

**Draft Environmental Checklist Form (Initial Study)**  
County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning



**Project title:** Sagewood Condominiums / Project No. R2014-03527-(2) / Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 073203, Zone Change No. 201400013, Conditional Use Permit No. 201400172, Parking Permit No. 201500005, Environmental Assessment No. 201400280.

**Lead agency name and address:** Los Angeles County, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012

**Contact Person and phone number:** Tyler Montgomery, (213) 974-6433

**Project sponsor's name and address:** Normandie Harbor City Investors, LLC, 1880 Century Park East, Suite 600, Los Angeles, CA 90067

**Project location:** 24500, 24906 South Normandie Avenue, West Carson  
APNs: 7409-029-006; 7409-029-009; 7409-029-010 USGS Quad: Torrance

**Gross Acreage:** 11.27 acres

**General plan designation:** Low/Medium Density Residential (6-12 dwelling units/gross acre)

**Community/Area wide Plan designation:** N/A

**Zoning:** M-1 (Light Manufacturing)

**Description of project:** The applicant requests a Vesting Tentative Tract Map for 111 residential condominiums and 3,900 square feet of commercial/retail space on three lots totaling 11.27 gross (9.37 net) acres. The proposed Lot 1 would have an area of 0.90 gross (0.44 net) for future commercial use. The proposed Lot 2 would have an area of 3.27 gross (2.55 net) acres and contain 39 attached residential condominium units. The proposed Lot 3 would have an area of 7.10 gross (6.39 net) acres and contain 72 detached residential condominium units. Vehicular access would be from Normandie Avenue for Lots 1-3 as well as Lomita Boulevard for Lot 1. The applicant also proposed to change the zone of Lots 2 and 3 from M-1 (Light Manufacturing) to RPD (Residential Planned Development) and a parking permit to allow parallel guest parking spaces. The project would require approximately 37,100 cubic yards of cut, 54,360 cubic yards of fill and the import of approximately 17,260 cubic yards of earth.

Lot 3 contains 73 three-story detached condominium single-family homes on 6.39 acres. Lot 3 will contain four unit types ranging from approximately 1,536 square feet to approximately 2,438 square feet. The maximum building height would be 27 feet. The residential component will include a total of 3.97 acres of open space with 1.03 acres on Lot 2 and 2.72 on Lot 3. Each residential lot will be separately gated, with two separate points of vehicular entry from Normandie Avenue. There will also be pedestrian access between lots and multiple pedestrian connections to Normandie Avenue.

The property contains three abandoned oil wells and one operating oil well. The three abandoned wells will be capped and closed in accordance with applicable requirements. The one operating oil well is located in

the open space component at the northern end of Lot 2 and will continue to operate, screened with landscaping.

**Surrounding land uses and setting:** The northern portion of the project site is a vacant, paved commercial lot formerly utilized as a truck storage yard. The southern portion is currently occupied by four auto parts stores and auto repair businesses. The site is surrounded by mobile home parks to the east and west, single-family residences to the north, and a church and light industrial uses to the south. Normandie Avenue, a busy four-lane thoroughfare, is immediately to the west of the project site, while Lomita Boulevard, a four-lane divided highway, is located immediately to the south.

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

<u>Public Agency</u>	<u>Approval Required</u>
<u>Department of Public Works</u>	<u>Final Map, Building &amp; Grading Permits</u>

<u>California Dept. of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, &amp; Geothermic Resources</u>	<u>Abandonment of oil wells</u>
---	---------------------------------

**Major projects in the area:**

<u>Project/Case No.</u>	<u>Description and Status</u>
<u>CP 00-169</u>	<u>Authorized adjacent (eastern) mobile home park in the R-3 Zone. Approved 2001.</u>
<u>RCUP 201100029</u>	<u>Authorized adjacent (western) mobile home park in the R-3 Zone. Approved 2011.</u>
<u>_____</u>	<u>_____</u>
<u>_____</u>	<u>_____</u>
<u>_____</u>	<u>_____</u>

**Reviewing Agencies:**

*Responsible Agencies*

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

*Special Reviewing Agencies*

- None
- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- National Parks
- National Forest
- Edwards Air Force Base
- Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mountains Area
- SCAQMD
- Los Angeles Unified School District
- Calif. Division of Oil, Gas, & Geothermic Resources (DOGGR)

*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*

- DPW:
  - Land Development Division (Grading & Drainage)
  - Geotechnical & Materials Engineering Division
  - Watershed Management Division (NPDES)
  - Traffic and Lighting Division
  - Environmental Programs Division
  - Waterworks Division
  - Sewer Maintenance Division

- Fire Department
  - Planning Division
  - Land Development Unit
- Sanitation District
- Public Health/Environmental Health Division: Toxics Epidemiology Program
- Sheriff Department
- Parks and Recreation
- Subdivision Committee
- Other

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                               |
| <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Services                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise                       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input 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>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

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

The project site not near any officially designated as a scenic highways (Source: Scenic Highway Element of the General Plan). There are no significant ridgelines adjacent to the subject property. The proposed project is a level, previously graded located within a mixed-use community. The proposed structures' maximum heights of 37 feet and their location on level ground not adversely affect a scenic vista.

- b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?

There are no riding or hiking trails within a mile of the project site, and the site would not be visible from any trail (Source: GIS-NET Trails Layer).

- c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings near a state scenic highway?

The residential and commercial development would be compatible with the mixed-use developed neighborhood and does not impact scenic resources. There are no oak trees on site. There is very little vegetation on the project site. No historic buildings exist on the site. The proposed project would result in less-than-significant aesthetic impacts.

- 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?

Single-family residential, mobile homes, commercial uses, and light industrial uses of a similar size and scale currently exist in all directions. The approval ensures consistency with applicable County zoning and General Plan standards and requirements.

- e) Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

The proposed project is a level, previously graded located within an established urban community. The proposed structures' maximum heights of 37 feet and their location on level ground will not create a substantial source of shadows, light, or glare.

**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 comprised of any farmland. The construction of residential and commercial buildings in an already disturbed, urbanized area will not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland (Source: Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, California Department of Conservation).

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 is not zoned for agricultural uses. The project site is not currently used for agricultural purposes and it is not designated as an Agricultural Opportunity Area or under a Williamson Act contract.

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(g))?

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

There is no forest land or timberland zoned Timberland Production within the vicinity of the project site.

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

There is no forest land within the vicinity of project site.

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 forest land or farmland within the vicinity of the project site, and the project would not result in changes to the environment that would result in the loss of either type of land.

### 3. AIR QUALITY

	<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 construction of 105 residential condominiums and 3,900 square feet of retail space on the project site would not require an amendment to the Countywide General Plan. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the population and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) projections of the existing SCAQMD air quality plan. As a result, the impact of the project on the air quality plan would be less than significant.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

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

In order to estimate the amount of emissions generated by the project during and after construction, a simulation was prepared using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). The simulation, dated July 2015, was prepared by MIG Hogle-Ireland, Inc. The results are summarized below and indicate that the project, during the construction phase, could exceed the recommended SCAQMD threshold for reactive organic gasses (ROGs), which are ozone precursors. As a result, a mitigation measure would require the applicant to utilize interior and exterior paints with the least amount of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) possible—generally less than 50g/L for interior paints and zero for exterior paints. Post-construction operations are not projected to exceed any SCAQMD thresholds for air pollutants.

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

In order to estimate the amount of emissions generated by the project during and after construction, a simulation was prepared using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). The simulation, dated July 2015, was prepared by MIG Hogle-Ireland, Inc. The results are summarized below and indicate that the project, during the construction phase, could exceed the recommended SCAQMD threshold for reactive organic gasses (ROGs), which are ozone precursors. As a result, a mitigation measure would require interior and exterior paints to utilize interior and exterior paints with the least amount of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) possible—generally less than 50g/L for interior paints and zero for exterior paints. Post-construction operations are not projected to exceed any SCAQMD thresholds for air pollutants.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

The nearest residences are immediately adjacent the project site. Earthmoving for the project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to dust, as indicated by the output of the CalEEMod simulations for particulate matter. Further, best management practices for dust control, including periodic watering, are required by SCAQMD Rule 403. However, during the construction phase, the project could potentially exceed significance thresholds for ROGs, which are ozone precursors. As a result, the applicant shall implement the mitigation measures indicated below, which shall reduce this impact to a level that is less than significant.

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

The proposed project of construction of 105 residential condominiums and 3,900 square feet of retail space would not create objectionable odors that would be perceptible to a substantial number of people. The proposed project would not violate AQMD Rule 402.

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The air pollutants that are regulated by the Federal and California Clean Air Acts fall under three categories, each of which are monitored and regulated:

- Criteria air pollutants;
- Toxic air contaminants (TACs); and,
- Global warming and ozone-depleting gases.

In 1970, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) identified six “criteria” pollutants they found to be the most harmful to human health and welfare. They are:

- Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>);
- Particulate Matter (PM);
- Carbon Monoxide (CO);
- Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>);
- Sulfur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>); and,
- Lead (Pb).

The Federal government and the State of California have established air quality standards designed to protect public health from these criteria pollutants. Among the federally identified criteria pollutants, the levels of ozone, particulate matter, and carbon monoxide in Los Angeles County continually exceed federal and state health standards and the County is considered a non-attainment area for these pollutants.

