

Environmental Checklist Form (Initial Study)

County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning

Project title: “Density Bonus Ordinance Update” (if applicable) / Project No. 2018-000572 / Case No(s) RPPL2018000900, RPPL2018000901 (Initial Study).

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

Contact Person and phone number: Ayala Scott, Senior Regional Planner 213-974-6417

Project sponsor’s name and address: County-initiated project

Project location: (Countywide)
APN: _____ *USGS Quad:* _____

Gross Acreage: Countywide

General plan designation: Countywide

Community/Area wide Plan designation: Countywide

Zoning: Applicable to all zones where permitted

Description of project:

Project Description:

The project is an update to the County’s Density Bonus Ordinance, which implements the State Density Bonus Law to promote affordable and senior housing in the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. To implement the State law, the project will:

- allow density bonuses for projects with set-asides for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), for senior citizen housing, and for land donations,
- include parking ratios for density bonus projects, including affordable housing within a ½ mile of transit,
- allow unlimited waivers of development standards that physically preclude a density bonus project with affordable set-asides from being built at the densities and/or with the incentives permitted by the density bonus,

- allow up to three incentives that result in identifiable and actual cost reductions to provide for affordable housing costs or affordable rents for the affordable housing set-aside units, and
- require rental housing set-asides to be affordable for 55 years, and require for-sale housing set-asides to be affordable to the initial buyer and subject to equity sharing with the County upon resale,
- require rental housing for senior citizens to be age-restricted for 55 years, and require for-sale housing for senior citizens to be age-restricted to the initial buyer,
- require one-to-one replacement of existing affordable rental units and affordable rental units demolished or vacated in the five-year period before application submittal,
- require density bonuses and affordable housing set-asides to be calculated by rounding fractional units up to the nearest whole number.

In addition to implementing State law, the project will result in the following local regulations to incentivize affordable housing:

- the addition of an extremely low income affordability category, with its own set-aside requirements, corresponding density bonuses and three incentives,
- no parking requirement for extremely low income units,
- options for a density bonus for a rental or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside,
- options for additional density bonuses as an incentive,
- ministerial review in certain commercial zones of affordable housing density bonus projects (apartment houses) that meet the criteria for a CEQA exemption,
- exemption from planning fees for 100% affordable housing projects, and reduced planning fees for other affordable housing projects; and
- ministerial review of mixed use and joint live-work developments in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, if development standards are waived or modified in accordance with the Density Bonus Ordinance with an Administrative Housing Permit.

Finally, the project will amend Title 21 and Title 22 for editorial consistency with the proposed ordinance.

Surrounding land uses and setting: Countywide

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

| <i>Public Agency</i> | <i>Approval Required</i> |
|----------------------|--------------------------|
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |

Major projects in the area:

| <i>Project/Case No.</i> | <i>Description and Status</i> |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <i>n/a</i> | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |

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
- State of California Department of Housing and Community Development
- State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research
- SCAG

Regional Significance

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

Trustee Agencies

- None
- State Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- State Dept. of Parks and Recreation

County Reviewing Agencies

- DPW

- Fire Department
 - Forestry, Environmental Division
 - Planning Division
 - Land Development Unit

- State Lands Commission
- University of California
(Natural Land and Water
Reserves System)

- Health Hazmat
- Sanitation District
- Public
Health/Environmental
Health Division: Land Use
Program (OWTS), Drinking
Water Program (Private
Wells), Toxics Epidemiology
Program (Noise)
- Sheriff Department
- Parks and Recreation
- Subdivision Committee
- Community Development
Commission
- Office of Los Angeles
County Counsel
- Public Library

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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


6/28/18

Signature (Prepared by) Ayala Scott, Senior Regional Planner Date


6/28/18

Signature (Approved by) Connie Chung, Supervising Regional Planner Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources the Lead Department cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the Lead Department has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly

explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced.)

- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA processes, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15063(c)(3)(D).) In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 7) The explanation of each issue should identify: the significance threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, and; mitigation measures identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. Sources of thresholds include Los Angeles County General Plan, other County planning documents, and County ordinances. Some thresholds are unique to geographical locations.
- 8) Climate Change Impacts: When determining whether a project's impacts are significant, the analysis should consider, when relevant, the effects of future climate change on : 1) worsening hazardous conditions that pose risks to the project's inhabitants and structures (e.g., floods and wildfires), and 2) worsening the project's impacts on the environment (e.g., impacts on special status species and public health).

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?

A scenic vista is typically defined as a public view of highly valued visual and scenic resources such as urban skylines and distant mountain ranges, particularly from public vantage points. The diverse landscape of unincorporated Los Angeles County contains many scenic vistas, including portions of Mulholland Highway, Las Virgenes Road, Malibu Canyon Road, Topanga Canyon Boulevard and Angeles Crest Highway, which are adopted Scenic Highways. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is not likely to result in development that would impact scenic vistas, including views along a scenic highway or scenic corridor.

Affordable and senior housing tend to locate in infill areas near transit and services because occupants of affordable and senior housing are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. Infill areas are less likely to contain or be near scenic vistas. Density bonus projects are unlikely to be located in scenic areas due to the lack of zoning that permits multifamily uses in these areas. These areas are generally zoned for open space, where density bonuses are not permitted. As the General Plan protects visual resources, the project is not likely to locate development in an area that is substantially visible from, nor obstruct views from, a scenic area.

Density bonuses would be difficult to utilize in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, Significant Ecological Areas, Hillside Management Areas, or sensitive habitat areas in the Coastal Zone. Los Angeles County scenic highways, routes, drives, and scenic elements identified in the Santa Monica Mountains Local Coastal Program are largely located within or next to these areas, which have development standards and permitting requirements that are intended to protect people, property, and biological resources. In addition, these areas are generally zoned for low density single-family development, where it would be difficult to utilize a density bonus. Even if a density bonus development contained single-family homes, the amount of land required for such a project would most likely restrict the project’s potential to be built, and the subdivision process, which is subject to CEQA, would likely require mitigations. Furthermore, the ordinance does not provide additional density bonuses as incentive with ministerial review in the rural mixed use or rural commercial zone, even if the project were to meet the criteria for a CEQA exemption. This would further reduce the potential impact of the ordinance on scenic vistas, which are closer to rural areas.

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

Trails are scenic and recreational resources that exist within the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. The ordinance is unlikely to result in impacts from developments that are substantially visible from or that will obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail.

Affordable and senior housing tend to locate in infill areas near transit and services because occupants of affordable and senior housing are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. Regional riding and hiking trails are less likely to contain or be near these areas. Density bonus projects are unlikely to be located in areas with regional riding and hiking trails due to the lack of zoning that permits multifamily and mixed uses in these areas. These areas tend to be zoned for open space, where density bonuses are not permitted. As the General Plan protects visual resources, the project is not likely to locate development in an area that is substantially visible from, nor obstruct views from, a regional riding or hiking trail.

Density bonuses would be difficult to utilize in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, Significant Ecological Areas, Hillside Management Areas, or sensitive habitat areas in the Coastal Zone. Trails in Los Angeles County are largely located within or next to these areas, which have development standards and permitting requirements that are intended to protect people, property, and biological resources. In addition, these areas are generally zoned for low density single-family development, where it would be difficult to utilize a density bonus. Even if a density bonus development contained single-family homes, the amount of land required for such a project would most likely restrict the project's potential to be built, and the subdivision process, which is subject to CEQA, would likely require mitigations.

Furthermore, the ordinance does not provide additional density bonuses as incentive with ministerial review in the rural mixed use or rural commercial zone, even if the project were to meet the criteria for a CEQA exemption. This would further reduce the potential impact of the ordinance on scenic vistas, which are closer to regional riding and hiking trails.

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

Portions of Mulholland Highway, Las Virgenes Road, Malibu Canyon Road, Topanga Canyon Boulevard and Angeles Crest Highway are adopted scenic highways. Furthermore, the Santa Monica Mountains

Local Coastal Program identifies scenic elements, which are “designated areas that contain exceptionally-scenic features unique not only to the Santa Monica Mountains, but to the Los Angeles County region. These areas are characterized by rare or unique geologic formations, such as large rock outcroppings and sheer canyon walls, as well as coastline viewsheds, undisturbed hillsides and/or riparian or woodland habitat with intact locally-indigenous vegetation and plant communities.”

