to the west and the existing residential homes to the east. The reuse of the industrial site as a public charter school will result in significantly improved frontage improvements of landscape and fencing, and structures on the site will appear less bulky from the public right of way of Beach Street.

2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site is not designated as prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance by the California Resources Agency¹.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site is not zoned solely or primarily for agricultural use, and is not a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area or within a Williamson Act contract area².

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site is not zoned solely or primarily for forest land or timberland and does not contain forest land or timberland.

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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site does not contain forest land.

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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

There is no designated Farmland or forest land in the immediate vicinity of the project site, and the proposed use is unlikely to result in the conversion of more remote Farmlands or forest lands.

¹ California Resources Agency, Important Farmland Map (<ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2010/los10.pdf>)

² Calif. Dept. of Conservation Williamson Act Maps 2011-2012 (ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/LA_11_12_WA.pdf)

3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The proposed project would comply with the existing Air Quality Management Plan of the SCAQMD³, as the proposed use is consistent with the General Plan land use designation and zoning.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project does not exceed the SCAQMD criteria for regional significance. Emissions from construction and operations, individually or cumulatively, would not exceed SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds for NO_x, VOC, PM₁₀, PM₂₅, Sox, CO or lead, as no permanent, significant source of air pollutants would be created. (An Emissions Report will be provided if needed.)

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The proposed project's generation of air pollutants would be minimal, as no permanent, significant source of air pollutants would be created.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

A health risk assessment was prepared to analyze health risks for students, staff and visitors attending the school from 10 stationary industrial facilities within ¼ mile that have potential to generate hazardous and acutely hazardous air emissions, and from non-stationary locomotives traveling the adjacent rail line (Source: The Planning Center/DC&E, April 2012; 12/10/2012). The April analysis evaluated emissions from 10 stationary facilities, and the December analysis evaluated emissions from traveling locomotives. According to the risk assessment, the cumulative health risk of cancer and non-cancer associated with exposure to

³ SCAQMD 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (https://aqmd.gov/aqmp/07aqmp/aqmp/Complete_Document.pdf)

toxic air contaminants (“TAC”) for both students and staff attending the school is expected to be less than significant.

The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The proposed Beach II charter school is next to the existing Beach I charter school, industrial land uses, Metro light rail and Union Pacific rail lines, but is replacing an industrial manufacturing, warehousing and trucking facility. Despite the fact that more middle and high school aged children will be in the immediate area, there will be no increase in pollutant concentrations over existing conditions—which have already been reduced previously by the adaptive reuse by Beach I of a former furniture manufacturing facility to the south. The Project will implement best management practices for dust control during construction. The property is located 2.2 miles north of the 105 Freeway and 3.1 miles east of the 405 Freeway.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

The proposed project is a school and will not result in the production of any objectionable odors.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

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 Game (CDFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project is currently developed for industrial use, and no identified sensitive species have been recorded in the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB)⁴.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFG or USFWS?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project is currently developed for industrial use, and no identified sensitive natural communities or habitats exist on the project site.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally or state protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, and drainages) or waters of the United States, as defined by § 404 of the federal Clean Water Act or California Fish & Game code § 1600, et seq. through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project is currently developed for industrial use, and no waters of any kind exist on the project site.

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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project setting is urbanized and densely developed, and wildlife are not known to migrate through the area.

⁴ CDFW California Natural Diversity Database (http://imaps.dfg.ca.gov/viewers/cnddb_quickviewer/app.asp)

e) Convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, southern California black walnut, etc.)?

There are no oaks or other unique native trees on the project site. A tree report was prepared by Biological Assessment Services on December 18, 2012, and based on field work there are no trees protected under the applicable County Planning and Zoning Code (Title 22).

f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215), and Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.44, Part 6)?

The project site is not within a designated Wildflower Reserve Area or Sensitive Environmental Resource Area, and there are no oak trees in the vicinity of the project site.

g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan?

The project site is not within any state⁵ or federal⁶ habitat conservation plan area, and it is not located within any Sensitive Ecological Area (“SEA”).

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The project site and the surrounding area have a significant lack of biological resources and no relationship to any Significant Ecological Areas (“SEAs”). Bird and animal habitat on site is limited to small mammals and avian species adapted to significantly disturbed industrial areas. The densely developed pattern of the area presents little opportunity to support native species. No oak tree or oak woodlands are located on or off the project site.