In response to the region’s poor air quality, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) & the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) were created. The SCAQMD and the AVAQMD are responsible for monitoring air quality as well as planning, implementing, and enforcing programs designed to attain and maintain state and federal ambient air quality standards in the region. The SCAQMD implements a wide range of programs and regulations, most notably, the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The SCAQMD jurisdiction covers approximately 10,743 square-miles and includes all of Los Angeles County except for the Antelope Valley, which is covered by the Antelope AVAQMD.

Sensitive receptors are uses such as playgrounds, schools, senior citizen centers, hospitals or other uses that would be more highly impacted by poor air quality. AQMD Rule 402, which states “A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. The provisions of this rule shall not apply to odors emanating from agricultural operations necessary for the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals.”

In order to mitigate the emission of ROG<sub>s</sub> during construction to a less-than-significant level, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

- AQ-1 Architectural Coatings.** The permittee shall use only paints and architectural coatings where the content of volatile organic compounds (VOC) does not exceed zero grams per liter (g/l) for interior and 50 g/l for exterior residential and non-residential applications.

The CalEEMod emission simulation outputs for the project are provided below:

**Table 1**  
**Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Emissions (lbs/day)**

<b>Source</b>	<b>ROG</b>	<b>NO<sub>x</sub></b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>SO<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>PM<sub>10</sub></b>	<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub></b>
<b>UNMITIGATED</b>						
<i>Summer</i>						
2015	7.98	97.01	64.24	0.11	21.36	12.83
2016	4.93	36.14	39.93	0.07	4.97	2.74
2017	<b>523.29</b>	33.35	37.79	0.07	4.77	2.55
<i>Winter</i>						
2015	8.05	97.67	65.74	0.11	21.36	12.83
2016	5.01	36.41	40.34	0.07	4.97	2.74
2017	<b>523.29</b>	33.56	38.25	0.07	4.77	2.55
<b>Threshold</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>55</b>
Substantial?	<b>Yes</b>	No	No	No	No	No
<b>MITIGATED</b>						
<i>Summer</i>						
2015	7.98	97.01	64.24	0.11	10.34	6.77
2016	4.88	35.85	39.24	0.07	4.87	2.71
2017	41.06	33.08	37.15	0.07	4.68	2.52
<i>Winter</i>						
2015	2.06	21.90	49.68	0.11	7.31	3.99
2016	1.88	9.84	38.53	0.07	2.95	0.90
2017	39.13	9.14	36.86	0.07	2.94	0.89
<b>Threshold</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>55</b>
Substantial?	No	No	No	No	No	No

**Table 2**  
**Net Long-Term Daily Emissions (lbs/day)**

<b>Source</b>	<b>ROG</b>	<b>NO<sub>x</sub></b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>SO<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>PM<sub>10</sub></b>	<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub></b>
<i>Summer</i>						
Area Sources	17.29	0.56	40.89	0.09	4.57	4.57
Energy Demand	0.09	0.75	0.32	0.01	0.06	0.06
Mobile Sources	3.95	11.11	45.43	0.12	7.92	2.22
<i>Summer Total</i>	<i>21.33</i>	<i>12.42</i>	<i>86.64</i>	<i>0.21</i>	<i>12.56</i>	<i>6.86</i>
<i>Winter</i>						
Area Sources	17.29	0.56	40.89	0.09	4.57	4.57
Energy Demand	0.09	0.75	0.32	0.01	0.06	0.06
Mobile Sources	4.08	11.68	44.72	0.11	7.92	2.22
<i>Winter Total</i>	<i>21.46</i>	<i>12.99</i>	<i>85.93</i>	<i>0.21</i>	<i>12.56</i>	<i>6.86</i>
Threshold	<b>55</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>55</b>
Substantial?	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	No	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>

As part of the SCAQMD's environmental justice program, attention has recently been focusing more on the localized effects of air quality. Although the region may be in attainment for a particular criteria pollutant, localized emissions from construction activities coupled with ambient pollutant levels can cause localized increases in criteria pollutants that exceed national and/or State air quality standards.

Construction-related criteria pollutant emissions and potentially significant localized impacts were evaluated pursuant to the SCAQMD Final Localized Significance Thresholds Methodology, conducted by MIG Hogle-Ireland and dated July 2015. This methodology provides screening tables for one through five acre project scenarios, depending on the amount of site disturbance during a day. Emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) will occur during site preparation, grading of the project site, construction of the project, and paving. Table 6 (Localized Significance Threshold Analysis) summarizes maximum on-site emissions as compared to the local thresholds established for Source Receptor Area (SRA) 3 (Southwest Los Angeles County Coastal). Because a total of 75 acres will be disturbed within the 30 days of grading which will result in 2.5 acres of land disturbed per day, the two acre threshold is used to provide a worst case analysis. A 25 meter receptor distance was used to reflect the proximity of nearby uses to the project site. Construction phases will occur consecutively and will not overlap. Therefore, on-site emissions from each construction phase were evaluated individually. Emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> and CO will be greatest during concurrent grading activities. Emissions of particulate matter will be greatest during site preparation activities. To accommodate the import of 17,260 cubic yards of soil, CalEEMod default construction phase lengths have been doubled and the number of daily equipment has been reduced by half. It should be noted that the results summarized in Table 6 include application of SCAQMD Rule 403 and requires the

utilization of applicable best management practices to minimize fugitive dust emissions. A 61 percent reduction in fugitive dust emissions is assumed based on rule requirements. As shown in Table 6, based on CalEEMod calculations, on-site emissions from construction activities will not exceed any localized threshold. Impacts related to localized construction emissions are less than significant.

**Table 3**  
**Localized Significance Threshold Analysis**

Phase	CO	NO <sub>x</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Building Demolition	36.07	48.36	3.00	2.37
Paving Demolition	36.07	48.36	5.81	2.79
Site Preparation	26.80	35.64	6.58	4.31
Grading	33.40	52.15	5.41	3.69
Building Construction	18.74	30.03	2.12	1.99
Paving	1.87	2.19	0.17	0.17
Architectural Coating	14.73	20.30	1.14	1.05
Roadway Improvements	9.70	0.68	0.02	0.02
Threshold	<b>967</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>
Potentially Substantial?	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>

#### 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 Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?

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

The project site is flat and mostly paved. Nesting birds occur all over the county and the project shall be compliant with the California Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW) codes related to Nesting Birds. There is one species of concern in the area identified by the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB): the pocketed free-tailed bat (*Nyctinomops femorosaccus*).

According to the Los Angeles County Draft General Plan Update EIR, the South Bay Planning Area does not support designated critical habitat for any federally-listed plant species. However, the Planning Area supports at least 22 special-status plant species that are federal and/or state listed, and/or are considered rare by the CNPS. Among these are six federal and/or state-listed species, including California Orcutt grass, coastal dunes milk-vetch, Lyon’s pentachaeta, salt marsh bird’s beak, beach spectaclepod, and spreading navarretia. Typical native habitat in the South Bay Planning Area would include scrub habitat southern coastal bluff scrub, vernal pool, and southern dune scrub, none of which occurs on the project site. The site is entirely paved, and any minimal on-site vegetation is currently disturbed through on- and off-site activities including traffic and the presence of humans and domestic animals, particularly cats. Considering the highly developed and urbanized character of the surrounding area and the presence of on- and off-site disturbances, designated species under federal or state law and other wildlife will not be disturbed.

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 CDFW or USFWS?

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

The project site consists of a level, previously disturbed area is not located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer Area, or Sensitive Environmental Resource Area (SERA). There are no oak trees, oak woodlands, wetlands, or waters of any kind located 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

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

**Fish & Game code § 1600, et seq. through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

The project site does not contain either Federal or State-protected wetlands, drainages, or waters.

**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?**

The project site is not located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer Area, or Sensitive Environmental Resource Area (SERA). There are no oak trees or oak woodlands located on the project site. The residential and commercial subdivision is located in a developed area and is surrounded by paved roads and/or residences in all directions. Therefore, the project would not interfere with connectivity to wildlife and plant linkage areas or wildlife linkage corridors or rivers or significant ridgelines.

**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 oak trees, oak woodlands, Joshuas, or Junipers on the subject property.

**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)?**

There are no Wildflower Reserve Areas, SEAs, or SERAs on the subject property. Since there are no oak trees or oak woodlands on the subject property, there is no conflict with the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance.

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

The project site is not in, or within, proximity to any Local Coastal Program, Significant Ecological Areas, a Natural Community Conservation Plan, or a federal Endangered Species Act Habitat Conservation Plan.

## 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>
<p><b>Would the project:</b></p> <p><b>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project site does not contain historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 and there is no record of national or state-designated historical resources on the project site.

<p><b>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The project site does not contain known archaeological resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5. However, in the event that cultural remains are found, a mitigation measure will require work to cease and for the Director of Regional Planning to be contacted to determine the next appropriate measures for preserving them.

<p><b>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The project site does not contain paleontological resources or sites, unique geological features, or rock formations. However, in the event that cultural remains are found, a mitigation measure will require work to cease and for the Director of Regional Planning to be contacted to determine the next appropriate measures for preserving them.

<p><b>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

There is no record of human remains on the project site, and the majority of the site has previously been graded. In the event that human remains are discovered as a result of site disturbance, a mitigation measure be incorporated to ensure that the permittee shall suspend construction, contact the County Coroner, and leave the resource of human remains in place until a qualified archaeologist can examine and determine appropriate measures.