Affordable and senior housing tend to locate in infill areas near transit and services because occupants of affordable senior housing are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. Infill areas are less likely to contain or be near state scenic highways. In addition, density bonus projects are unlikely to be located in areas along state scenic highways due to the lack of zoning that permits multifamily and mixed uses in these areas. Goals and land use policies set forth in the SMMLCP seek to preserve scenic elements and significant ridgelines, not only for the sake of the resources themselves, but also for the “line-of-sight” to these resources. In addition, as the General Plan protects visual resources, the project is not likely to locate development in an area that is substantially visible from, nor obstruct views from, a state scenic highway.

Scenic highways and resources are located within or next to areas where density bonuses would be difficult to utilize, including Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, Significant Ecological Areas, Hillside Management Areas and sensitive habitat areas in the Coastal Zone. These areas have development standards and permitting requirements that are intended to protect people, property, and biological resources. The areas described above are also generally zoned for low-density single-family development. Even if a density bonus development contained single-family homes, the amount of land required for such a project would most likely restrict the project’s potential to be built, and the subdivision process, which is subject to CEQA, would likely require mitigations.

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?

The ordinance could result in more housing overall that does not conform to height or setback limitations. However, the impact to visual character would be less than significant. Density bonus projects are likely to locate in areas with zoning that permits multifamily and mixed uses. Furthermore, affordable and senior housing tend to locate in urban areas near transit and services. These areas tend to be built-out and have visual character typical of urban or suburban environments, so new density bonus projects would not cause significant visual impacts compared to what is existing.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon the physical environment, or on any real property that is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following projects would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

If the project does not meet the findings for ministerial review and thresholds for CEQA exemptions, if applicable, the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including: that the project will not be detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site; that the proposed project has been designed to be complimentary to the surrounding area in terms of land use patterns and design; and that any proposed incentives will contribute to the use and enjoyment of persons residing within the proposed project. The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would reduce any potential impacts to visual character to less than significant.

The visual character of areas within a half-mile of transit would not be significantly impacted by the parking requirements in the ordinance, or by eliminating the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households. This is because the parking provisions would reduce the potential visual impact generated by parking structures or parking areas.

Furthermore, the commercial zones (C-H, C-1, C-2, and C-3) where apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review under the ordinance, are generally in built-out areas with an urban or suburban visual character, at densities and intensities that would be comparable to the residential use proposed by a density bonus project. The CEQA exemptions mostly apply to infill sites or sites previously developed with urban uses in urbanized areas and/or areas near transit.

Furthermore, density bonus apartment projects would not be a ministerially permitted use in the Commercial Manufacturing (C-M) zone under the ordinance. In addition, the ordinance would not permit apartment projects in the Commercial Recreation (C-R) zone, where apartments are not permitted. The other commercial zone, C-MJ (Major Commercial), is not currently mapped, so the potential impact of the Density Bonus Ordinance Update on housing in this zone would be less than significant.

In the unlikely event that a project is located outside of urban infill areas, other considerations include: The ordinance does not provide additional density bonuses as incentive with ministerial review in the rural mixed use or rural commercial zone, even if the project were to meet the criteria for a CEQA exemption. This would further reduce the potential impact of the ordinance on visual character.

Furthermore, density bonuses would be difficult to utilize in areas most vulnerable to impacts from height, bulk and scale, including Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, Significant Ecological Areas, Hillside Management Areas, or sensitive habitat areas in the Coastal Zone. These areas have development standards and permitting requirements that are intended to protect people, property, and biological resources. These areas are generally zoned for open space, where density bonus projects are not permitted. In addition, these areas are generally zoned for low density single-family development, where it would be difficult to utilize a density bonus. Even if a density bonus development contained single-family homes, the amount of land required for such a project would most likely restrict the project's potential to be built, and the subdivision process, which is subject to CEQA, would likely require mitigations.

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

Density bonus projects are likely to locate in areas with zoning that permits multifamily or mixed uses. Furthermore, affordable and senior housing tend to locate in urban areas near transit and services. These areas tend to be built-out and have visual character typical of urban or suburban environments, so the potential impact of new sources of light, glare, and shadows due to new density bonus projects would be less than significant compared to what is existing.

Density bonus projects that request incentives such as additional height and reduced setbacks could cast shadows that could affect views in the neighborhood. However, the impact to views of any shadows, light or glare would be less than significant. Furthermore, the impacts to views from shadows, light and glare within a half-mile of transit would not be impacted by the parking requirements in the ordinance, or by eliminating the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses

to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including: that the project will not be detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site; that the proposed project has been designed to be complimentary to the surrounding area in terms of land use patterns and design; and that any proposed incentives will contribute to the use and enjoyment of persons residing within the proposed project. The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would reduce any potential impacts to views from shadows, light or glare to less than significant.

Infill areas have existing sources of shadows, light and glare with impacts that are not likely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus project. The commercial zones (C-H, C-1, C-2, and C-3) where density bonus apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review under the ordinance, are in built-out areas. The CEQA exemptions mostly apply to infill sites or sites previously developed with urban uses in urbanized areas and/or areas near transit.

For the same reasons, the ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would be unlikely to impact views from shadows, light or glare.

Furthermore, density bonus apartment projects would not be a ministerially permitted use in the Commercial Manufacturing (C-M) zone under the ordinance. In addition, the ordinance would not permit apartment projects in the Commercial Recreation (C-R) zone, where apartments are not permitted. The other commercial zone, C-MJ (Major Commercial), is not currently mapped, so the potential impact of the Density Bonus Ordinance Update on housing in this zone would be less than significant.

In the unlikely event that a project is located outside of urban infill areas, other considerations include: The ordinance does not provide additional density bonuses as incentive with ministerial review in the rural mixed use or rural commercial zone, even if the project were to meet the criteria for a CEQA exemption. This would further reduce the potential impact of shadows, light and glare in rural areas.

Furthermore, density bonuses would be difficult to utilize in areas most vulnerable to impacts from shadows, light or glare, including Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, Significant Ecological Areas, Hillside Management Areas, or sensitive habitat areas in the Coastal Zone. These areas have development standards and permitting requirements that are intended to protect people, property, and biological resources. These areas are generally zoned for open space, where density bonus projects are not permitted. In addition, these areas are generally zoned for low density single-family development, where it would be difficult to utilize a density bonus. Even if a density bonus development contained single-family homes, the amount of land required for such a project would most likely restrict the project's potential to be built, and the subdivision process, which is subject to CEQA, would likely require mitigations.

The County's Dark Skies Ordinance protects areas in the Antelope, Santa Clarita and San Fernando valleys and the Santa Monica Mountains North Area from light pollution by requiring measures, such as directing lighting towards the ground.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The analysis concludes that the Density Bonus Ordinance Update will not result in significant impacts to aesthetics and visual resources. This is due to the following:

Affordable and senior housing tend to be built in urban infill areas near transit and services because the occupants are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. In addition, extremely low income housing generally serves people with special needs and is usually accompanied by on-site supportive services, making urban infill areas appropriate locations. Therefore, the potential impact of affordable and senior housing on aesthetics would be less than significant compared to what is existing.

Density bonus projects that request incentives such as additional height and reduced setbacks could affect aesthetics or visual resources in the neighborhood. However, the impact would be less than significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a

moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including: that the project will not be detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site; that the proposed project has been designed to be complimentary to the surrounding area in terms of land use patterns and design; and that any proposed incentives will contribute to the use and enjoyment of persons residing within the proposed project. The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would reduce any potential impacts to aesthetics or visual resources to less than significant.

Infill areas have existing sources of aesthetic impacts that are not likely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus project. The commercial zones (C-H, C-1, C-2, and C-3) where density bonus apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review under the ordinance, are in built-out areas. The CEQA exemptions mostly apply to infill sites or sites previously developed with urban uses in urbanized areas and/or areas near transit.

For the same reasons, the ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would be unlikely to create significant aesthetic impacts.

Furthermore, density bonus apartment projects would not be a ministerially permitted use in the Commercial Manufacturing (C-M) zone under the ordinance. In addition, the ordinance would not permit apartment projects in the Commercial Recreation (C-R) zone, where apartments are not permitted. The other commercial zone, C-MJ (Major Commercial), is not currently mapped, so the potential impact of the Density Bonus Ordinance Update on housing in this zone would be less than significant.