⁵ CDFW Natural Community Conservation Plan database (<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/habcon/nccp/>)

⁶ USFWS Habitat Conservation Plan database (http://ecos.fws.gov/conserv_plans/PlanReportSelect?region=8&type=HCP)

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

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

Site is developed with industrial buildings dating from the mid-to-late twentieth century. There are no known historical resources on the project site.

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

The site has been previously disturbed through development and is unlikely to contain significant archaeological resources.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?

The site has been previously disturbed through development and is unlikely to contain significant paleontological or geological resources.

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

The site has been previously disturbed through development, so ground disturbance is unlikely to contain human remains. However, If human remains are discovered during these activities, law requires that all work shall stop and the County Coroner shall be contacted immediately to determine the origin and disposition of the remains. If the remains are determined to be of American Indian origin, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendent (“MLD”). The MLD shall then be consulted regarding treatment and/or reburial of the remains.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The project site is located in a significantly urbanized area with a history of industrial development of more than 40 years. There are no known historically significant structures or archaeological/paleontological resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines, and therefore there will be a less than significant impact to cultural resources. In the event that archaeological or paleontological resources are uncovered during grading, the grading will cease until a third party consultant with requisite experience to assess potential resource value has visited the site and determined whether additional action is required. This will be added as a mitigation measure to ensure that overall impact to cultural resources is less than significant.

6. ENERGY

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Conflict with Los Angeles County Green Building Ordinance (L.A. County Code Title 22, Ch. 22.52, Part 20 and Title 21, § 21.24.440) or Drought Tolerant Landscaping Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 21, § 21.24.430 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52, Part 21)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project is exempt from Los Angeles County building codes due to the review of public school projects by DSA. Project review by the DSA will establish conformance with Cal Green Building requirements.

b) Involve the inefficient use of energy resources (see [Appendix F](#) of the CEQA Guidelines)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Use of energy resources would be similar or less than the existing industrial uses on the project site.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

<p>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 active fault trace? Refer to Division of Mines & Geol. Special Publication 42.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project is not within the vicinity of any known fault trace⁷

<p>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project site is in a seismically active area subject to potential strong ground shaking, as is the entire Los Angeles Basin. This is made less than significant by the fact that new construction is required to consider site specific seismic design parameters in accordance with the 2010 California Building Code.

<p>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project site is in an area identified as being at risk of liquefaction, as is most of the southeastern Los Angeles Basin.⁸ A geotechnical report prepared for the applicant by Converse Consultants, dated 12/18/2012, concludes that the site would likely be subject to “relatively minor” liquefaction. Any such liquefaction is made less than significant by the fact that new construction is required to consider site specific seismic design parameters in accordance with the 2010 California Building Code.

<p>iv) Landslides?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project site is not in an area identified as being at risk of landslides.⁸

<p>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Due to surficial disturbed soils and undocumented fill soils, remedial grading is recommended for ground preparation and should include over-excavation and re-compaction. A total of 5,703 cubic yards of cut and 4,689 cubic yards of fill will occur during grading activities, resulting in a net export of 1,014 cubic yards of earth from the project site. Although soil would be exported, this would consist of

⁷ California Geological Survey Alquist-Priolo fault trace maps (<http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/index.aspx>)

⁸ CGS Seismic Hazard Zone maps (<http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/MapProcessor.asp?Action=Download&Location=SoCal>)

surficial disturbed soils and undocumented fill soils. Therefore, topsoil is not proposed for removal from the site in substantial amounts.

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?

A geotechnical report prepared for the applicant by Converse Consultants, dated 12/18/2012, concludes that site alluvial soils are anticipated to have a “very low” expansion potential and on-site soils are not considered potentially corrosive to concrete and buried metal. The site has been found to be suitable from a geotechnical standpoint for the proposed development of Beach II. However, due to surficial disturbed soils and undocumented fill soils, remedial grading is recommended for ground preparation and should include over-excavation and re-compaction as a mitigation measure.

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?

A geotechnical report prepared for the applicant by Converse Consultants, dated 12/18/2012, concludes that site alluvial soils are anticipated to have a “very low” expansion potential.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

The project does not propose to use onsite wastewater treatment systems.

f) Conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215) or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element?