## **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Because the majority of the project site has previously been developed, it is unlikely that paleontological, cultural, or archeological remains will be discovered during development of the project. However, to guard against the possibility of such an occurrence, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

**CR-1 Cultural Remains.** Should cultural resource remains be encountered during land modification activities, work shall cease, and the Los Angeles County Director of Regional Planning contacted immediately to determine appropriate measures to mitigate adverse impact to the discovered resources. If human remains are discovered within the boundaries of the project area, then the procedures described in Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code shall be followed. These procedures require notification of the County Coroner. If the County Coroner determines that the discovered remains are those of Native American ancestry, then the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) must be notified by telephone within 24 hours; Sections 5097.94 and 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code describes the procedures to be followed after the notification of the NAHC.

**6. ENERGY**

Would the project:	<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) Conflict with Los Angeles County Green Building Standards Code (L.A. County Code Title 31)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project is subject to all components of the Green Building Program: Green Building, Low-Impact Development, and Drought Tolerant Landscaping.

b) Involve the inefficient use of energy resources (see Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Appendix F, Section 1 of the CEQA Guidelines requires evaluation of energy efficiency only for Environmental Impact Reports. The environmental determination for this project is a mitigated negative declaration.

## 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 and Geology Special Publication 42.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

There is no fault trace within the project site. Therefore, people or structures on the project site will not be exposed to potential substantial adverse effects (Source: California Geological Survey, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones Map).

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

The project site is located more than five miles from the nearest recorded fault trace. There is no fault trace within the project site. Therefore, people or structures on the project site will not be exposed to potential substantial adverse effects (Source: California Geological Survey, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones Map).

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

The project site is not located within a designated soil liquefaction area (Source: California Geological Survey).

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

The project site is not located within an identified landslide zone. (Source: California Geological Survey).

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

Topsoil is used to cover surface areas for the establishment and maintenance of vegetation due to its high concentrations of organic matter and microorganisms. Little native topsoil is likely to occur on the site because the topsoil would have been removed or compacted as a result of engineering for the existing on-site development and pavement. The project has the potential to expose surficial soils to wind and water erosion during construction activities. Wind erosion will be minimized through soil stabilization measures



The project site does not contain any areas of slope with grades greater than 25 percent that are proposed for development. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance or any other hillside design standards.

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

Existing Emissions:

The project site is currently occupied by approximately 14,244 square feet of auto repair and service uses: Irvine’s Alignment Services, A Plus Auto & Electric, Upholstery Works, Leo’s Autohaus, and KCM Test Only Center. Existing emissions were estimated utilizing CalEEMod default assumptions for fleet mix, energy and water use, and solid waste generation. Existing vehicle trips have been estimated in the project traffic study. Table 4 (Existing Greenhouse Gas Emissions) summarizes annual greenhouse gas emissions associated with existing uses

**Table 4  
Existing Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Source	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	MTCO <sub>2</sub> E/YR
Area	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy	63.42	0.00	0.00	63.69
Mobile	178.72	0.01	0.00	178.90
Solid Waste	11.04	0.65	0.00	24.75
Water/Wastewater	8.03	0.04	0.00	9.29
<i>Total</i>				<i>276.63</i>

Short-Term Emissions:

The proposed project will result in short-term greenhouse gas emissions from construction and installation activities. Greenhouse gas emissions will be released by equipment used for demolition, grading, paving, building construction, and architectural coating activities. GHG emissions will also result from worker and vendor trips to and from the project site. Table 5 (Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions) summarizes the estimated yearly emissions from construction activities. Carbon dioxide emissions from construction equipment and worker/vendor trips were estimated utilizing the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2013.2.2. Construction activities are short-term and cease to emit greenhouse gases upon completion, unlike operational emissions that are continuous year after year until operation of the use ceases. Because of this difference, SCAQMD recommends in its draft threshold to amortize construction emissions over a 30-year operational lifetime. This normalizes construction emissions so that they can be grouped with operational emissions in order to generate a precise project GHG inventory. Amortized

construction emissions are included in Table 5.

**Table 5  
Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Construction Year	GHG Emissions (MT/YR)			
	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	TOTAL*
2015	330.68	0.06	0.00	331.95
2016	787.37	0.10	0.00	789.39
2017	72.19	0.01	0.00	70.48
<i>AMORTIZED TOTAL<sup>^</sup></i>	<i>39.67</i>	<i>0.01</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>39.79</i>
* MTCO <sub>2</sub> E  Note: Slight variations may occur due to rounding  ^ Amortized over 30-years				

Long-Term Emissions:

Proposed project activities will result in continuous greenhouse gas emissions from mobile, area, and operational sources. Mobile sources, including vehicle trips to and from the project site, will result primarily in emissions of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) with minor emissions of methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O). The most significant GHG emission from natural gas usage will be methane. Electricity usage by the proposed project and indirect usage of electricity for water and wastewater conveyance will result primarily in emissions of carbon dioxide. Disposal of solid waste will result in emissions of methane from the decomposition of waste at landfills coupled with CO<sub>2</sub> emission from the handling and transport of solid waste. These sources combine to define the long-term greenhouse gas emissions inventory for the build-out of the proposed project.

The methodology utilized for each emissions source in CalEEMod is based on the CAPCOA *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures* handbook. A summary of the proposed project operational greenhouse gas emissions is included in Table 6 (Proposed Long-Term Greenhouse Gas Emissions). The emissions inventories are presented as metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO<sub>2</sub>E) meaning that all emissions have been weighted based on their Global Warming Potential (GWP) (a metric ton is equal to 1.102 US short tons).

Mobile sources are based on annual vehicle miles traveled (VMT) based on daily trip generation identified in the project traffic study. Default CalEEMod trip lengths and fleet mix are utilized. Natural gas, electricity and solid waste generation were projected using CalEEMod default values. Water demand was based on CalEEMod defaults.

**Table 6  
Proposed Long-Term Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Source	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	MTCO <sub>2</sub> E/YR
Area	33.59	0.04	0.00	34.63
Energy	372.28	0.01	0.01	374.08
Mobile	1,469.74	0.06	0.00	1,470.95
Solid Waste	21.87	1.29	0.00	49.00
Water/Wastewater	45.86	0.25	0.01	53.03
<i>Total</i>	<i>1,943.33</i>	<i>1.66</i>	<i>0.01</i>	<i>1,981.70</i>

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory:

Table 7 (Proposed Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory) summarizes the yearly estimated greenhouse gas emissions from construction of the proposed project and operational sources under operational conditions. The project will generate an additional 1,744.86 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E over existing conditions annually as shown in Table 8 (Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory).

**Table 7  
Proposed Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory**

Source	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	MTCO <sub>2</sub> E/YR
Construction	39.67	0.01	0.00	39.79
Operation	1,943.33	1.66	0.01	1,981.70
<i>Total</i>				<i>2,021.49</i>

**Table 8 1  
Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory**

Source	MTCO <sub>2</sub> E/YR
Existing	276.63
Proposed	2,021.49
<i>Net Emissions</i>	<i>+1,744.86</i>

A numerical threshold for determining the significance of greenhouse gas emissions in the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) has not officially been adopted by the SCAQMD. As an interim threshold based on guidance provided in the CAPCOA CEQA and Climate Change white paper, a non-zero threshold based on Approach 2 of the handbook will be used. Threshold 2.5 (Unit-Based Thresholds Based on Market Capture) establishes a numerical threshold based on capture of approximately 90 percent of emissions from future development. The latest threshold developed by SCAQMD using this method is 3,000 metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO<sub>2</sub>E) per year for residential and commercial projects. This threshold is based on the review of 711 CEQA projects.

Greenhouse gas emissions associated with the proposed project would not exceed the 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E threshold; therefore, impacts will be less than significant.

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

                

The County has adopted the 2013 edition of the California Building Code (County Code Title 26 (Building Code), including the California Green Building Standards Code (County Code Title 31 (Green Building Standards Code)). The project would be subject to the California Green Building Standards Code, which requires new buildings to reduce water consumption, employ building commissioning to increase building system efficiencies for large buildings, divert construction waste from landfills, and install low pollutant-emitting finish materials. The project does not include any feature (i.e. substantially altered energy demands) that would interfere with implementation of these state and County codes and plans. No impact will occur.

## 9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

                                                                

The residential and commercial subdivision project does not include the routine transportation, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or the use of pressurized tanks. During the construction phase of the project, the project may include minimal use of hazardous materials, such as solvents, paints, lubricants, and oils. Current local, state, and Federal laws relating to the use, storage, and disposal of these materials make it unlikely that the project would have a significant effect on the environment.

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 residential and commercial subdivision project does not include the routine transportation, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or the use of pressurized tanks. During the demolition and construction phases of the project, the project may include the minimal use or encounter of hazardous materials, such as asbestos, solvents, paints, lubricants, and oils. Current local, state, and Federal laws relating to the use, storage, and disposal of these materials make it unlikely that the project would have a significant effect on the environment.

There are no open cases of a leaking underground storage tank (LUST), cleanup sites or land disposal sites within one-quarter mile of the project site (Source: California Water Resources Board GeoTracker—<https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>). There will be no impact related to the release of hazardous materials from leaking underground storage tanks into the environment as a result of the proposed project.

Phase I and Phase II Limited Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) were prepared for the applicant by The Source Group, Inc. and presented in a document dated July 22, 2013. These ESAs indicated that there are three previously abandoned oil wells on the subject property, as well as one currently active oil well. All proposed structures would be located more than 100 feet from the active well, which would be fenced and screened from view. However, the potential for hazardous materials in the soil from previous oil production, as well as hazards resulting from excavation and construction in the vicinity of abandoned wells, requires mitigation measures in order to limit their impacts to a less-than-significant level. For a greater discussion of these issues, see “Evaluation of Environmental Impacts” section below.