In the rare event that a density bonus project is proposed in or near a scenic area, regional hiking trails, or near a scenic highway, density bonuses would be difficult to utilize in areas most vulnerable to aesthetic impacts, including Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, Significant Ecological Areas, Hillside Management Areas, or sensitive habitat areas in the Coastal Zone. These areas have development standards and permitting requirements that are intended to protect people, property, and biological resources. These areas are generally zoned for open space, where density bonus projects are not permitted. In addition, these areas are generally zoned for low density single-family development, where it would be difficult to utilize a density bonus. Even if a density bonus development contained single-family homes, the amount of land required for such a project would most likely restrict the project's potential to be built, and the subdivision process, which is subject to CEQA, would likely require mitigations.

Furthermore, Los Angeles County's Dark Skies Ordinance would protect areas in the Antelope, Santa Clarita and San Fernando valleys and the Santa Monica Mountains North Area from light pollution by requiring measures, such as directing lighting towards the ground. The ordinance update does not provide additional density bonuses as incentive with ministerial review in the rural mixed use or rural commercial zone, even if the project were to meet the criteria for a CEQA exemption. This would further reduce the potential impact to aesthetics in rural areas, which are closer to scenic resources and scenic highways.

Other aspects of the ordinance, including equity sharing on for-sale units, one-for-one replacement of affordable units, the requirement for affordability covenants for 55 years, and fee exemptions and reductions for projects would not increase the amount of housing and therefore would have no impact on aesthetics.

2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST

| 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) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Agricultural Resource Areas (ARAs) are unincorporated areas in the Santa Clarita and Antelope valleys, where farming in unincorporated Los Angeles County is generally concentrated. ARAs include Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, and other areas identified in the General Plan. ARAs are almost exclusively zoned for agricultural and single-family residential uses.

Affordable and senior housing is generally located in areas close to public transit and social services. The County’s farmland is generally not located in areas well served by public transit and easily accessible to social services. Therefore, the potential of density bonus projects to cause the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use would be less than significant.

In order to qualify for a density bonus, a project must have at least five units pre-bonus. Agricultural zoning, which would not change with the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, precludes apartment development. Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots that would meet the minimum lot size in farmland areas. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts to farmland are significant.

Other residential uses eligible for a density bonus, including adult residential facilities serving seven or more people, density-controlled developments, mobile home parks and townhouses, are only allowed in agricultural zones with a discretionary review, which would also be subject to CEQA.

While farmworker housing could be eligible for a density bonus in an agricultural zone, no farmworker housing has been built in unincorporated Los Angeles County since the Farmworker Housing Ordinance was adopted in 2010. Farmworker housing is allowed ministerially in agricultural zones, but supports farmland employment, so farmworker housing is unlikely to cause the conversion of ARAs to non-

agricultural use. In addition, the County is required to comply with State law ensuring that farmworker housing be considered an agricultural or residential use. Farmworker housing would also typically qualify for a CEQA exemption.

The ordinance does not provide additional density bonuses as incentive with ministerial review in the Rural Mixed Use (MXD-RU) or Rural Commercial zone (C-RU), even if the project were to meet the criteria for a CEQA exemption. This would further reduce the potential impact to farmland. While a density bonus project requesting set-asides and bonuses in the amounts set by State law could locate in one of these zones, almost none contain ARAs, rendering any potential impact less than significant.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in projects that would conflict with agricultural zoning, an Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract.

Affordable housing is generally located in areas close to public transit and social services. The County’s agricultural zones are generally not located in areas well served by public transit and easily accessible to social services. Therefore, the potential of density bonus projects to conflict with agricultural zoning would be less than significant.

In addition, agricultural zones are primarily designed to permit agricultural and single-family residential uses. In order to qualify for a density bonus, a project must have at least five units pre-bonus. Agricultural zoning, which would not change with the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, precludes apartment development. Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots that would meet the minimum lot size in agriculturally zoned areas. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts are significant.

Other residential uses eligible for a density bonus, including adult residential facilities serving seven or more people, density-controlled developments, mobile home parks and townhouses, are only allowed in agricultural zones with discretionary review, which would also be subject to CEQA.

Farmworker housing is allowed ministerially in agricultural zones, so this housing type would not conflict with agricultural zoning. If an agriculturally zoned property were to be rezoned in conjunction with a density bonus project, the rezoning would be subject to CEQA review.

Furthermore, Los Angeles County does not participate in agricultural Williamson Act contracts, nor are there designated Agricultural Opportunity Areas in unincorporated Los Angeles County.

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))?

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in projects that would conflict with forest or timberland zoning or cause forest or timberland to be rezoned.

There are no areas zoned Timberland Production or areas zoned only for forest or timberland in unincorporated Los Angeles County. The Angeles National Forest and Los Padres National Forest lie within the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County and are managed by the U.S. Forest Service. These forest areas, as well as areas where timber production is permitted, are zoned for watershed, open space, agriculture and a limited amount of low-density residential and rural commercial development. These zones permit single-family homes but not multifamily homes.

Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots that would meet the minimum lot size in forest areas. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts to forests are significant. Development within the areas zoned for watershed must also be approved by the Forest Service. Any rezoning, even if it is in conjunction with a density bonus project, would be subject to a discretionary review, which would include CEQA review.

Other residential uses eligible for a density bonus, including adult residential facilities serving seven or more people, density-controlled developments, mobile home parks and townhouses, are only allowed in agricultural zones with discretionary review, which would be subject to CEQA review.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

The Angeles National Forest and Los Padres National Forest lie within the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County and are managed by the U.S. Forest Service. These forest areas are zoned for watershed, open space, agriculture and a limited amount of low-density residential and rural commercial development. These zones permit single-family homes but not multifamily homes. In order to qualify for a density bonus, a project must have at least five units pre-bonus.

Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots that would meet the minimum lot size in forest areas. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts to forest land are significant.

Development within the areas zoned for watershed must also be approved by the Forest Service. Any rezoning, even if it is in conjunction with a density bonus project, would be subject to a discretionary review, which would include CEQA review.

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?

It is unlikely that the Density Bonus Ordinance Update will result in development that will encroach on agricultural or forest land with incompatible uses.

The County's forests and farmland largely contain, and are surrounded by, areas zoned for watershed, agriculture and open space. Zoning and land use regulations effectively preclude multifamily development in most areas immediately surrounding forests and farmland. Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots that would meet the minimum lot size in forest and farmland areas. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts to forests or farmland are significant. Development within the areas zoned for watershed must also be approved by the Forest Service as part of an overall recreational plan.

Other residential uses eligible for a density bonus, including adult residential facilities serving seven or more people, density-controlled developments, mobile home parks and townhouses, are only allowed in agricultural zones with discretionary review, which would also be subject to CEQA.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The analysis concludes that the ordinance will not result in significant impacts to agricultural or forest land. This is due to the following:

Forests and farmland in Los Angeles County are relatively isolated from urban areas where affordable housing is generally located. Affordable housing is usually located in areas close to public transit and social services. The County's forests and farmland and the surrounding areas are not well served by public transit nor are they easily accessible to social services. Therefore, forest and farmland would not be significantly impacted.

In addition, forest and farmland areas and their immediate environs in Los Angeles County are generally zoned in a way that would preclude most density bonus projects, which are multifamily. Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots that would meet standards for minimum lot sizes in these areas, which tend to be large. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts to forests or farmland are significant.

Projects using the density bonus would be subject to CEQA review, as applicable. Therefore, any impacts related to the above would be addressed and mitigation may be required.

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 Density Bonus Ordinance Update is not likely to conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD).

Density bonus projects that are otherwise consistent with the underlying land use at the project site will be consistent with the goals of the applicable air quality plans. The General Plan permits deviations to the Land Use Legend and Land Use Policy Map, such as an increase in density above the maximum allowable density, to accommodate density bonuses to create affordable and senior citizen housing, as density bonuses for these projects implement the goals of the General Plan.

Furthermore, density bonuses are much more likely to be utilized in areas zoned to allow multifamily uses, because density bonus projects tend to be multifamily, and the establishment of a use not permitted by right (such as a multifamily project in a single-family zone) would trigger a discretionary process such as a zone change or conditional use permit with environmental review and a public hearing. Areas zoned to allow multifamily housing are also close to public transit and social services, where affordable and senior housing also tend to locate because these occupants are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. Because density bonus projects tend to locate in infill areas, they also use land more efficiently than lower-density housing. For these reasons, density bonus projects tend to produce fewer vehicle miles traveled and are therefore not likely to conflict with or obstruct implementation of air quality plans. For the same reasons, the parking requirements in the ordinance, and elimination of the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households, would not conflict with air quality plans.