The project is not located on a hillside or within a Hillside Management Area.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS: The following sets forth the conclusions of the Geohazards/Geotechnical Study Report (Source Converse Consultants, 12/18/2012) based in part on eight exploratory borings: (i) groundwater was not encountered at the maximum boring depth of 51.5 ft. BGS consistent with the results for Beach I on the adjacent property, (ii) the site is not within a California Earthquake Fault Zone, (iii) the site is located in a seismically active area, and will be subject to intense ground motion during a significant seismic event – new construction should consider site specific seismic design parameters in accordance with the 2010 California Building Code, (iv) the site is within a mapped Seismic Hazard Zone for liquefaction and the site is susceptible to relatively minor liquefaction during earthquakes, (v) the site is outside the 0.2% annual chance flood plain as defined by FEMA, (vi) site alluvial soils are anticipated to have a “very low” expansion potential, (vii) on site soils are not considered potentially corrosive to concrete and buried metal. The project will also involve less soils import than would require analysis under the haul route permit process of the County. The site has been found to be suitable from a geotechnical standpoint for the proposed development of Beach II. However, due to surficial disturbed soils and undocumented fill soils, remedial grading is

recommended for ground preparation and should include over-excavation and re-compaction. This will be added as a mitigation measure to ensure that the project's overall environmental impact is less than significant.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) **Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) 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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project would not generate GHG's that would have a significant impact on the environment. Temporary construction impacts include site preparation, the demolition of the existing industrial structures, removal and relocation of the existing collocated telecommunications monopole, construction, paving and landscaping. The construction period will be approximately less than one year. GHGs would be emitted by construction equipment and worker vehicles; however these GHG emissions would be short term.

Operational or long term annual GHG emissions attributed to the proposed project would be generated from the increased use of electricity and water and from vehicle trips generated by the project. Additionally, on weekdays, the number of vehicles driving will be decreased due to the proximity of more than 90% of students within a one-mile radius. Driving by students is prohibited and parking is restricted to 48 on site spaces – mostly for staff. Alternative modes of transportation to the school will likely decrease vehicle trips. Thus the operational impacts are also less than significant.

The CO₂ emissions are expected to be less than significant.

b) **Conflict with any 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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project is required to comply with existing energy saving regulations including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and any portion of the Cal Green standards determined to be applicable by the Division of the State Architect.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	<i>Less Than Significant</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
		<i>Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>		

Would the project:

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

The proposed project would not store or use any hazardous materials other than small amounts of gasoline, propane and other materials used for building and equipment maintenance. The storage requirements and small amounts of such materials would make any impact from these materials less than significant. Standards regarding hazardous materials encountered during demolition activities, such as asbestos and lead paint, are regulated by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (“DTSC”) and administered by the Los Angeles County Health Hazardous Materials Division (“HHMD”)

The project site is adjacent to the right-of-way for the Metro Blue Line and Union Pacific railroads. Hazardous materials, such as petroleum products, are sometimes transported on this route. These lines were the subject of a Rail Safety Study (“RSS”) prepared for the applicant by The Planning Center/DC&E, dated April 2012. The RSS was prepared because the school is within 1,500 ft. of a railroad easement. The school property boundary is 8.5 ft. and 80.5 ft. from the nearest Metro track and nearest Union Pacific track, respectively. Conclusions of the RSS include the following: (i) there are multiple factors that reduce the likelihood of an accident or derailment occurring along the tracks, (ii) state of the art safety devices minimize the potential for light rail or freight train highway accidents at the one at-grade crossing located at Nadeau Street within a 1,500 ft. radius of the proposed school, (iii) the likelihood of debris from a derailment reaching the school site is low, (iv) potential for release of hazardous materials from a freight train derailment impacting students or staff is low because of only three freight trains per day, which travel at speeds of less than 30 miles per hour, and (v) there are no pipelines located along the rail right of way or that cross the rail lines track within 1,500 ft. of the proposed Beach II school, and therefore the probability of a railroad derailment resulting in the rupture of a pipeline is negligible

A pipeline safety hazard assessment (“PSHA”) was also prepared for the applicant by The Planning Center/DC&E in April 2012. It was prepared to analyze safety hazards related to above- or below-ground pipelines or pipeline easements. There is one petroleum product pipeline identified within 1,500 ft. of the school site located approximately 339 ft. south of the site beneath 83rd Street and 334 ft. east of the school under Holmes Avenue. No natural gas or chemical pipelines were identified. Using the guidelines provided in LAUSD’s PSHA User Manual, it has been determined that the hazard footprint of the pipeline does not reach the school site property boundary, and therefore no quantitative or other risk analysis is necessary and no mitigation measures are needed. The PSHA concludes that there is no significant risk to students or staff who will attend the school if a release or rupture of this pipeline were to occur.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment?