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

                                                                

The residential and commercial subdivision project does not include the routine transportation, storage,

production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or the use of pressurized tanks. During the construction phase of the project, the project may have included minimal use of hazardous materials, such as solvents, paints, lubricants, and oils. Current local, state, and Federal laws relating to the use, storage, and disposal of these materials make it unlikely that the project would have a significant effect on the residences located within one-quarter mile of the project 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 included on the California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database of clean-up sites and hazardous waste permitted facilities (Source: <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>).

**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 proposed project site is located approximately 1.92 miles east of the Torrance Airport runway. The airport serves approximately 500 aircraft, housing primarily private aircraft. The airport operates in some capacity between the hours of 5:00 AM and 10:00 PM, seven days a week. The airport has two runways, running northwest to southeast. The Airport Influence Zone encompasses airport property, general commercial use to the west and north, business park use, and light industrial uses. Runway protection zones are located at each end of the runways (northwest and southeast portions of the Airport Influence Zone) (Source: The Planning Center. *Draft City of Torrance General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2008111046*. July 2009). The proposed project site is not located within the Airport Influence Zone and is not located within the runway protection zone. As a result, the impact of the project would be less than significant with regard to the airport's proximity.

**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 proposed project site is located approximately 1.92 miles east of the Torrance Airport runway. The airport serves approximately 500 aircraft, housing primarily private aircraft. The airport operates in some capacity between the hours of 5:00 AM and 10:00 PM, seven days a week. The airport has two runways, running northwest to southeast. The Airport Influence Zone encompasses airport property, general commercial use to the west and north, business park use, and light industrial uses. Runway protection zones are located at each end of the runways (northwest and southeast portions of the Airport Influence Zone) (Source: The Planning Center. *Draft City of Torrance General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2008111046*. July 2009). The proposed project site is not located within the Airport Influence Zone and is not located within the runway protection zone. As a result, the impact of the project would be less than significant with regard to the airport's proximity.

**g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere**

with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The project will not 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 fires, because the project is located:**

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

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

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

The project site is not within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access. The project site is located in an urbanized area with easy access to arterial roads and has been reviewed and approved by the Los Angeles County Fire Department for adequate emergency access.

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

The Fire Department has determined that the existing water pressure would be adequate to meet fire flow standards for the proposed development.

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

The project site is not located in proximity to land uses with a potential for dangerous fire hazard. The project site is surrounded by other residential uses. The proposed project would be required to comply with all of the requirements of the Los Angeles County Fire Code.

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

The proposed use does not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard. The project site is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The proposed project of a residential and commercial subdivision does not entail the regular use of large amounts any hazardous or highly flammable materials or substances.

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

The project site is located within an oil producing area of the Torrance Oil Field. Three previously abandoned wells (“Joughlin” 1-H, “Faith” 64, and “Ring-Hawkins” 4) and one active oil producing well (“South Torrance Unit” D-205) operated by the Brea Canon Oil Company are located on the project site. The operating “South Torrance Unit” well is currently located within a 30-foot by 50-foot fenced area. The operator accesses the well for maintenance that includes a work-over rig to maintain the well. This well will remain active after development of the proposed project and will be fenced in and screened with vegetation.

In addition, all proposed buildings will be set back a minimum of 100 feet from the existing active well.

### Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the project site (Appendix C) included record searches, interviews and site reconnaissance. Three recognized environmental concerns (RECs) were identified on the site:

- The Phase I ESA identified a potential underground storage tank at 24500 S. Normandie. A building permit for a 1,000 gallon gasoline underground storage tank was issued for Herwood Building Supply dated April 2, 1965. The location of a UST is not indicated and no additional permits for the removal of a UST were found in the records. The site inspection did not identify an obvious location of a UST as there was no indication of a fill pipe, vent piping, or a former dispenser location.
- A REC was identified for the past oil and gas development on the project site, which includes the presence of three plugged and abandoned oil wells, one operating oil well, and associated former sumps, piping, and above ground storage tanks. The potential presence of elevated petroleum-hydrocarbon, such as methane vapor in soil-gas associated with the abandoned wells and the underlying oil field and former sumps, tanks, and piping from the drilling and production at the wells are potential concerns identified by the Phase I ESA. Elevated concentrations of methane and other volatile petroleum vapors may intrude into the buildings over time from well casing that have not been properly abandoned or have corroded over time, from residual petroleum hydrocarbons in near surface soil, and potentially from deeper oil and gas producing zones.

The California Department of Conservation's Division of Oil and Gas and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR or "Division") provided well files that indicate the two oil wells were abandoned in 1976 and the third in 1961 were conducted under Division inspection per the standards of that time. Under California Public Resources Code, Section 3208.1, the DOGGR can order the re-abandonment of previously abandoned well for safety reasons. DOGGR acts in an advisory role with local permitting agencies (in this case the Los Angeles County, Building and Safety Division) when property development planning is under way near oil and gas wells under the Construction-Site Plan Review Program. Under this program, DOGGR typically reviews past plugging and abandonment operations, evaluates the top of excavated well casing to verify the well is not leaking fluids or gas, open the well casing to inspect for methane gas accumulation if the well has been sealed, and issue a Well Review Letter to the applicant and local permitting agency.

- The potential for the release of asbestos containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paints during demolition of the structures on the northern portion of the site was identified. However, since preparation of the Phase I ESA (2013), the northern structures have been demolished. Therefore, release of ACM and lead-based paints from demolition of the previous storage facility on the northern portion of the site will not occur as a result of the proposed project.

Activities associated with the demolition of existing structures on the southern portion of the site, which were constructed in the late 1950s to late 1980s may pose a hazard with regard to asbestos containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paints. ACM were used on a widespread basis in building construction prior to and into the 1980s; therefore, it is assumed that ACM is present on the project site and will need to be handled following specific regulations/guidelines described below. Asbestos generally does not pose a threat when it remains intact. When asbestos is disturbed and becomes airborne. SCAQMD Rule 1403 (Asbestos Emissions from Demolition/Renovation Activities) requires work practices that limit asbestos emissions from building demolition and renovation activities, including the removal and disturbance of

ACM. This rule is designed to protect uses and persons adjacent to demolition or renovation activity from exposure to asbestos emissions. Rule 1403 requires a certified inspector to survey any facility being demolished or renovated for the presence of all friable and Class I and Class II non-friable ACM. The applicant must also notify SCAQMD of their intent to perform demolition or renovation of any buildings that may contain asbestos prior to demolition and requires that all ACM is removed prior to any demolition. Rule 1403 also establishes notification procedures, removal procedures, handling and clean-up procedures, storage, disposal, landfilling requirements, and warning label requirements, including HEPA filtration, the *glovebag* method, wetting, and some methods of dry removal that must be implemented when disturbing appreciable amounts of ACM (more than 100 square feet of surface area). All ACM shall be disposed of at a waste disposal site operated in accordance with Rule 1403. The applicant will also ensure the safety of constructor workers involved in the ACM removal by complying with all California Asbestos Standards in Construction, including, but not limited to minimum air circulations, use of respirators, wetting of materials, clothing laundering, construction and demolition equipment requirements, and shielding specifications. Adherence to SCAQMD Rule 1403 would ensure that impacts related to the release of ACM are less than significant.

Exposure of construction workers to lead-based paint during demolition activities is also of concern, similar to exposure to asbestos. Exposure of surrounding land uses to lead from demolition activities is generally not a concern because demolition activities do not result in appreciable emissions of lead. The primary emitters of lead are industrial processes. Any lead-based paint utilized on the exterior and interior of the existing structures would generally remain inside the structure or close to the exterior of the building and would be removed during demolition. Improper disposal of lead-based paint could contaminate soil and subsurface groundwater in and under landfills not properly equipped to handle hazardous levels of this material. Due to the age of the buildings it is assumed that lead-based paint is present. Therefore, 8 CCR Section 1532.1 (California Construction Safety Orders for Lead) must be followed for the demolition of all existing structures requiring exposure assessment and compliance measures to keep worker exposure below action levels. The proposed project is also subject to Title 22 requirements for the disposal of solid waste contaminated with excessive levels of lead. Testing, monitoring, containment, and disposal of lead-based materials will comply with all Cal/OSHA standards and regulations under California Construction Safety Orders for Lead section 1532. Adherence to standard regulation would ensure that impacts related to the release of lead based paints would be less than significant.

#### Phase II Environmental Site Assessment

Based on recommendations included in the Phase I ESA, a Phase II Limited ESA was prepared. Subsurface investigation activities were performed by The Source Group, Inc. to screen for VOCs in soil, for methane and VOCs in soil gas, characterize oily water in abandoned drums for future disposal, and inspect and sample the five vacant buildings located in the northern portion of the project site for asbestos containing materials and lead based paint. The structures sampled for asbestos materials and lead based paint have since been removed and no longer exist on the project site. See Appendix D for further discussion for Phase II methodology.

Based on the sampling results, no additional site assessment sampling is recommended by The Source Group, Inc. Grading of the project site may expose abandoned piping, petroleum in soil, abandoned waste disposal system (septic or cesspool), and debris not encountered in the Phase II ESA. Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 requires that all suspect materials should be segregated for proper characterization and disposal or recycle if any should be encountered during ground-disturbing activities.