If land is subdivided to create affordable single-family homes, this would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include project-level environmental review.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is not likely to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Density bonuses are much more likely to be utilized in areas zoned to allow multifamily uses, because density bonus projects tend to be multifamily, and the establishment of a use not permitted by right (such as a multifamily project in a single-family zone) would trigger a discretionary process such as a zone change or conditional use permit with environmental review and a public hearing. Areas zoned to allow multifamily housing are also close to public transit and social services, where affordable and senior housing also tend to locate because these occupants are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. Because density bonus projects tend to locate in infill areas, they also use land more efficiently than lower-density housing. For these reasons, density bonus projects tend to produce fewer vehicle miles traveled and are therefore not likely to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. For the same reasons, the parking requirements in the ordinance, and elimination of the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households, would not be likely to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

If land is subdivided to create affordable single-family homes, this would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include project-level environmental review.

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)?

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which Los Angeles County is in non-attainment.

Density bonuses are much more likely to be utilized in areas zoned to allow multifamily uses, because density bonus projects tend to be multifamily, and the establishment of a use not permitted by right (such as a multifamily project in a single-family zone) would trigger a discretionary process such as a zone change or conditional use permit with environmental review and a public hearing. Areas zoned to

allow multifamily housing are also close to public transit and social services, where affordable and senior housing also tend to locate because these occupants are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. Because density bonus projects tend to locate in infill areas, they also use land more efficiently than lower-density housing. For these reasons, density bonus projects tend to produce fewer vehicle miles traveled and are therefore not likely to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which Los Angeles County is in non-attainment. For the same reasons, the parking requirements in the ordinance, and elimination of the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households, would not be likely to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which Los Angeles County is in non-attainment.

If land is subdivided to create affordable single-family homes, this would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include project-level environmental review.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential for the ordinance to result in projects that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollution exposure would be less than significant.

While housing itself is unlikely to create substantial pollutant concentrations, it is possible that this housing would be located near sources of pollution, such as freeways or major commercial thoroughfares with high levels of vehicle traffic. The Land Use Element of the General Plan identifies land use compatibility as a major consideration in the siting of new sensitive land uses. The General Plan addresses land use compatibility by including policies and programs that mitigate land use conflicts through design, such as the use of landscaping, walls, building orientation, and performance standards.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses

to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, which would trigger a CEQA review. Findings for the discretionary review include that the project will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; and that the project will not jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare.

The above findings are not likely to result in projects that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollution concentrations.

Furthermore, residential uses are not permitted in industrial zones, where polluting uses are concentrated. Residential uses would not be permitted in industrial zones under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update. Any rezoning in conjunction with a density bonus project would trigger a discretionary process with environmental review.

Multifamily and commercial zones are close to public transit and social services, where affordable and senior housing also tend to locate because these occupants are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. Commercial zones are frequently located on major thoroughfares with high traffic volume, which could be a source of pollution exposure for the residents of a density bonus project.

The ordinance allows ministerial review of density bonus apartment projects in certain commercial zones (C-H, C-1, C-2, and C-3), but only for projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions. Most CEQA exemptions for which density bonus projects would qualify, require that the project either meet environmental criteria regarding exposure to hazardous substances, or are consistent with a specific plan EIR. Therefore, this provision would not result in projects that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Density bonus apartment projects in the Commercial Manufacturing (C-M) zone, which permits some industrial uses, would not be eligible ministerial review under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update.

Density bonus projects in the Commercial Recreation (C-R) zone would also not be eligible for ministerial review under the ordinance. The other commercial zone, C-MJ (Major Commercial), is not currently mapped, so the potential impact of the Density Bonus Ordinance Update on housing in this zone would be less than significant.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would not result in projects that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollution exposure, as mixed-use and joint live-work are permitted uses in these zones.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors.

New housing construction may create odors from paint and equipment fuel exhaust, for example, but these would not be significant or permanent. Residential uses generally do not create significant or permanent odors. The ordinance does not facilitate the production of industrial or animal-related uses, which tend to produce the strongest odors associated with their operation.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The analysis concludes that the ordinance will not result in significant impacts to air quality. This is due to the following:

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential for the ordinance to result in projects that impact air quality would be less than significant.

While the ordinance could increase the amount of housing, there are existing measures in place that limit any potential impacts. Density bonus projects that are otherwise consistent with the General Plan and Antelope Valley Area Plan will be consistent with the goals of air quality plans from the SCAQMD and AVAQMD. These air quality plans regulate air pollutants as well as odors from commercial and industrial sites. The General Plan also contains policies to discourage incompatible land uses and mitigate land use conflicts through design through the use of landscaping, walls, building orientation, and performance standards.

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is not likely to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Density bonuses are much more likely to be utilized in areas zoned to allow multifamily uses, because density bonus projects tend to be multifamily, and the establishment of a use not permitted by right (such as a multifamily project in a single-family zone) would trigger a discretionary process such as a zone change or conditional use permit with environmental review and a public hearing. Areas zoned to allow multifamily housing are also close to public transit and social services, where affordable and senior housing also tend to locate because these occupants are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. Because density bonus projects tend to locate in infill areas, they also use land more efficiently than lower-density housing. For these reasons, density bonus projects tend to produce fewer vehicle miles traveled and are therefore not likely to significantly impact air quality. For the same reasons, the parking requirements in the ordinance, and elimination of the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households, would not be likely to significantly impact air quality.

If land is subdivided to create affordable single-family homes, this would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include project-level environmental review.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical

environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, which would trigger a CEQA review. Findings for the discretionary review include that the project will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; and that the project will not jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare.

The above findings are not likely to result in projects that significantly impact air quality.

The ordinance allows ministerial review of density bonus apartment projects in certain commercial zones (C-H, C-1, C-2, and C-3) only for projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, so this provision would not result in projects that significantly impact air quality.

Density bonus apartment projects in the Commercial Manufacturing (C-M) zone, which permits some industrial uses, would not be eligible ministerial review under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update. Density bonus projects in the Commercial Recreation (C-R) zone would also not be eligible for ministerial review under the ordinance. The other commercial zone, C-MJ (Major Commercial), is not currently mapped, so the potential impact of the Density Bonus Ordinance Update on housing in this zone would be less than significant.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would not result in projects that significantly impact air quality, as mixed-use and joint live-work are permitted uses in these zones. Mixed use and joint live-work developments are also efficient uses of land that reduce vehicle miles traveled and therefore would not produce significant air quality impacts. Mixed residential and commercial projects are prohibited in Title 22 from including auto-related and other businesses that could expose people to harmful air pollutants.

Other aspects of the ordinance, including equity sharing on for-sale units, fee exemptions and reductions for projects, one-for-one replacement of affordable units, and the requirement for affordability covenants for 55 years would not increase the amount of housing and therefore not result in air quality impacts.

4. BIOLOGICAL 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) 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 Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

Impacts to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species would be limited by the fact that affordable housing is usually developed in urban areas near transit and social services that are already built-out. While all Planning Areas in Los Angeles County General Plan contain sensitive species, many of the areas where the species have been identified overlap with areas not easily accessible to transit and supportive services, such as SEAs, HMAs, and coastal habitat areas. These areas have building requirements designed to protect biological resources such as species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

Furthermore, many of the areas with sensitive species are not zoned to permit multifamily uses. Areas with sensitive habitat are generally zoned for watershed, open space, agriculture and a limited amount of low-density residential and rural commercial development. These zones permit single-family homes but not multifamily homes. In order to qualify for a density bonus, a project must have at least five units pre-bonus. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update in and of itself will not allow multifamily uses where they are not permitted. Any rezoning would be subject to a discretionary process and environmental review.

Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts to species are significant.

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?

Unincorporated Los Angeles County contains many areas with riparian and other sensitive natural communities.

Impacts to sensitive natural communities would be limited by the fact that affordable housing is usually developed in urban areas near transit and social services that are already built-out. Many of the areas with the most sensitive natural communities overlap with areas not easily accessible to transit and supportive services, such as SEAs, HMAs, and coastal habitat areas. These areas have building requirements and discretionary permit review processes designed to protect the most sensitive natural communities in the unincorporated areas.

The General Plan contains policies to preserve and protect riparian habitats, wetlands, woodlands, and shrublands. County policies also regulate the removal of oak trees. Since the most sensitive natural communities are protected by the General Plan, and the impacts of the ordinance would be less than significant.

Furthermore, many sensitive natural communities are not zoned to permit multifamily uses. Sensitive natural communities are generally zoned for watershed, open space, agriculture and a limited amount of low-density residential development. These zones permit single-family homes but not multifamily homes. In order to qualify for a density bonus, a project must have at least five units pre-bonus. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update in and of itself will not allow multifamily uses where they are not permitted. Any rezoning would be subject to a discretionary process and environmental review.

Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts to sensitive natural communities are significant.

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

Unincorporated Los Angeles County contains areas with coastal wetlands, drainages, marshes and vernal pools.

Impacts to federally or state protected wetlands and waters of the United States would be limited by the fact that affordable housing is usually developed in urban areas near transit and social services that are already built-out. Many of the areas with wetlands overlap with areas not easily accessible to transit and supportive services, such as SEAs, HMAs, and coastal habitat areas. These areas have building requirements and discretionary permit review processes designed to protect the most sensitive marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, and drainages. Since the most sensitive of these resources are protected in the General Plan, the impacts of the ordinance would be less than significant.

For waterways in the unincorporated areas that are not located in special management areas, the General Plan contains policies to preserve wetlands and streambeds. In addition to County policy and regulation, projects that are subject to CEQA and located in a wetland are forwarded to applicable state and federal agencies for further review and permitting requirements.

Furthermore, many federally or state protected wetlands and waters of the United States are not zoned to permit multifamily uses. These areas are generally zoned for watershed, open space, agriculture and a limited amount of low-density residential development. These zones permit single-family homes but not multifamily homes. In order to qualify for a density bonus, a project must have at least five units pre-bonus. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update in and of itself will not allow multifamily uses where they are not permitted. Any rezoning would be subject to a discretionary process and environmental review.

In Marina del Rey, where multifamily uses are permitted in certain areas, development is subject to the Coastal Act and the Marina del Rey Local Coastal Program, which contain policies to protect wetlands.

Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts are significant.

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?

Impacts to wildlife movement would be limited by the fact that affordable housing is usually developed in urban areas near transit and social services that are already built-out. The General Plan identifies wildlife linkage areas in Los Angeles County that serve as important habitat and/or connections between habitat and wildlife migratory routes. Many of these include Significant Ecological Areas, Hillside Management Areas, and sensitive coastal habitat areas, which are not easily accessible to transit and supportive services. These areas have building requirements and discretionary permit review processes designed to protect wildlife movement.

Furthermore, these areas are not zoned to permit multifamily uses. These areas are generally zoned for watershed, open space, agriculture and a limited amount of low-density residential development. These zones permit single-family homes but not multifamily homes. In order to qualify for a density bonus, a project must have at least five units pre-bonus. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update in and of itself will not allow multifamily uses where they are not permitted. Any rezoning would be subject to a discretionary process and environmental review.

Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts are significant.

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 oaks and other unique native trees within the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. Many of them exist within Significant Ecological Areas or sensitive coastal habitat areas, which are not in built-out areas near transit and social services where affordable and senior housing tend to locate.

In addition, these areas are generally not zoned to permit multifamily uses. These areas are generally zoned for watershed, open space, agriculture and a limited amount of low-density residential development. These zones permit single-family homes but not multifamily homes. In order to qualify for a density bonus, a project must have at least five units pre-bonus. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update in and of itself will not allow multifamily uses where they are not permitted. Any rezoning would be subject to a discretionary process and environmental review.

Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts are significant.

Where oak and native woodlands exist outside these Significant Ecological Areas or sensitive coastal habitat areas, density bonus projects may require the appropriate permits and approvals issued by Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, such as Oak Tree Permits, if the trees will be impacted or removed. If the project is discretionary and two or more unique trees are affected, mitigation may be required under CEQA.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, which would trigger a CEQA review.

The above review processes and findings would render any impacts to oaks and unique native trees less than significant.

In addition, oaks and native trees would not be impacted by the parking requirements in the ordinance, or by eliminating the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households. Because density bonus projects tend to locate in areas previously developed, the impact of the parking requirements in the ordinance would be less than significant.

The commercial zones (C-H, C-1, C-2, and C-3) where density bonus apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review under the ordinance, are generally in built-out areas. The CEQA exemptions mostly apply to infill sites or sites previously developed with urban uses in urbanized areas and/or areas near transit. Oak woodlands and unique native trees are not likely to be significantly impacted in such areas.

For the same reasons, the ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would be unlikely to significantly impact oak woodlands or unique native trees.

Furthermore, density bonus apartment projects would not be eligible for ministerial review in the Commercial Manufacturing (C-M) zone, and would not be permitted in the Commercial Recreation (C-R) zone, where apartments are not permitted.

The other commercial zone, C-MJ (Major Commercial), is not currently mapped, so the potential impact of the Density Bonus Ordinance Update on housing in this zone would be less than significant.

The ordinance does not provide additional density bonuses as incentive with ministerial review in the Rural Mixed Use (MXD-RU) or Rural Commercial zone (C-RU), even if the project were to meet the criteria for a CEQA exemption. This would further reduce the potential impact to oak woodlands and unique native trees. While a density bonus project requesting set-asides and bonuses in the amounts set by State law could locate in one of these zones, these zones are not located in areas where affordable housing tends to locate, rendering any potential impact less than significant.

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)?

It is unlikely that the Density Bonus Ordinance Update will conflict with policies and ordinances that protect biological resources, such as the Wildflower Reserve Areas, the Oak Tree Ordinance, SEAs or SERAs.

There are Wildflower Reserve Areas in the northeastern portion of Los Angeles County, including the State-designated Antelope Valley California Poppy Reserve. There are also oak woodlands within the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County where developments could be subject to the Oak Tree Ordinance. A density bonus project may require an Oak Tree Permit, if the trees will be impacted or removed.

Impacts would be limited by the fact that affordable housing is usually developed in urban areas near transit and social services that are already built-out, on land that has previously been developed. Significant Ecological Areas (which also contain many oak woodlands and wildflower resources) and SERAs are not easily accessible to transit and supportive services. These areas have building requirements and discretionary permit review processes designed to protect biological resources. The ordinance would not include any changes to SEA areas or SEA conformance criteria, nor would it revise, replace, or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with Los Angeles County Code and General Plan policies regarding oak woodlands or native trees.

Furthermore, these areas, as well as Wildflower Reserve Areas, are not generally zoned to permit multifamily uses. These areas are generally zoned for watershed, open space, agriculture and a limited amount of low-density residential development. These zones permit single-family homes but not multifamily homes. In order to qualify for a density bonus, a project must have at least five units pre-bonus. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update in and of itself will not allow multifamily uses where they are not permitted. Any rezoning would be subject to a discretionary process and environmental review.

There are parts of Wildflower Reserve Areas that are outside an SEA and are zoned Rural Commercial (C-RU), where farmworker housing and joint live-work units are permitted uses by right and could be eligible for a density bonus. However, Wildflower Reserve Areas are also not located in areas easily accessible to transit and services where density bonus projects tend to locate.

Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts are significant.

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

Within Los Angeles County, local habitat conservation plans are included as part of Local Coastal Programs as well as the SEA program. Natural Community Conservation Plans created by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Habitat Conservation Plans approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife

Service and the Bureau of Land Management, include the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan and the West Mojave Plan. Some of the unincorporated areas that would be covered by these plans include SEAs and HMAs, where the density bonus would be difficult to utilize due to permitting requirements and development standards designed to protect people, property, and biological resources. The Newhall Farm Seasonal Crossings Habitat Conservation Plan is active and located along the Santa Clara River east of the Ventura County border. This HCP overlaps with the Santa Clara River SEA and is located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Both of these overlays would make it difficult to utilize a density bonus.

Impacts would be limited by the fact that affordable housing is usually developed in urban areas near transit and social services that are already built-out, on land that has previously been developed. Areas covered by habitat conservation plans are not easily accessible to transit and supportive services. These areas have building requirements and discretionary permit review processes designed to protect natural resources. The ordinance would not include any changes to SEA areas or SEA conformance criteria.

Furthermore, these areas are not zoned to permit multifamily uses. These areas are generally zoned for watershed, open space, agriculture and a limited amount of low-density residential development. These zones permit single-family homes but not multifamily homes. In order to qualify for a density bonus, a project must have at least five units pre-bonus. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update in and of itself will not allow multifamily uses where they are not permitted. Any rezoning would be subject to a discretionary process and environmental review.

Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts are significant.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive species, habitat, oak or native woodlands, wildlife linkages, or wetlands, or to conflict with ordinances or plans intended to preserve these biological resources.