The proposed project would not store or use any hazardous materials other than small amounts of gasoline, propane and other materials used for building and equipment maintenance. The storage requirements and small amounts of such materials would make any impact from these materials less than significant.

The project site is located adjacent to a railroad right-of-way and 339 feet from an underground petroleum pipeline. For information regarding the potential for release of hazardous materials from either of these locations due to an accident, see Section “a” above.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses?

The proposed project is a school and is therefore considered a sensitive land use. The proposed project would not store or use any hazardous materials other than small amounts of gasoline, propane and other materials used for building and equipment maintenance. The storage requirements and small amounts of such materials would make any impact from these materials less than significant. Any hazardous emissions would be minimal and would originate from automobiles or other small mechanical equipment on the site.

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

The project site is not listed as a hazardous materials site in the DTSC’s “Envirostor” database⁹.

A Preliminary Environmental Assessment Report (“PEA”) was prepared by The Planning Center-DC&E, in February 2013 pursuant to the California Education Code which requires that all new school sites obtain a “No Further Action” (“NFA”) determination from DTSC prior to proceeding with construction of a school. The human health risk screening indicated that chemical concentrations do not pose a significant risk to human health or the environment under an unrestricted, residential land use scenario, which is the most conservative screening approach. Based on the PEA objectives, the report determined that no further assessment is needed on the site.

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?

The project is not located within an airport land use plan 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?

The project is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

⁹ DTSC Envirostor database (<http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public>)

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

The project site is not located near any identified disaster route and would not interfere with any portion of the County’s Operational Area Emergency Response Plan (“OAERP”)¹⁰.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, because the project is located:

i) within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4)?

The project is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.

ii) within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?

The proposed project has been reviewed by the Los Angeles County Fire Department and has been determined to have adequate access.

iii) within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?

The proposed project has been reviewed by the Los Angeles County Fire Department and has been determined to have adequate access to water for fire flow standards.

iv) within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard?

The project site is located adjacent to a railroad right-of-way and 339 feet from an underground petroleum pipeline. For information regarding the potential for release of hazardous materials from either of these locations due to an accident, see Section “a” above.

i) Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?

The proposed project is a school that does not propose to store, utilize, or be composed of highly flammable materials and must meet rigorous fire and building safety standards imposed by the Los Angeles County Fire Department, the Los Angeles Unified School District, and the Division of the State Architect.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The project is located in an urbanized area and is not within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Adequate access from Beach Street would be provided and minimum fire flow would be provided, per Los Angeles County Fire Department standards. The site is adjacent to residential to the east and a school—Beach I—to the south. Proximity to the existing Metro Blue Line and Union Pacific freight rail line to the

¹⁰ Office of Emergency Management OAERP (http://file.lacounty.gov/bc/q2_2006/cms1_043521.pdf)

west was the subject of a Rail Safety Study (“RSS”) by The Planning Center/DC&E in April 2012. The RSS concludes that multiple factors reduce the likelihood of the rail lines creating hazardous conditions for occupants of the site through transport of hazardous materials, accidents, or fire. A pipeline safety hazard assessment (“PSHA”) was also prepared by the same group in April 2012. Using standards established by the Los Angeles Unified School District, the report determined that the petroleum pipeline 339 feet to the south would create a less-than-significant hazard.

The project site is not within the vicinity of any airport and is not listed within DTSC’s Envirostor database of hazardous materials sites. Nothing regarding the project’s development would interfere with the County’s Operational Area Emergency Response Plan (“OAERP”), and the project itself—a public charter high school—would not constitute a potential fire hazard. As a result of all of these factors, the overall environmental impact with respect to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>			

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

The scope of the project requires review and approval of drainage and grading plans through the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (“DPW”). Drainage and hydrology studies will be reviewed and approved by DPW. Any drainage that flows offsite to existing catch basins must be shown to comply with NPDES and SUSMP 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)?

The proposed project will not involve the use or withdrawal of groundwater.

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?

The proposed development—three school buildings, internal circulation driveways, landscaping and an open landscaped area—would minimally alter the topographically flat 3.02-acre site. There will be relatively minor changes to current drainage patterns on the project site and relatively minor potential for erosion or siltation, as the site is currently developed with warehouses and industrial uses.

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?

The proposed development would minimally alter the topographically flat 3.02-acre site. There will be relatively minor changes to current drainage patterns on the project site and relatively minor potential for flooding, as the site is currently developed with warehouses and industrial uses. In fact, the increased amount of landscaping on the project site is likely to decrease the amount of surface runoff.