#### Inactive Oil Wells

Although the Phase II Limited ESA determined that two oil wells were abandoned in 1976 and a third in

1961 were conducted under DOGGR inspection per the standards of that time, DOGGR found that two out of the three abandoned wells (“Faith” 64 and “Ring-Hawkins” 4) have not been abandoned to the DOGGR’s current plugging and abandonment requirements. Plugging and re-abandonment of these two wells following the guidelines included below will be required prior to project construction pursuant to California Code of Regulations Title 14 (Natural Resources) Section 1981 (General Requirements). General requirements for the plugging and abandonment of oil wells is as follows. Following fulfillment of general requirements and site inspection by a DOGGR engineer, DOGGR will issue a Division Report of Well plugging and abandonment.

- (a) Notice of Intention to plug and abandon Geothermal Resources Well, is required for all wells.*
- (b) History of Geothermal Resources Well shall be filed within 60 days after completion of the plugging and abandonment.*
- (c) The Division’s Report of Well plugging and abandonment, will not be issued until all records have been filed and the site inspected for final cleanup by a Division engineer.*
- (d) Subsequent to the plugging and abandonment of the hole, all casings shall be cut off at least 2 meters (6 feet) below the surface of the ground, all concrete cellars and other structures shall be removed, and the surface location restored, as near as practicable, to original conditions. The landowner has the option to assume legal responsibility for a well; however, to do so he or she must have legal clearance from the Division.*
- (e) Good quality, heavy drilling fluid approved by the Supervisor shall be used to replace any water in the hole and to fill all portions of the hole not plugged with cement.*
- (f) All cement plugs, with the possible exception of the surface plug, shall be pumped into the hole through drill pipe or tubing.*
- (g) All open annuli shall be filled solid with cement to the surface.*

Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 requires that inactive wells “Faith” 64 and “Ring-Hawkins” 4 be re-abandoned in accordance with the current California Code of Regulations Title 14 Section 1981 prior to issuance of grading permits. With implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-2, impacts related to reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the two abandoned oil wells will be less than significant.

Therefore, the following mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the project:

**HAZ-1 Petroleum in Soil.** In the event that ground-disturbing activities expose abandoned piping, petroleum in soil, an abandoned waste disposal system, debris not encountered during the Phase II site reconnaissance, or any other suspect materials, encountered materials shall be segregated for proper characterization and disposal or recycle. Proper disposal or recycle of suspect materials shall be performed in accordance with County regulations and subject to monitor and review by the Hazardous Materials Division of the Los Angeles County Fire Department (“Hazmat”).

**HAZ-2 Re-abandonment of Oil Wells.** Prior to issuance of grading permits, inactive oil wells “Faith” 64 and “Ring-Hawkins” 4 shall be re-abandoned in accordance with current California Code of Regulations Title 14 Section 1981 abandonment standards. All required documentation shall be submitted to the Division of Oil, Gas & Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) and the site inspected by DOGGR engineer. Prior to inspection by DOGGR, the DOGGR Report of Well Plugging and Abandonment shall be submitted to the Los Angeles County Fire Department and the Department of Regional Planning for review and approval.

**10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

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

                                                                

The project site will be connected to an existing municipal wastewater system. In unincorporated Los Angeles County, the proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements of the Low-Impact Development Ordinance, as well as the requirements of the County’s MS4 Permit (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System), in order to control and minimize potentially polluted runoff. Because all projects are required to comply with these requirements in order to obtain construction permits and certificates of occupancy, the proposed project would not impact any nonpoint source 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 project site would be served by a public water system and would not make use of local 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 site is relatively level and does not contain any existing drainage courses. The construction of the proposed structures and the subdivision of the lot will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site in a manner which would result in flooding, erosion, or siltation on-site or off-site. The project will be required to submit an approved drainage plan and comply with all NPDES and MS4 requirements, as well as the Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance. The project would require approximately 37,100 cubic yards of cut, 54,360 cubic yards of fill and the import of approximately 17,260 cubic yards of earth..

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 site is relatively level and does not contain any existing drainage courses. The construction of the residences and the subdivision of the lot will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site in a manner which would result in flooding, erosion, or siltation on-site or off-site. The project will be

required to submit an approved drainage plan and comply with all NPDES and MS4 requirements, as well as the provisions of the Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance. The project would require approximately 37,100 cubic yards of cut, 54,360 cubic yards of fill and the import of approximately 17,260 cubic yards of earth.

**e) Add water features or create conditions in which standing water can accumulate that could increase habitat for mosquitoes and other vectors that transmit diseases such as the West Nile virus and result in increased pesticide use?**

The project does not propose any water features that could accumulate standing water.

**f) 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?**

The proposed construction of retail and residences will be subject to the County's Low Impact Development Ordinance, and the developer will be required to submit an approved drainage plan and comply with all NPDES and MS4 requirements.

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

The proposed construction of retail and residences will be subject to the County's Low Impact Development Ordinance to minimize or reduce runoff, and the developer will be required to submit an approved drainage plan and comply with all NPDES and MS4 requirements.

**h) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84)?**

The project will be required to comply with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance.

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

The project site is located inland from the coastal portions of Los Angeles County and connects to the municipal storm drain system. Since the proposed is subject to the County's Low Impact Development Ordinance, adherence to the requirements would prevent any substantial amount of nonpoint sources of pollutants.

The project site is not located in the vicinity of a State Water Resources Control Board ("SWRCB")-designated Area of Special Biological Significance identified on the SCRCB website, [http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/ocean/docs/asbs/asbs\\_areas/asbs\\_swqpa\\_publication0](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ocean/docs/asbs/asbs_areas/asbs_swqpa_publication0)

**j) 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 proposed project does not entail the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems.

**k) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**                       

The project will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The proposed project will be connected to the existing public water and sewer systems

**l) 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 site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped by a Federal Emergency Management Agency (“FEMA”) Flood Insurance Rate Map (“FIRM”).

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

The project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped by a Federal Emergency Management Agency (“FEMA”) Flood Insurance Rate Map (“FIRM”).

**n) 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?**                       

There are no flood zones, levees, or designated dam inundation areas in the vicinity of the project site.

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

The project site is not located within a seiche or landslide zone, or within a tsunami inundation area.

**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?**                                                                                       

The proposed project construction and subdivision of a 112-unit condominium community and 3,900 square feet of commercial space in a mixed-use area and would not result in a physical division of an established community. The project does not require the construction of new freeways or rail lines or flood control channels, and the project will conform to the existing street grid. The design will also incorporate numerous pedestrian and vehicular connections into and through the site.

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 property is within the Medium Density Residential land use category of the Countywide Land Use Plan. The Plan indicates that this land use designation indicates that the project site is suitable for both residential and local commercial uses, upon issuance of appropriate permits. The proposed project of 112 dwelling units and one commercial lot is consistent with the land use category, as the maximum residential density for the project site is 12 dwelling units per acre. The proposed densities for the condominium lots is 9.8 and 10.3 dwelling units per acre, respectively.

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

The commercial portion of the project site is located within the M-1 (Light Manufacturing) Zone, in which retail uses are allowed by right. The remainder of the project site is proposed to be changed from the M-1 to the RPD (Residential Planned Development) Zone. Both detached and attached residential condominiums are allowed in the RPD Zone.

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

The project site does not contain any area exceeding 25 percent in slope and is not subject to the requirements of the Hillside Management Ordinance. The project site is also not located within any Significant Ecological Area.

**12. MINERAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:	<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) <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?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource, as the project site is not identified as a mineral resource area on the Los Angeles County Natural Resource Areas map.

b) <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?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site, as the project site is not identified as a mineral resource area on the Los Angeles County Natural Resource Areas map.

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

The project entails the subdivision, construction, and operation of 112 residential condominium units and 3,900 square feet of retail space. The project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas. Any noise generated by the proposed project would be similar to ambient noise levels in the area, which is developed with single-family residences and commercial uses at similar densities. New stationary sources of noise, such as mechanical HVAC equipment, would be installed for the proposed uses. This equipment would be required to comply with County Code Section 12.08.530, which prohibits operation of any air conditioning or refrigeration so that its noise exceeds 55 dBA at any neighboring property.

Construction noise levels were estimated using the FHWA Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM). Receptors were selected based on proximity to the project site and noise producers (eg., roadways). Temporary noise increases at each of the receptors during construction of each project component is shown in Table 9 (Construction Noise Levels) below. Construction noise levels have been modeled separately for each project component: single-family residential, multifamily residential, and retail. Default construction equipment estimated by the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) for the entire project site has been assumed for each project component to provide a worst case analysis. Temporary noise levels during construction activity for the project will be greatest during demolition. The model indicates that the use of concrete saws, dozers, tractors, and graders could expose the single-family residence located approximately 472 feet north of the center of the single-family portion of the site to a combined maximum noise level of 70.1 dBA  $L_{max}$ , the manufactured home located approximately 206 feet east of the center of the multifamily portion of the site to a combined maximum noise level of 77.3 dBA  $L_{max}$ , and the place of worship located approximately 645 feet east of the center of the retail portion of the project site to a combined maximum noise level of 81.9 dBA  $L_{max}$ . Construction noise levels during improvements to Normandie Avenue and Lomita Boulevard have been modeled and are summarized in Table 10 (Roadway Improvement Noise Levels). Noise levels are anticipated to reach 83.4 dBA at the single family home located north of the project site (Receptor #1).