Many of the areas with important biological resources overlap with one or more of the following areas where the density bonus is difficult to utilize due to open space or single-family zoning, or to discretionary review processes (such as SEAs, HMAs, VHFHSZs, and sensitive coastal habitat areas). These areas are zoned to permit single-family homes but not multifamily homes. In order to qualify for a density bonus, a project must have at least five units pre-bonus. The Density Bonus

Ordinance Update in and of itself will not allow multifamily uses where they are not permitted. Any rezoning would be subject to a discretionary process and environmental review.

Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts are significant.

Impacts to biological resources would be further limited by the fact that affordable and senior housing is usually developed in built-out urban areas near transit and social services, because these populations are transit-dependent. These characteristics are not typical of areas with important biological resources. For this reason, the parking requirements for density bonus projects near transit, and the elimination of parking requirements for extremely low income resident units, would also be unlikely to impact these areas. Furthermore, many of these areas are not zoned for commercial or mixed use development, which would diminish the potential impact of the ministerial review in commercial zones of projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemption.

When applicable to a project located out of these areas, under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households; and that the incentive or waiver is not contrary to state or federal law.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, which would trigger a CEQA review.

The above review processes and findings would reduce the potential impacts to biological resources to less than significant.

Other aspects of the ordinance, including equity sharing on for-sale units, one-for-one replacement of affordable units, the requirement for affordability covenants for 55 years, and fee exemptions and reductions for projects would not increase the amount of housing and therefore would have no impact on biological resources.

5. CULTURAL 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) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

It is unlikely that the Density Bonus Ordinance Update will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

Increasing the amount of housing could result in a modification or other impact to a historic building. However, the Historic Preservation Ordinance and State Historic Building Code would be applied at the project level to protect historic buildings in the unincorporated areas or in adjoining cities, if applicable. However, in addition, many of the historic resource sites identified in the General Plan are located within or next to areas where projects are unlikely to use density bonuses, such as SEAs and HMAs. These areas have building requirements and discretionary permit review processes designed to protect resources.

Impacts would also be limited by the fact that affordable housing is usually developed in urban areas near transit and social services that are already built-out, on land that has previously been developed. Many of the historic resource sites identified in the General Plan are not easily accessible to transit and supportive services.

Furthermore, most of the areas with historic resource sites are not zoned to permit multifamily uses. These areas are generally zoned for watershed, open space, agriculture and low-density residential development. These zones permit single-family homes but not multifamily homes. In order to qualify for a density bonus, a project must have at least five units pre-bonus. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update in and of itself will not allow multifamily uses where they are not permitted. Any rezoning would be subject to a discretionary process and environmental review.

Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts are significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets

the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon the physical environment, or on any real property that is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, which would also be subject to CEQA.

The above review processes and findings would render any impacts to historic resources less than significant.

In addition, historic resources would not be impacted by the parking requirements in the ordinance, or by eliminating the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households. Affordable and senior housing tends to be built in infill areas near transit and services because these occupants are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. Most historic resource sites are not located in infill areas.

While there are some historic resource sites in commercial zones, only density bonus apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review under the ordinance.

Furthermore, density bonus apartment projects in the Commercial Manufacturing (C-M) zone would not be eligible for ministerial review under the ordinance. In addition, the ordinance would not permit apartment projects in the Commercial Recreation (C-R) zone, where apartments are not permitted.

The other commercial zone, C-MJ (Major Commercial), is not currently mapped, so the potential impact of the Density Bonus Ordinance Update on housing in this zone would be less than significant.

The ordinance does not provide additional density bonuses as incentive with ministerial review in the Rural Mixed Use (MXD-RU) or Rural Commercial zone (C-RU), even if the project were to meet the criteria for a CEQA exemption. This would further reduce the potential impact to historic resources. While a density bonus project requesting set-asides and bonuses in the amounts set by State law could locate in one of these zones, these zones are not located in infill areas where affordable housing tends to locate, rendering any potential impact less than significant.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would be unlikely to adversely affect historic resources. Historic resources are not located in the MXD zone, and density bonus projects in commercial zones would be subject to discretionary review of the use unless the project is exempt from CEQA.

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

It is unlikely that the Density Bonus Ordinance Update will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.

Affordable housing and senior housing is generally located in urban areas with access to transit and services. Urban areas tend to have been previously developed and therefore archeological resources that may have existed on affordable housing sites will most likely have already been disturbed.

Undeveloped parcels that are found to contain archeological resources, or parcels that are adjacent to archeological resources, may have to undergo mitigation measures per consultation with the South Central Coastal Information Center. In the event that archaeological resources are encountered during the construction process, the proposed project would be required to halt all development activities, contact the South Central Coastal Information Center and inform them of the encounter. Subsequently, the applicant would retain the services of a certified archaeological resource specialist, who can advise the builder when development activities can recommence.

Previously undisturbed or lightly disturbed lands tend to be in areas where projects are unlikely to use density bonuses, such as SEAs, HMAs and sensitive coastal habitat areas. These areas have building requirements and discretionary permit review processes designed to protect resources. These areas are also not easily accessible to transit and supportive services.

Furthermore, undeveloped or lightly disturbed lands are not generally zoned to permit multifamily uses. These areas are generally zoned for watershed, open space, agriculture and low-density residential development. These zones permit single-family homes but not multifamily homes. In order to qualify for

a density bonus, a project must have at least five units pre-bonus. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update in and of itself will not allow multifamily uses where they are not permitted. Any rezoning would be subject to a discretionary process and environmental review.

Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts are significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon the physical environment, or on any real property that is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, which would trigger a CEQA review.

The above review processes and findings would render any potential impacts to archaeological resources less than significant.

In addition, archaeological resources would not be impacted by the parking requirements in the ordinance, or by eliminating the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households. Affordable and senior housing tends to be built in infill areas near transit and services because these occupants are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. Most previously undeveloped or lightly disturbed sites are not located in infill areas.

While there could be archaeological resource sites in commercial zones, only density bonus apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review

under the ordinance. Many previously undeveloped or lightly disturbed areas are not zoned for commercial development, which would further diminish the potential impact to archaeological resources.

Furthermore, density bonus apartment projects would not be a ministerially permitted use in the Commercial Manufacturing (C-M) zone under the ordinance. In addition, the ordinance would not permit apartment projects in the Commercial Recreation (C-R) zone, where apartments are not permitted.

The other commercial zone, C-MJ (Major Commercial), is not currently mapped, so the potential impact of the Density Bonus Ordinance Update on housing in this zone would be less than significant.

The ordinance does not provide additional density bonuses as incentive with ministerial review in the Rural Mixed Use (MXD-RU) or Rural Commercial zone (C-RU), even if the project were to meet the criteria for a CEQA exemption. This would further reduce the potential impact to archaeological resources. While a density bonus project requesting set-asides and bonuses in the amounts set by State law could locate in one of these zones, these zones are not located in infill areas where affordable housing tends to locate, rendering any potential impact less than significant.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would be unlikely to adversely affect archaeological resources. Previously undeveloped or lightly disturbed areas are less likely to be located in the MXD zone, and density bonus projects in commercial zones would be subject to discretionary review of the use unless the project is exempt from CEQA.

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

It is unlikely that the Density Bonus Ordinance Update will cause a significant impact to paleontological resources.

Affordable housing and senior housing is generally located in urban areas with access to transit and services. Urban areas tend to have been previously developed and therefore paleontological resources that may have existed on affordable housing sites will most likely have already been disturbed. Undeveloped parcels that are found to contain paleontological resources, or parcels that are adjacent to paleontological resources, may have to undergo mitigation measures per consultation with the Natural History Museum.

Many of the significant general fossil localities identified in the General Plan, and previously undisturbed or lightly disturbed lands, as well as areas with unique geologic features and rock formations, tend to be in areas where projects are unlikely to use density bonuses, such as SEAs, HMAs and sensitive coastal habitat areas. These areas have building requirements and discretionary permit review processes designed to protect resources. These areas are also not easily accessible to transit and supportive services.

The Hillside Management Areas Ordinance would be applied to protect unique geological features and rock formations. Also, Santa Monica Mountains Local Coastal Program identifies scenic elements, which are "designated areas that contain exceptionally-scenic features unique not only to the Santa Monica Mountains, but to the Los Angeles County region. These areas are characterized by rare or unique geologic formations, such as large rock outcroppings..." Goals and land use policies set forth in the SMMLCP seek to preserve such resources.