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?

There will be relatively minor changes to current drainage patterns on the project site, as the site is currently developed with warehouses and industrial uses. In fact, the increased amount of landscaping on the project site is likely to decrease the amount of surface runoff. The project must also be reviewed and approved by DPW to ensure adequacy of existing storm drains and comply with all applicable NPDES and SUSMP requirements regarding polluted runoff.

- f) Generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality?**

There will be relatively minor changes to current drainage patterns on the project site and relatively minor potential for erosion and run-off during construction—consistent with erosion and runoff generally occurring during construction despite implementation of erosion control measures. The scope of the project requires review and approval of drainage and grading plans through DPW for onsite improvement areas. Drainage and hydrology studies will be reviewed and approved by DPW, and any drainage that flows offsite to existing catch basins must be shown to comply with NPDES and SUSMP requirements.

- g) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52)?**

The project is required to conform to Los Angeles County Low Impact Development (“LID”) standards.

- h) Result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance?**

Any and all pollutants would discharge directly into existing sanitary and storm sewers and, therefore, would be required to comply with NPDES and other applicable requirements.

- i) Use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course)?**

The project does not propose an onsite wastewater treatment system.

- j) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**

No other aspects of the proposed project would substantially degrade water quality.

- k) 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, or within a floodway or floodplain?**

The project does not propose housing and is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area¹¹

l) Place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain?

The project is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area¹¹ or identified floodway or floodplain.

m) 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?

The proposed project is not within any flood hazard area identified by FEMA¹¹. The project site is within the projected dam inundation area of the Hollywood, Franklin Canyon, and Santa Fe dams¹². However, a large portion of the eastern Los Angeles Basin is also within these areas. Because the school would primarily draw students from the neighboring area, its location would not increase the risk of injury or death from such an event.

n) Place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

The project site is not within an identified tsunami inundation zone¹³. The site is not within the vicinity of any water body, drainage course, or significant slope, and is therefore unlikely to be affected by a seiche or mudflow.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The proposed development—three school buildings, internal circulation driveways, landscaping and an open landscaped area—would minimally alter the topographically flat 3.02-acre parcel. There will be relatively minor changes to current drainage patterns on the project site and relatively minor potential for erosion and run-off during construction—consistent with erosion and runoff generally occurring during construction despite implementation of erosion control measures. The scope of the project requires review and approval of drainage and grading plans through DPW for onsite improvement areas. Drainage and hydrology studies must also be reviewed and approved by DPW, and County LID standards must be met. Any drainage that flows offsite to existing catch basins will be compliant with LID, NPDES, and SUSMP (or other applicable) requirements. The proposed project will not involve the withdrawal of groundwater.

There are no FEMA-mapped 100-year flood hazard areas in the project vicinity. The subject property is not within an identified area of tsunami inundation and does not adjoin any water body, drainage course, or significant slope so there is little risk of flood by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. While the project site is within an identified dam failure inundation area, much of the eastern Los Angeles Basin is as well. Because the school will primarily draw students from the surrounding area, its construction would not significantly increase the risk of such an event.

Due to the aforementioned factors, the overall environmental impact of the project in regards to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant.

¹¹ FEMA National Flood Insurance Program Flood Maps

¹² County of Los Angeles CEO / ITS Emergency Management Systems

¹³ CalEMA/CGS/USC Los Angeles County Tsunami Inundation Maps ([LINK](#))

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) **Physically divide an established community?**

Nothing in the substance or scale of the proposed project would physically divide the community.

b) **Be inconsistent with the applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans?**

The project site is located within the “I” (Industrial) land use designation of the Countywide General Plan. Non-industrial uses within major industrial areas are permitted, provided that certain specific conditions exist in the vicinity. Therefore, the proposed use is not inconsistent with the existing General Plan.

c) **Be inconsistent with the County zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject property?**

The project site is located within the M-1 (Light Manufacturing) Zone. Schools are allowed within the M-1 Zone, provided that a conditional use permit is obtained (County Code Title 22, Section 32.070).

d) **Conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria?**

The proposed project is not within a Hillside Management area or a Significant Ecological Area, and the proposed use would not conflict with any other applicable land use criteria.

12. MINERAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:				
b) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project site is not within a designated Mineral Resource Area of the Countywide General Plan, and there is no known history of mineral resources on or adjacent to the site.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project site is not within a designated Mineral Resource Area of the Countywide General Plan, and there is no known history of mineral resources on or adjacent to the site.