**Table 9  
Construction Noise Levels**

Receptors	Distance to Center of Activity (feet)	Construction Phase					
		Demolition	Site Preparation	Grading	Building Construction	Paving	Architectural Coating
<i>Single-Family Development</i>							
1 – Single-Family Home (N)	472	70.1	64.5	65.5	65.5	65.5	58.2
2 – Manufactured Home (E)	610	67.9	62.3	63.3	63.3	63.3	55.9
3 – Place of Worship (E)	1,165	62.2	56.7	57.7	57.7	57.7	50.3
4 – Place of Worship (S)	1,489	60.1	54.5	55.5	55.5	55.5	48.2
5 – Commercial (SW)	1,365	60.9	55.3	56.3	56.3	56.3	48.9
6 – Manufactured Home (W)	1,078	62.9	57.3	58.3	58.3	58.3	51.0
7 – Manufactured Home (W)	549	68.8	63.2	64.2	64.2	64.2	56.9
8 – Multifamily (NW)	552	68.7	63.1	64.1	64.1	64.1	56.8
<i>Multifamily Development</i>							
1 – Single-Family Home (N)	1,140	62.4	56.8	57.8	57.8	57.8	50.5
2 – Manufactured Home (E)	206	77.3	71.7	72.7	72.7	72.7	65.4
3 – Place of Worship (E)	424	71.0	66.4	66.4	66.4	66.4	59.1
4 – Place of Worship (S)	739	66.2	60.6	61.6	61.6	61.6	54.3
5 – Commercial (SW)	650	67.3	61.7	62.7	62.7	62.7	55.4
6 – Manufactured Home (W)	399	71.5	66.0	67.0	58.3	67.0	59.6
7 – Manufactured Home (W)	269	75.0	69.4	70.4	64.2	70.4	63.1
8 – Multifamily (NW)	1,200	62.0	56.4	57.4	64.1	57.4	50.1

<i>Retail Development</i>							
1 – Single-Family Home (N)	1,580	59.6	54.0	55.0	55.0	55.0	47.7
2 – Manufactured Home (E)	645	67.4	61.8	62.8	62.8	62.8	55.5
3 – Place of Worship (E)	121	81.9	76.3	77.3	77.3	77.3	70.0
4 – Place of Worship (S)	290	74.3	68.7	69.7	69.7	69.7	62.4
5 – Commercial (SW)	266	75.1	69.5	70.5	70.5	70.5	63.2
6 – Manufactured Home (W)	203	77.4	71.8	72.8	72.8	72.8	65.5
7 – Manufactured Home (W)	680	66.9	61.3	62.3	62.3	62.3	55.0
8 – Multifamily (NW)	1,615	59.4	53.8	54.8	54.8	54.8	47.5
<i>Source: MIG   Hogle-Ireland, May 2015</i>							

**Table 10  
Roadway Improvement Noise Levels**

<b>Receptor</b>	<b>Distance to Nearest Activity</b>	<b>Noise Level (dBA)</b>
1 – Single-Family Home (N)	60	83.4
2 – Manufactured Home (E)	230	71.7
3 – Place of Worship (E)	100	79.0
4 – Place of Worship (S)	205	72.7
5 – Commercial (SW)	188	73.5
6 – Manufactured Home (W)	91	79.8
7 – Manufactured Home (W)	66	82.6
8 – Storage (NW)	100	79.0
<i>Source: MIG   Hogle-Ireland, May 2015</i>		

Los Angeles County Code Section 12.08.440 prohibits construction between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. of any day, and at any time on Sundays and legal holidays. Required compliance with these time

restrictions would limit construction noise to times when people are generally less sensitive to noise and reduce the effect of construction equipment noise. The Noise Control Ordinance further states that the contractor shall conduct construction activities in such a manner that the maximum noise levels at affected buildings will not exceed those listed in the following table. All mobile and stationary internal-combustion-powered equipment and machinery is required to be equipped with suitable exhaust and air-intake silencers in proper working order.

**Table 11  
County of Los Angeles Construction Equipment Noise Restrictions**

	<b>Single-Family Residential</b>	<b>Multi-Family Residential</b>	<b>Commercial<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>Mobile Equipment: Maximum noise levels for nonscheduled, intermittent, short-term operation (less than 10 days) of mobile equipment:</b>			
Daily, except Sundays and legal holidays, 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM	75 dB(A) Leq	80 dB(A) Leq	85 dB(A) Leq
Daily, 8:00 PM to 7:00 AM and all day Sunday and legal holidays	60 dB(A) Leq	64 dB(A) Leq	70 dB(A) Leq
<b>Stationary Equipment: Maximum noise level for repetitively scheduled and relatively long-term operation (periods of ten days or more) of stationary equipment:</b>			
Daily, except Sundays and legal holidays, 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM	60 dB(A) Leq	65 dB(A) Leq	70 dB(A) Leq
Daily, 8:00 PM to 7:00 AM and all day Sunday and legal holidays	50 dB(A) Leq	55 dB(A) Leq	60 dB(A) Leq

<sup>1</sup> Refers to residential structures within a commercial area. This standard does not apply to commercial structures.

Because project construction and roadway improvement activities could exceed the above limitations and would be a substantial source of noise for the surrounding uses, noise associated with short-term construction activities is potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated. Implementation of the mitigation measures below would reduce, avoid or minimize potentially significant impacts to sensitive receptors.

Ambient noise in the project area will generally be defined by vehicular traffic on area roadways. Traffic noise from vehicular traffic generated by the proposed project was projected using SoundPlan software based on trip generation and distribution estimates in the project traffic study prepared by Kunzman Associates, Inc., dated April 29, 2015. The noise model assumes a flat topography condition (which is a worst-case scenario). Traffic noise levels were projected to the ground floor for various locations throughout the project area.

Traffic noise levels in the project area were calculated for Existing Without Project, Existing Plus Project, Existing Plus Cumulative Without Project, and Existing Plus Cumulative Plus Project scenarios using SoundPLAN (see Appendix E). Trip volumes included in the project traffic study takes into consideration related projects in the area. Traffic noise levels at various receptors are summarized in Table 12 (Existing Roadway Noise Levels) and Table 13 (Cumulative Roadway Noise Levels). As shown in Tables 14 and 15,

traffic noise levels under both without and plus project conditions exceed County and City (uses to the south are within the City of Los Angeles) Municipal Code thresholds for noise. The proposed project will not increase noise exposure to a receiver that is currently within County or City noise thresholds to significant levels. Because noise levels already exceed established County or City thresholds under the without project condition, the proposed project will not cause the exposure of persons to noise levels above established thresholds. Impacts related to the increases in roadway noise levels are discussed under subsection “c” below. Impacts will be less than significant.

**Table 12  
Existing Roadway Noise Levels**

Receptors	Allowable Noise Level (dBA CNEL)	No Project (dBA CNEL)		Plus Project (dBA CNEL)	
		AM	PM	AM	PM
1 – Single-Family Home (N)	50	72.1	71.0	72.2	71.1
2 – Manufactured Home (E)	50	59.7	59.1	58.5	57.9
3 – Place of Worship (E)	50	68.4	68.3	68.3	68.2
4 – Place of Worship (S)	60*	66.7	66.4	66.7	66.5
5 – Commercial (SW)	60*	74.0	73.8	74.1	73.9
6 – Manufactured Home (W)	50	71.5	71.2	71.6	71.3
7 – Manufactured Home (W)	50	74.0	73.8	74.8	74.6
8 – Storage (NW)	70	73.0	72.8	73.2	72.9
* City of Los Angeles Presumed Ambient Noise Level					
Source: MIG   Hogle-Ireland, May 2015					

**Table 13  
Cumulative Roadway Noise Levels**

Receptors	Allowable Noise Level (dBA CNEL)	No Project (dBA CNEL)		Plus Project (dBA CNEL)	
		AM	PM	AM	PM
1 – Single-Family Home (N)	50	72.4	71.3	72.5	71.4
2 – Manufactured Home (E)	50	59.9	59.4	58.6	58.1
3 – Place of Worship (E)	50	68.7	68.6	68.7	68.6

4 – Place of Worship (S)	60*	66.8	66.6	66.9	66.7
5 – Commercial (SW)	60*	74.1	74.0	74.2	74.1
6 – Manufactured Home (W)	50	71.7	71.5	71.8	71.6
7 – Manufactured Home (W)	50	74.2	74.1	74.9	74.9
8 – Storage (NW)	70	73.1	73.1	73.3	73.2
* City of Los Angeles Presumed Ambient Noise Level					
Source: MIG   Hogle-Ireland, May 2015					

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

As indicated above, the construction noise level at the exterior of surrounding uses could exceed the standards of the County Noise Ordinance. Because project construction activities could exceed these limitations and would be a substantial source of noise for some surrounding uses, noise associated with short-term construction activities is potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated. Implementation of the mitigation measures below would reduce, avoid or minimize potentially significant impacts to sensitive receptors.

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

The project entails the subdivision, construction, and operation of 112 residential condominium units and 3,900 square feet of retail space in an urbanized mixed-use area. The project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas. As previously discussed above under subsection “a,” any noise generated by the proposed project would be similar to ambient noise levels in the area, which is developed with residential and commercial uses at similar densities.