Furthermore, undeveloped or lightly disturbed lands, as well as areas with unique geologic features and rock formations, are not generally zoned to permit multifamily uses. These areas are generally zoned for watershed, open space, agriculture and low-density residential development. These zones permit single-family homes but not multifamily homes. In order to qualify for a density bonus, a project must have at least five units pre-bonus. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update in and of itself will not allow multifamily uses where they are not permitted. Any rezoning would be subject to a discretionary process and environmental review.

Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts are significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon the physical environment, or on any real property that is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, or that the impact can be mitigated without

making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, which would trigger a CEQA review.

The above review processes and findings would render any potential impacts to paleontological resources and/or unique geologic features or rock formations less than significant.

In addition, paleontological resources and/or unique geologic features or rock formations would not be impacted by the parking requirements in the ordinance, or by eliminating the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households. Affordable and senior housing tends to be built in infill areas near transit and services because these occupants are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. Most previously undeveloped or lightly disturbed sites, or areas with geologic features or rock formations, are not located in infill areas.

While there could be paleontological resources in commercial zones, only density bonus apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review under the ordinance. Many previously undeveloped or lightly disturbed areas and/or unique geologic features or rock formations are not zoned for commercial development, which would further diminish the potential impact to paleontological resources.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would be unlikely to adversely affect paleontological resources and/or unique geologic features or rock formations. Previously undeveloped or lightly disturbed areas are less likely to be located in the MXD zone, and density bonus projects in commercial zones would be subject to discretionary review of the use unless the project is exempt from CEQA.

Furthermore, density bonus apartment projects would not be a ministerially permitted use in the Commercial Manufacturing (C-M) zone under the ordinance. In addition, the ordinance would not permit apartment projects in the Commercial Recreation (C-R) zone, where apartments are not permitted.

The other commercial zone, C-MJ (Major Commercial), is not currently mapped, so the potential impact of the Density Bonus Ordinance Update on housing in this zone would be less than significant.

The ordinance does not provide additional density bonuses as incentive with ministerial review in the Rural Mixed Use (MXD-RU) or Rural Commercial zone (C-RU), even if the project were to meet the criteria for a CEQA exemption. This would further reduce the potential impact to paleontological resources. While a density bonus project requesting set-asides and bonuses in the amounts set by State law could locate in one of these zones, these zones are not located in infill areas where affordable housing tends to locate, rendering any potential impact less than significant.

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

It is unlikely that the Density Bonus Ordinance Update will cause a significant impact to human remains.

Affordable housing and senior housing is generally located in urban areas with access to transit and services that have been previously developed. For projects on undeveloped parcels that are found to contain human remains, or parcels that are adjacent to burial sites or cemeteries, the project may have to undergo mitigation measures per consultation with the California Native American Heritage Commission.

Many undeveloped areas tend to be where projects are unlikely to use density bonuses, such as SEAs, HMAs and sensitive coastal habitat areas. These areas have building requirements and discretionary permit review processes designed to protect resources. These areas are also not easily accessible to transit and supportive services.

Furthermore, undeveloped or lightly disturbed lands are not generally zoned to permit multifamily uses. These areas are generally zoned for watershed, open space, agriculture and low-density residential development. These zones permit single-family homes but not multifamily homes. In order to qualify for a density bonus, a project must have at least five units pre-bonus. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update in and of itself will not allow multifamily uses where they are not permitted. Any rezoning would be subject to a discretionary process and environmental review.

Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts are significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

In addition, human remains would not be impacted by the parking requirements in the ordinance, or by eliminating the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households. Affordable and senior housing tends to be built in infill areas near transit and services because these occupants are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. Most previously undeveloped or lightly disturbed sites are not located in infill areas.

While there could be human remains in commercial zones, only density bonus apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review under the ordinance. Many previously undeveloped or lightly disturbed areas are not zoned for commercial development, which would further diminish the potential impact to human remains.

Furthermore, density bonus apartment projects would not be a ministerially permitted use in the Commercial Manufacturing (C-M) zone under the ordinance. In addition, the ordinance would not permit apartment projects in the Commercial Recreation (C-R) zone, where apartments are not permitted.

The other commercial zone, C-MJ (Major Commercial), is not currently mapped, so the potential impact of the Density Bonus Ordinance Update on housing in this zone would be less than significant.

The ordinance does not provide additional density bonuses as incentive with ministerial review in the Rural Mixed Use (MXD-RU) or Rural Commercial zone (C-RU), even if the project were to meet the criteria for a CEQA exemption. This would further reduce the potential impact to human remains. While a density bonus project requesting set-asides and bonuses in the amounts set by State law could locate in one of these zones, these zones are not located in infill areas where affordable housing tends to locate, rendering any potential impact less than significant.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would be unlikely to adversely affect human remains. Previously undeveloped or lightly disturbed areas are less likely to be located in the MXD zone, and density bonus projects in commercial zones would be subject to discretionary review of the use unless the project is exempt from CEQA.

e) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in CEQA Public Resources Code § 21074?

It is unlikely that the Density Bonus Ordinance Update will cause a cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource. A tribal consultation for the ordinance was conducted per AB 52.

Affordable housing and senior housing is generally located in urban areas with access to transit and services. Urban areas tend to have been previously developed and therefore tribal resources that may have existed on affordable housing sites will most likely have already been disturbed. In addition, tribes may be contacted when applications are deemed complete, as applicable.

Many undisturbed or lightly disturbed lands tend to be in areas where projects are unlikely to use density bonuses, such as SEAs, HMAs and sensitive coastal habitat areas. These areas have building requirements and discretionary permit review processes designed to protect resources. These areas are also not easily accessible to transit and supportive services.

Furthermore, undeveloped or lightly disturbed lands are not generally zoned to permit multifamily uses. These areas are generally zoned for watershed, open space, agriculture and low-density residential development. These zones permit single-family homes but not multifamily homes. In order to qualify for a density bonus, a project must have at least five units pre-bonus. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update in and of itself will not allow multifamily uses where they are not permitted. Any rezoning would be subject to a discretionary process and environmental review.

Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts are significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon the physical environment, or on any real property that is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, which would trigger a CEQA review.

The above review processes and findings would render any potential impacts to paleontological resources and/or unique geologic features or rock formations less than significant.

In addition, tribal resources would not be impacted by the parking requirements in the ordinance, or by eliminating the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households. Affordable and senior housing tends to be built in infill areas near transit and services because these occupants are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. Most previously undeveloped or lightly disturbed sites are not located in infill areas.

While there could be tribal resources in commercial zones, only density bonus apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review under the ordinance. Many previously undeveloped or lightly disturbed areas are not zoned for commercial development, which would further diminish the potential impact to tribal resources.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would be unlikely to adversely affect tribal resources. Previously undeveloped or lightly disturbed areas are less likely to be located in the MXD zone, and density bonus projects in commercial zones would be subject to discretionary review of the use unless the project is exempt from CEQA.

Furthermore, density bonus apartment projects would not be a ministerially permitted use in the Commercial Manufacturing (C-M) zone under the ordinance. In addition, the ordinance would not permit apartment projects in the Commercial Recreation (C-R) zone, where apartments are not permitted.

The other commercial zone, C-MJ (Major Commercial), is not currently mapped, so the potential impact of the Density Bonus Ordinance Update on housing in this zone would be less than significant.

The ordinance does not provide additional density bonuses as incentive with ministerial review in the Rural Mixed Use (MXD-RU) or Rural Commercial zone (C-RU), even if the project were to meet the criteria for a CEQA exemption. This would further reduce the potential impact to tribal resources. While a density bonus project requesting set-asides and bonuses in the amounts set by State law could locate in one of these zones, these zones are not located in infill areas where affordable housing tends to locate, rendering any potential impact less than significant.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The analysis concludes that the ordinance will not result in significant impacts to cultural resources. This is due to the following:

Affordable and senior housing is generally located in urban areas with access to transit and services on land that was previously developed.

Many of the historic resource sites identified in the General Plan, as well as undisturbed/lightly disturbed areas more likely to contain human remains or archaeological, tribal, and paleontological resources in the unincorporated areas, are also located within areas where projects are unlikely to utilize density bonuses. These include Significant Ecological Areas, Hillside Management Areas and sensitive habitat areas in the Coastal Zone, which are not generally zoned to permit multifamily uses, and have discretionary reviews designed to protect resources.

Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts are significant.

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential impact of the ordinance on cultural resources would be less than significant.

While the Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to produce housing on a scale that would significantly impact cultural resources, the review processes and findings applicable to density bonus projects would ensure that impacts from individual projects are less than significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for

senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon the physical environment, or on any real property that is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, which would trigger a CEQA review.