13. NOISE

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

An acoustical analysis was conducted for the applicant by Bricken Associates, dated 12/15/2012, to assess and present the results of a noise impact and design study of the proposed. Ambient noise levels were measured at the east and west sides of the school site to insure consideration of existing noise emanating from Beach Street traffic and from the adjacent Metro Blue Line and Union Pacific rail lines. Some low background noise was included from distant airplane traffic related to LAX. The Acoustical Analysis concluded: (i) there is no requirement to mitigate existing ambient exterior noise in the areas that students and faculty will utilize exterior to the proposed school buildings, and (ii) the buildings as designed will meet applicable interior classroom noise level standards, as insulated windows are proposed for the classroom buildings, which will insulate students and staff from exterior noise.

Modeling of the noise emanating from students either in the courtyard between the buildings or in the grassy area was performed, and it was determined that proposed layout of school buildings on the perimeter of the site would maintain noise levels at each location to less than the allowed 52 dBA Leq(h).

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Some of the noise emanating from the adjacent rail lines is likely to be in the form of groundborne vibrations. However, the acoustical study prepared by Bricken Associates determined that such noise would be periodic and would not exceed applicable standards (see Section “a” above).

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The adjacent Beach I school and surrounding residential lands uses can be considered sensitive receptors that would be exposed to the increased ambient noise levels noises, such as car doors closing, conversations, and playing students. These noises are already a significant part of the existing ambient noise from the existing school site, and both schools will operate during substantially similar weekday hours.

Mitigation measures will be incorporated to: (i) limit the operation of the rooftop mechanical equipment, and (ii) limit the Sound Power level and utilize a HUSH cover for proposed HVAC units. These measures will ensure that noise impacts of this equipment on students, as well as residences immediately to the east, would be less than significant.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from amplified sound systems?

The County Code regulates noise generated during construction (Title 12, Section 12.08—Noise Control). The ordinance prohibits construction equipment operation between 7:00 PM and 7:00 AM, Monday through Saturday, or at any time on Sunday or holidays if the noise disturbance crosses a residential or commercial real property line. The project will be required to comply with these standards during the construction phase.

Other than the permanent increase in ambient noise levels mentioned in Section “c” above, there would be no other increase in ambient noise levels near the project site. No amplified sound systems are proposed, and there would be no on-site physical education or team sports at the school, as there are no suitable outdoor areas for such activities included in the project design.

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?

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan.

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?

The project site is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

An acoustical analysis was conducted for the applicant by Bricken Associates, dated 12/15/2012, to assess and present the results of a noise impact and design study of the proposed. The Acoustical Analysis concluded: (i) there is no requirement to mitigate existing ambient exterior noise in the areas that students and faculty will utilize exterior to the proposed school buildings, and (ii) the buildings as designed will meet applicable interior classroom noise level standards, as insulated windows are proposed for the classroom buildings, which will insulate students and staff from exterior noise. Modeling of the noise emanating from students either in the courtyard between the buildings or in the grassy area was performed, and it was determined that proposed layout of school buildings on the perimeter of the site would maintain noise levels at each location to less than allowed.

The surrounding area would be exposed to the increased ambient noise levels noises, such as car doors closing, conversations, and playing students. These noises are already a significant part of the existing ambient noise from the existing school site, and both schools will operate during substantially similar weekday hours.

Mitigation measures will be incorporated to: (i) limit the operation of the rooftop mechanical equipment, and (ii) limit the Sound Power level and utilize a HUSH cover for proposed HVAC units. These measures will

ensure that noise impacts of this equipment on students, as well as residences immediately to the east, would be less than significant.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

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)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed school provides an alternative for public education in addition to other public schools in the surrounding communities. It is unlikely that the school would spur population growth in the area, as the surrounding neighborhood is urbanized and would likely require more significant improvements in infrastructure and/or business conditions to encourage redevelopment at higher densities, which is more costly than greenfield construction.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Neither existing market rate nor affordable housing would be displaced.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project would not displace housing or necessary residential infrastructure.

d) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project does not propose to construct residential units.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

	<i>Less Than Significant</i>	<i>Less Than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Impact</i>	<i>Impact</i>

a) Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or 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 any of the public services:

Fire protection?