**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?**                       

As indicated in subsection “a” above, the construction noise level at the exterior of the eastern residences could be approximately 83 dBA. Because project construction activities could exceed the 75 dBA Leq limitation and would be a substantial source of noise for the residences to the east, noise associated with short-term construction activities is potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated. Implementation of the mitigation measures below would reduce, avoid or minimize potentially significant impacts to sensitive receptors.

**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 proposed project site is located approximately 1.92 miles east of the Torrance Airport runway. According to the Acoustical Analysis prepared for the applicant by MIG Hogle-Ireland, dated May 2015, the airport serves approximately 500 aircraft, housing primarily private aircraft. The airport also houses several Fixed Base Operators (FBOs) which are available for flight instruction, aircraft repair, and charter flights. In addition, the airport serves as the headquarters for Robinson Helicopters, the largest manufacturer of private helicopters in the United States. Regular operation hours are between 7:00 AM and 10:00 PM Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM to 10:00 PM on Saturday, Sunday, and federal holidays. The airport has two runways, running northwest to southeast. The 60 dBA CNEL noise contour is confined to the area south of Lomita Boulevard and north of Pacific Coast Highway. In addition, 65 dBA CNEL is not reported for this general aviation airport due to the low level of flight activity. Therefore, any noise-related impacts would be less than significant.

**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 within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Noise generated by construction equipment during the construction phase of the project may result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels. Construction activities will be conducted according to best management practices, including maintaining construction vehicles and equipment in good working order by using mufflers where applicable, limiting the hours of construction, and limiting the idle time of diesel engines. Noise from construction equipment will be limited by compliance with the Noise Control Ordinance and County Code Section 12.12, as well as the following mitigation measures, which shall be incorporated into the project’s Mitigation Monitoring Program:

**N-1 Construction Equipment.** If electrical service is available within 150 feet, electrical power shall be used to run air compressors and similar power tools. Internal combustion engines shall be equipped with a muffler of a type recommended by the manufacturer. No internal combustion engine shall be operated on the project site without the manufacturer-recommended muffler. All diesel equipment shall be operated with closed engine doors and shall be equipped with factory-recommended mufflers.

**N-2 Additional Construction Noise Controls.** For all mobile construction equipment operating within 250 feet of adjacent residential receptors, and for all stationary construction equipment operating on the project site, additional noise attenuation techniques shall be employed to ensure that noise remains within levels allowed by the County of Los Angeles noise restrictions. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Applicant shall submit a mitigation plan prepared by a qualified engineer or other acoustical expert for review and approval by the departments of Regional Planning and Public Health that identifies noise

control measures that achieve a minimum 20 dBA reduction in construction-related noise levels. The mitigation plan may include use of vibratory pile drivers or other pile driving noise controls, sound curtains, engineered equipment controls, or other methods. Noise control requirements shall be noted on project construction drawings and verified by the Building and Safety Division during standard inspection procedures.

**N-3 Neighbor Notification.** Provide notification to commercial and residential occupants adjacent to the project site at least 24 hours prior to initiation of construction activities that could significantly affect outdoor or indoor living areas. This notification shall include the anticipated hours and duration of construction and a description of noise reduction measures. The notification shall include a telephone number for local residents to call to submit complaints associated with construction noise. The notification shall be posted on Normandie Avenue and Lomita Boulevard adjacent to the project site, and shall be easily viewed from adjacent public areas.

## 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>
<p><b>Would the project:</b></p> <p><b>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></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in the area. Although 112 new residential units are proposed, such growth is well within the population projections of the area within the Southern California Association of Governments (“SCAG”) Regional Transportation Plan and is consistent with the prescribed density of the Medium Density Residential land use category of the General Plan. In addition, the project site is located in an urbanized area and would not require the extension of roads or utility infrastructure.

<p><b>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project would not displace existing housing, including affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The site is currently vacant, and the applicant proposes to construct 112 residential units and retail space.

<p><b>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project would not displace existing housing, including affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The site is currently vacant, and the applicant proposes to construct 112 residential units and retail space.

<p><b>d) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project would not exceed official regional or local population projections. The proposed 112 residential units will not exceed this projection. The project is consistent with the density permitted by the Countywide Land Use Plan for Medium Density Residential areas. The creation of 112 additional housing units should not alter the growth rate of the population beyond that projected in the County General Plan or result in a substantial increase in demand for additional housing or create a development that significantly reduces the ability of the county to meet housing objectives set forth in the General Plan’s Housing Element. Such growth is well within the population projections of the area within the Southern California Association of Governments (“SCAG”) Regional Transportation Plan and those of the General Plan Housing Element.

**15. PUBLIC SERVICES**

	<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 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?**

The Los Angeles County Fire Department has reviewed the proposed project and cleared it for public hearing. The nearest Los Angeles County Fire Station (#6) is located approximately 1.5 miles to the southwest in the City of Lomita. The project site is not within any High or Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone or a State Responsibility Area.

**Sheriff protection?**

The project would not create capacity or service level problems or result in substantial adverse physical impacts. The project site is approximately four (4) miles southwest of the Carson Sheriff's Station. The proposed project will add new permanent residents to the project site but not enough to substantially reduce service ratios.

**Schools?**

The project site is within the Los Angeles Unified School District. The project would create an additional 112 residential units, which would increase the school-age population to some extent. The applicant would be required to pay development impact fees to the local school districts prior to final map approval, which would result in a less-than-significant impact to school facilities.

**Parks?**

Project residents would be expected to use existing neighborhood and regional parks, but such use is not expected to result in substantial physical deterioration of those facilities. The project includes open space and private recreational use areas to serve on-site residents—not for public use. The project has a park land obligation of 0.91 acres or \$359,229 in in-lieu fees, per Los Angeles County Code Section 21.28.140. The park obligation for this project will be met by the payment of a \$359,229 in-lieu fee by the applicant to the Department of Parks and Recreation prior to Final Map approval. The nearest public park is Ken Malloy Harbor Regional Park, which is approximately 0.8 miles to the south in the City of Los Angeles.

**Libraries?**

The proposed project will generate 112 residential units, and thus increase the population. However, the

developer would be required to pay a library mitigation fee, per Section 22.72.030 of the County Code.

**Other public facilities?**

The project is not perceived to create capacity or service level problems or result in substantial adverse physical impacts for any other public facility.

## 16. RECREATION

- |   | <i>Potentially<br/>Significant<br/>Impact</i> | <i>Less Than<br/>Significant<br/>Impact with<br/>Mitigation<br/>Incorporated</i> | <i>Less Than<br/>Significant<br/>Impact</i> | <i>No<br/>Impact</i>     |
|---|---|--|---|--------------------------|
| a) <b>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> | <input type="checkbox"/>                      | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>         | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Project residents would be expected to use existing neighborhood and regional parks, but such use is not expected to result in substantial physical deterioration of those facilities. The project includes open space and private recreational use areas to serve on-site residents—not for public use. The project has a park land obligation of 0.91 acres or \$359,229 in in-lieu fees, per Los Angeles County Code Section 21.28.140. The park obligation for this project will be met by the payment of a \$359,229 in-lieu fee by the applicant to the Department of Parks and Recreation prior to Final Map approval. The nearest public park is Ken Malloy Harbor Regional Park, which is approximately 0.8 miles to the south in the City of Los Angeles.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) <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?</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project does include open space and recreational use areas to serve on-site residents, although these facilities are relatively small in nature and would not be open to the general public. The 112 dwelling units that would be created by the project are not enough to require the construction of significant new recreational facilities in the area.

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

The project would not serve to separate any open space from residents or any other 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?

                                                                

The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The growth proposed by the project is accounted for in the Baseline Growth Forecast of the 2008 Southern California Association of Governments' Regional Transportation Plan ("RTP"), which provided the basis for developing the land use assumptions at the regional and small-area levels that established the 2008 Regional Transportation Plan Alternative.

A traffic impact study was conducted by Kunzman Associates, Inc., dated April 29, 2015, to assess project-related traffic impacts. This analysis studied an earlier version of the project that proposed 112 dwelling units. The traffic impact analysis analyzed the four intersections (Normandie/Project North Access, Normandie/Project South Access, Normandie/Lomita, and Lomita/Project Access). Three of the four studied intersections are future project access driveways and do not exist under current conditions. Both daily and peak hour trip generation for the proposed development are shown in Table 14 (Project Trip Generation Summary). The proposed development is projected to generate approximately 1,180 trips per day, and 103 vehicles per hour during the A.M. peak hour and 112 vehicles per hour during the P.M. peak hour. Table 14 summarizes net trips based on the estimated trip generation from existing auto repair and maintenance uses.

**Table 14  
Project Trip Generation Summary**

Land Use	Peak Hour						Daily
	AM			PM			
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	
Specialty Retail Center	13	14	27	5	6	11	173
Townhomes	2	19	21	18	10	28	312
Single Family Detached	14	41	55	46	27	73	695
<i>Total Project Trips</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>112</i>	<i>1,180</i>

Existing Trips	-21	-11	-32	-21	-22	-43	-285
<b>Net Trips Generated</b>	<b>+8</b>	<b>+63</b>	<b>+71</b>	<b>+48</b>	<b>+21</b>	<b>+69</b>	<b>+895</b>
<i>Source: Kunzman Associates, Inc, April 2015</i>							

Existing Plus Project Plus Cumulative intersection level of service is shown in Table 15 (Existing Plus Project Plus Cumulative Intersection Capacity Utilization and Level of Service). As shown, Normandie Avenue at Lomita Boulevard is projected to operate at unacceptable level of service (LOS) during the morning peak hour under existing conditions. Table 16 (Existing Plus Project Plus Cumulative Significant Impact Evaluation) shows the Existing Plus Project Plus Cumulative traffic contribution at the study area intersection. As shown in Table 16, the project significantly impacts the study area intersection without intersection improvements. Mitigation Measure T-1 requires the project proponent to pay a fair share fee for the construction of a southbound right turn overlap lane and an eastbound right turn lane at this intersection. Project fair share calculations are included in Table 17 (Project Fair Share Calculations). With implementation of Mitigation Measure T-1, impacts will be less than significant.