A public charter school presents no greater need for fire protection services than the existing industrial land uses. All project improvements—including structures, driveways, pedestrian access as well as fire hydrants—have been reviewed by the Los Angeles County Fire Department, and the project design includes infrastructure measures to comply with all applicable rules, regulations and policies of said department. The closest County fire station is Fire Station 16, located at 8010 S. Compton Avenue—approximately 0.6 miles to the northwest from the project site.

Sheriff protection?

Data provided by the applicant indicates that 90 percent of the students at proposed school would be drawn students from within one mile of the site, and its overall student population would be relatively small (570 students). Therefore, the construction of the school is unlikely to significantly affect Sheriff service levels in the vicinity. The closest Sheriff's station is located at 6548 Miles Avenue in Huntington Park—approximately 2.0 miles to the east of the project site

Schools?

The proposed project would create additional school capacity for the area.

Parks?

The proposed public charter school is an academic institution without physical education or team sports programs, and there is no proposal to utilize public parklands. The Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation has reviewed the proposed project and concluded that it would not adversely affect existing park facilities in the area.

Libraries?

The proposed school would primarily drawn students from existing schools in the vicinity, and its overall student population would be relatively small (570 students). Therefore, the construction of the school is unlikely to significantly affect library service levels in the vicinity. The closest library to the school site is the Florence Library, located at 1610 East Florence Avenue, approximately 0.9 miles to the north.

Other public facilities?

The proposed project is not expected to significantly affect other public facility service levels.

16. RECREATION

- | | <i>Potentially
Significant
Impact</i> | <i>Less Than
Significant
Impact with
Mitigation
Incorporated</i> | <i>Less Than
Significant
Impact</i> | <i>No
Impact</i> |
|---|---|--|---|--------------------------|
| 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"/> |

The proposed public charter school is an academic institution without physical education or team sports programs, and there is no proposal to utilize public parklands. The Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation has reviewed the proposed project and concluded that it would not adversely affect existing park facilities in the area.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Does the project include neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation has reviewed the proposed project and concluded that it would not require additional parklands in the area.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would break up any existing open space.

17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Temporary traffic impacts would result from the construction of the proposed project due to construction equipment and construction related vehicles. However, these impacts are short-term and would be considered less than significant when controlled by construction staging plans and temporary traffic/street closure plans approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (“DPW”).

A traffic impact analysis (“TIA”) was prepared for the applicant by Linscott, Law, & Greenspan Engineers on 02/11/2013 to evaluate potential impacts to the local street system. Twelve study intersections were identified by DPW—Traffic & Lighting Division and analyzed to determine changes in operations following construction and occupancy of the proposed Beach II school. Application of the impact threshold criteria from both the County (ten intersections) and City of Los Angeles (two intersections) indicates that none of the 12 intersections would be significantly impacted by the forecasted project traffic although incremental, less-than-significant impacts are noted at all the study intersections. No direct traffic mitigation measures are required or recommended for the 12 study intersections.

The TIA finds that cumulative impacts may occur at (i) Intersection No. 11—Alameda St/Nadeau St—morning peak hours, and (ii) Alameda St/Firestone Blvd—morning and evening peak hours from combined traffic effects due to the Beach II project and planned related projects. However, since the morning peak hour at the Alameda St/Nadeau St and Alameda St/Firestone Bl intersections occurs between 7:00 – 8:00 AM and the start times for the High School and Middle School are 8:30 AM and 9:00 AM respectively, the project is not expected to contribute to the potentially significant cumulative traffic impacts at these intersections. Similarly, since the evening peak at the Alameda St/Firestone Bl intersection occurs between 5:00 – 6:00 PM and the dismissal times for the High School and Middle School are 3:35 PM and 4:05 PM respectively, the project is not expected to contribute to the potentially significant cumulative traffic impacts at this intersection. These specific staggered start times and dismissal times shall be included as mitigation measures.

The TIA concludes that the existing transit service in the project area will adequately accommodate a small increase of project-generated transit trips.

The project site currently has a lack of Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”) compliant pedestrian paths along its street frontage. In addition, there is a lack of ADA compliant curb ramps at the northeast and southeast corners of 82nd Street and Beach Boulevard, which would be a main pedestrian path for the project. In order to ensure equal access, a mitigation measure shall be included requiring the provision of

ADA compliant pathways at these locations.

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

No significant project impact was identified to the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan (“CMP”). Two intersection monitoring locations in the project vicinity – Manchester Ave/Avalon Blvd and Alameda St/Firestone Blvd – were identified. The Alameda St/Firestone Blvd monitoring location required further review because more than 50 trips would be added to the intersection during the morning or evening peak hours. However, it was determined that the Alameda St/Firestone Blvd CMP monitoring location is not anticipated to be significantly impacted by the proposed project, when applying the CMP TIA significant impact criteria. There are no CMP freeway monitoring locations in the project vicinity. No further analysis was required because less than 150 morning or evening peak trips would be added to a freeway monitoring location.

- 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?**

Nothing in the proposed project is likely to result in a change in air traffic patterns.

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

A particular focus of the TIA is the proposed student drop-off/pick-up operations along the eastside frontage of Beach Street and the analysis of safe pedestrian crossings and pathways on the project site and in the immediate vicinity. The proposed on-site area has been positioned and designed to mitigate potential queuing impacts along Beach Street. The school will utilize a system of dispersed and staggered times for student drop-off/pick-up such that the proposed vehicle queue and parking locations provide sufficient on-site space to mitigate queuing impacts along Beach Street.

It is anticipated that there will continue to be high levels of pedestrian activity related to the project as more than 90% of the current Beach I students live within 1.0 miles of the site. The TIA concludes that pedestrian movements can be accommodated as part of the proposed project. A Traffic Management Plan shall be required as a mitigation measure. This plan shall address the positioning of staff and parent volunteers in strategic on-site and off-site locations to direct the student drop-off/pick-up operations. The plan shall also address the provision of informational materials to students, parents, caregivers, and staff at the start of each school term indicating suggested pedestrian routes to and from the school. The information shall include mandatory pedestrian pathways in regards to avoiding crossing the vehicle queuing and parking areas.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?**
The proposed project has been reviewed for emergency access by the Los Angeles County Fire Department, and said department has determined that it is adequate.

- f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs**

regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

The project site is located in a Transit Oriented District and is a land use considered compatible with transportation and pedestrian-oriented programs. A pedestrian safety study has been provided as part of the Traffic Impact Analysis as reviewed and approved by DPW—Traffic & Lighting Division.

18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards?

A sanitary sewer study was prepared for the applicant by Brandow and Johnson on 12/19/2012. The study determined the sewer loading and existing sewer capacity of the existing sanitary sewer system. The resultant flow of 0.24 CFS from the proposed school and tributary area is less than and able to be accommodated by the maximum flow rate of 0.31 CFS for the existing sanitary sewer.

b) Create water or wastewater system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

A sanitary sewer study was prepared for the applicant by Brandow and Johnson on 12/19/2012. The study determined the sewer loading and existing sewer capacity of the existing sanitary sewer system. The resultant flow of 0.24 CFS from the proposed school and tributary area is less than and able to be accommodated by the maximum flow rate of 0.31 CFS for the existing sanitary sewer.

c) Create drainage system capacity problems, 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?

The proposed project would include more landscaping and permeable surface area than that which exists on the existing industrial sites. Therefore, it is unlikely that the project would result in a greater amount of storm water runoff.

d) Have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses?

Source:

A "will serve" letter was issued for the project by Golden State Water Company on 12/19/2012.

e) Create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could

cause significant environmental effects?

The amount of energy used by the proposed project would be relatively low and would not rise to the level requiring energy infrastructure expansion.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

The proposed project would generate minimal amounts of solid waste. This amount would be easily accommodated by the existing Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Plan ("IWMP")¹⁴.

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

The small amount of solid waste generated by the facility would be easily accommodated by the Los Angeles County IWMP. The proposed deconstruction and reconstruction activities would also be required to comply with county, state, and federal guidelines regarding the disposal of hazardous substances, such as asbestos and lead paint (see above section 9—"Hazards and Hazardous Materials"), and state and county green building requirements—such as Cal Green and the County Green Building Ordinance—and other waste diversion standards¹⁴.

¹⁴ Los Angeles County IWMP and solid waste diversion documents (<http://dpw.lacounty.gov/epd/swims/swims-more-links.aspx?id=4>)

19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, 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?

The site is currently developed with industrial uses, and development of the project site with a public charter high school is unlikely to disturb the habitat of sensitive species or uncover cultural resources in previously disturbed ground.

b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

It is unlikely that the proposed project would negatively impact long-term environmental goals.

c) 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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project is unlikely to have cumulatively considerable environmental impacts.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project would have less-than-significant environmental effects on human beings. Mitigation measures will be required regarding geology, noise, and transportation/traffic to ensure this.