**Table 15**  
**Existing Plus Project Plus Cumulative Intersection Capacity Utilization and Level of Service**

Intersection	Jurisdiction	Traffic Control	Peak Hour Level of Service		
			AM	PM	
Normandie Avenue at Project North Access	Los Angeles County	CSS	0.427 A	0.388 A	
Normandie Avenue at Project South Access	Los Angeles County	CSS	0.394 A	0.393 A	
Normandie Avenue at Lomita Boulevard	Los Angeles County	TS	Without Improvements	1.084 F	0.908 E
			With Improvements	0.942 E	0.848 D
Project Access at Lomita Boulevard	Los Angeles County	CSS			
<i>Source: Kunzman Associates, Inc, April 2015</i>					
TS	<i>Traffic Signal</i>				
CSS	<i>Cross Street Stop</i>				

**Table 16**  
**Existing Plus Project Plus Cumulative Intersection Capacity Utilization and Level of Service**

Intersection	Peak Hour	Existing		Existing Plus Project Plus Cumulative							
		ICU	LOS	Without Improvements				With Improvements			
				ICU	LOS	Project Impact	Significant Impact <sup>1</sup>	ICU	LOS	Project Impact	Significant Impact <sup>1</sup>
Normandie Ave at Lomita Blvd	AM	1.040	F	1.084	F	0.044	Yes	0.942	E	-0.098	No
	PM	0.865	D	0.908	E	0.043	Yes	0.848	D	-0.017	No

Source: Kunzman Associates, Inc, April 2015

1 In Los Angeles County, an impact is considered significant if the project related increase in the volume to capacity ratio equals or exceeds the thresholds shown below:

<u>Level of Service</u>	<u>Volume/Capacity</u>	<u>Incremental Increase</u>
C	0.71-0.80	0.04 or more
D	0.81-0.90	0.02 or more
E/F	0.91-more	0.01 or more

**Table 17**  
**Project Fair Share Calculations**

Intersection	Improvement	Project Traffic		Total New Traffic		Project Percent of New Traffic		Project Fair Share Percentage
		AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	
Normandie Ave at Lomita Blvd	Construct southbound right turn overlap	42	48	225	271	18.7%	17.7%	18.7%
	Construct eastbound right turn lane							

Source: Kunzman Associates, Inc, April 2015

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?

Pursuant to the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Congestion Management Plan (CMP), any project that adds 150 or more vehicle trips to freeway segments or 50 or more vehicle trips to roadway segments during peak hours must be examined for impact of CMP roadways and intersections. There are no CMP roadway segments within the project vicinity. The project would therefore not conflict with an applicable congestion management program or level of service standard established by the congestion management agency. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.

**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?**                       

The project will not encroach into 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)?**                       

The project does not entail creating sharp curves or dangerous intersections or incompatible uses. Therefore, there will be no increased hazards due to design features.

**e) Result in inadequate emergency access?**                       

The proposed subdivision, construction, and operation of 112 residential condominiums and 3,900 square feet of retail space would not block or provide inadequate emergency access for the project itself or make existing emergency access to off-site properties inadequate. Emergency access has been reviewed and cleared by the Los Angeles County Fire Department.

**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?**                       

Public bus transit service in the project vicinity is currently provided by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Torrance Transit, and Gardena Municipal Bus Lines. Metro operates two transit bus routes in the project vicinity. Route 205 runs north-south from San Pedro to Willowbrook via Western Avenue, Vermont Avenue, and Wilmington Avenue. Route 550 is an express route and runs north-south from San Pedro to Downtown Los Angeles via Normandie Avenue, Vermont Avenue, and the Harbor Transitway. Torrance Transit Route 9 provides transit service at the project site with a stop located at Normandie Avenue and Lomita Boulevard. Route 9 runs east-west from Anza Avenue to Avalon Boulevard. Gardena Municipal Bus Line 2 serves a loop along Normandie Avenue, Vermont Avenue, Imperial Highway, Western Avenue and Pacific Coast Highway.

The proposed project is consistent with the County's Healthy Design Ordinance, as there are numerous five-foot-wide pedestrian pathways into and through the site, as well as a perimeter pathway around the residential area. There would also be direct pedestrian connections between the residential area, private recreational areas, and the commercial area. There are no specific bicycle parking requirements for single-family residences, although any future commercial development on the site would be required to provide such facilities. According to the Los Angeles County 2012 Bicycle Master Plan, there is an existing class II bike path along Normandie Avenue and a proposed class II bike path along Lomita Boulevard, both of which are immediately adjacent to the project site. The proposed project would not interfere with any

designated bikeways, pedestrian, or transit facilities. The proposed project will not result in any changes to lane or street configuration of Normandie Avenue or Lomita Boulevard, or to existing sidewalks that could affect performance or safety of alternative transportation facilities. Therefore, the project impact would be less than significant.

## **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

As shown in Table 16, the project significantly impacts the study area intersection without intersection improvements. Mitigation Measure T-1 requires the project proponent to pay a fair share fee for the construction of a southbound right turn overlap lane and an eastbound right turn lane at this intersection. Project fair share calculations are included in Table 17 (Project Fair Share Calculations). With implementation of Mitigation Measure T-1, impacts will be less than significant:

- T-1 Right Turn Lanes.** Prior to issuance of Final Map, the permittee shall contribute fair share funds for the construction of a southbound right turn overlap lane and an eastbound right turn lane at the intersection of Normandie Avenue and Lomita Boulevard, to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

**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 Impa ct</i>
--	---	--	---	---------------------------

Would the project:

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

The subdivision, construction, and operation of 112 residential condominiums and 3,900 square feet of retail space is not expected to exceed treatment requirements of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. All public wastewater disposal (sewer) systems are required to obtain and operate under the terms of an NPDES (National Pollution Discharge Elimination System) permit, which is issued by the local Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Because all municipal wastewater treatment facilities are required to obtain NPDES permits from the RWQCB, any project which would connect to such a system would be required to comply with the same standards imposed by the NPDES permit. As such, these connections would ensure the project's compliance.

- 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 sewer area study prepared by Fuscoe Engineering (dated 06/09/2015) has been conducted, and it determined that existing sewer mains downstream of the proposed project have sufficient capacity to accept additional wastewater. Wastewater generated in the area is treated at the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant in Carson. Sewage increase due to proposed project would be less than significant and further capacity analysis of wastewater reclamation plants is not necessary. The conclusions of the sewer area study shall be reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Works.

- 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 project will comply with the most recently approved hydrology and all drainage and grading plans prior to building permit to ensure that the project would not create drainage system capacity problems, and that no construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities is required. The project will comply with the County's Low Impact Development Ordinance ("LID") as part of the approved hydrology to comply with storm water quality runoff requirements.

- 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?

The project has provided a “will serve” letter from the local public water purveyor (California Water Services Company), which indicates that the purveyor has sufficient supply and capacity to serve the proposed project.

**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 subdivision, construction, and operation of 112 residential condominiums and 3,900 square feet of retail space will not significantly impact the availability of adequate energy supplies and should not create energy utility capacity problems or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities. In addition, any future construction will be subject to the Cal Green building standards, which is required to provide energy saving measures to further reduce the amount of energy consumed by the proposed project.

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

Development at the proposed density at this location is planned for under the existing Los Angeles County Regional Waste Management Plan. Due to the relatively small scale of the proposed project, the proposal to subdivide, construct, and operate 112 residential condominiums and 3,900 square feet of retail space should not significantly impact solid waste disposal capacity.

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

The project would be required to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 requires the County of Los Angeles to attain specific waste diversion goals. In addition, the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991 mandates that expanded or new development projects to incorporate storage areas for recycling bins into the existing design. The project will include sustainable elements to ensure compliance with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. It is anticipated that these project elements will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations to reduce the amount of solid waste. The project will not displace an existing or proposed waste disposal, recycling, or diversion site.

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 project does not 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. As analyzed in the Initial Study sections above, the proposed project will have no impact or less than significant impact in all these areas upon implementation of appropriate mitigation measures.

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

The proposed project does not achieve short-term goals to the disadvantage of long-term goals. The proposed use and density complies with the existing and proposed General Plan, General Plan Housing Element, and Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact.

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

The proposed project does not have cumulative impacts. The proposed project will not be an inducement to future growths, as the project does not require additional infrastructure beyond that necessary to serve the project. The Traffic Study prepared for the project also indicates that cumulative traffic effects would be less than significant with proposed mitigation measures. There are no impacts that are cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact with appropriate mitigation measures.

d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human

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

**beings, either directly or indirectly?**

The project will require mitigation measures regarding air quality, cultural resources, hazards/hazardous materials, noise, and transportation/traffic in order for its impacts on human beings in these areas to be less than significant. These measures are delineated in the attached Mitigation Monitoring Program document. No other substantial adverse effects on human beings were identified. Therefore, the overall impact of the project on humans would be less than significant with appropriate mitigation.