The above review processes and findings would render any potential impacts to cultural resources less than significant.

In addition, cultural resources would not be impacted by the parking requirements in the ordinance, or by eliminating the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households. Affordable and senior housing tends to be built in infill areas near transit and services because these occupants are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. Most previously undeveloped or lightly disturbed sites are not located in infill areas.

While there could be cultural resources in commercial zones, only density bonus apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review under the ordinance. Many previously undeveloped or lightly disturbed areas are not zoned for commercial development, which would further diminish the potential impact to cultural resources.

Furthermore, density bonus apartment projects would not be a ministerially permitted use in the Commercial Manufacturing (C-M) zone under the ordinance. In addition, the ordinance would not permit apartment projects in the Commercial Recreation (C-R) zone, where apartments are not permitted.

The other commercial zone, C-MJ (Major Commercial), is not currently mapped, so the potential impact of the Density Bonus Ordinance Update on housing in this zone would be less than significant.

The ordinance does not provide additional density bonuses as incentive with ministerial review in the Rural Mixed Use (MXD-RU) or Rural Commercial zone (C-RU), even if the project were to meet the criteria for a CEQA exemption. This would further reduce the potential impact to cultural resources. While a density bonus project requesting set-asides and bonuses in the amounts set by State law could locate in one of these zones, these zones are not located in infill

areas where affordable housing tends to locate, rendering any potential impact less than significant.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would be unlikely to adversely affect cultural resources. Previously undeveloped or lightly disturbed areas are less likely to be located in the MXD zone, and density bonus projects in commercial zones would be subject to discretionary review of the use unless the project is exempt from CEQA.

Other aspects of the ordinance, including equity sharing on for-sale units, one-for-one replacement of affordable units, fee exemptions and reductions for projects, and the requirement for affordability covenants for 55 years would not increase the amount of housing and therefore would have no impact on cultural resources.

Finally, density bonus projects may trigger notification to stakeholders such as the South Central Coastal Information Center, tribes, or the Natural History Museum, which work to avoid or mitigate potential impacts to cultural resources from development.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in conflicts with Title 31. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in the construction of more housing. However, Title 31 does not provide an exemption for projects built with a density bonus. Therefore, projects would be required to comply with Title 31. Any conflicts with Title 31 would be determined and addressed at the project level.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in inefficient use of energy resources. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in the construction of more housing. However, Title 31 does not provide an exemption for projects built with a density bonus. Therefore, projects would be required to comply with Title 31. Any conflicts with Title 31 would be determined and addressed at the project level.

Because residents of affordable and senior housing are transit-dependent, and because density bonus projects tend to be multifamily, density bonus projects are usually built near transit and services in built-out infill areas zoned to permit multifamily uses, including density bonus projects, which are commonly multifamily developments. This type of development is an efficient use of land that reduces use of fossil fuels by reducing driving. Therefore, incentivizing this type of housing by offering density bonuses and lower parking requirements than non-density bonus projects promotes efficient use of energy resources.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in the production of more housing, but such development would be subject to the energy efficiency requirements in Title 31. Any conflicts with Title 31 would be addressed at the project level.

Because residents of affordable and senior housing are transit-dependent, and because density bonus projects tend to be multifamily, density bonus projects are usually built near transit and services in built-out infill areas zoned to permit multifamily use. This type of development is an efficient use of land that reduces use of fossil fuels by reducing driving. Therefore, incentivizing this type of housing by offering density bonuses and lower parking requirements than non-density bonus projects promotes efficient use of energy resources.

Other aspects of the ordinance, including equity sharing on for-sale units, the requirement for affordability covenants for 55 years, exemption from planning fees for 100% affordable projects and the reduction of planning fees for other affordable housing projects do not involve construction and therefore would have no potential involvement in the inefficient use of energy resources. One-for-one replacement of existing affordable units would improve the energy efficiency of older units by bringing them into compliance with current building energy efficiency standards.

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:

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.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in the production of more housing. Earthquake faults are located throughout unincorporated Los Angeles County. If the project site is located in close proximity to any known fault trace or designated fault zone, the Department of Public Works will require a geology or geotechnical report. The report will determine the potential seismic hazard and the necessary construction standards that should be incorporated.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in the production of more housing. Earthquake faults are located throughout unincorporated Los Angeles County. If the project site is located in close proximity to any known fault trace or designated fault zone, the Department of Public Works will require a geology or geotechnical report. The report will determine the potential seismic hazard and the necessary construction standards that should be incorporated.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading?

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in the production of more housing. If the project site is located in a liquefaction zone, the Department of Public Works will require a geology or geotechnical report. The report will determine the potential liquefaction hazard.

iv) Landslides?

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in the production of more housing. If the project site is located in a landslide zone, the Department of Public Works will require a geology or geotechnical report. The report will determine the potential landslide hazard.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

It is unlikely that density bonus projects will locate in areas vulnerable to substantial soil erosion, such as greenfields, Significant Ecological Areas, Hillside Management Areas, or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, where fuel modification is required. This is because affordable housing is usually built in previously disturbed, urbanized areas near transit and services, and where the zoning supports multifamily housing and commercial development. Areas most at risk of substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil are not generally zoned to facilitate these uses, and have discretionary reviews designed to protect resources.

Furthermore, projects that comply with Los Angeles County’s Low-Impact Development Ordinance would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil as a result of stormwater runoff. Projects that involve grading would need to comply with the Department of Public Works’ requirements to minimize potential for erosion.

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential impact of the ordinance on erosion would be less than significant.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

It is unlikely that density bonus projects will locate in areas most vulnerable to soil instability, such as greenfields, Significant Ecological Areas, Hillside Management Areas, or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, where fuel modification is required. This is because affordable housing is usually built in previously disturbed, urbanized areas near transit and services, and where the zoning supports multifamily housing and commercial development. Areas most at risk of substantial soil instability are not generally zoned to facilitate these uses, and have discretionary reviews designed to protect resources.

Furthermore, projects that comply with the construction and engineering standards in Los Angeles County’s Building Code, as well as any recommendations in a soils or geology report required by the Department of Public Works, would not create significant impacts. Landslide and liquefaction zones are mapped in the General Plan.

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential impact of the ordinance on soil instability would be less than significant.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in the production of more housing. It is not known whether such housing would be located on expansive soils. The only way to determine if soils are

expansive is through testing or consultation with the Department of Public Works at the project stage, as there are no reliable maps showing distribution of expansive soils in Los Angeles County.

Projects that comply with the construction and engineering standards in Los Angeles County’s Building Code, as well as any recommendations in a soils or geology report required by the Department of Public Works, would not create significant impacts.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in projects that use onsite wastewater treatment systems.

Affordable and senior housing is usually built in previously disturbed, urbanized areas near transit and services, connected to public sewer systems, and where the zoning supports multifamily housing and commercial development. Areas not connected to sewers are not generally zoned to facilitate these uses, and have discretionary reviews designed to protect resources. Even single-family affordable developments would require a site large enough to be subdivided into single-family lots. Subdivisions would trigger a discretionary process with CEQA review, which would include mitigations if impacts are significant.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in the construction of housing in areas subject to the Hillside Management Areas Ordinance. This is because affordable and senior housing is usually built in previously urbanized areas near transit and services, and where the zoning supports multifamily housing or commercial development. Hillside Management Areas are not generally zoned to facilitate multifamily housing.

If a density bonus project were to locate in a Hillside Management Area, the discretionary HMA process would apply to the grading, regardless of whether the housing use was reviewed ministerially or under a discretionary process. Furthermore, the Hillside Management Ordinance applies mostly to subdivision projects, and if an affordable homeownership project were to be built using the density bonus, impacts would be mitigated through the application of the Hillside Management Ordinance and the discretionary subdivision process.

In addition, the parking requirements in the ordinance, and eliminating the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households, would not conflict with the HMA ordinance. Affordable and senior housing tends to be built in infill areas near transit and services because these occupants are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent.

Furthermore, density bonus apartment projects would not be a ministerially permitted use in the Commercial Manufacturing (C-M) zone under the ordinance. In addition, the ordinance would not permit apartment projects in the Commercial Recreation (C-R) zone, where apartments are not permitted.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to cause significant impacts to geology and soils, to expose people to significant hazards from faults or unstable soils, or to conflict with the HMA ordinance. Affordable and senior housing is unlikely to be located in areas most at risk of landslides, or in Hillside Management Areas, or in areas not connected to public sewer. This is because zoning in these areas generally does not support multifamily housing or commercial development. Also, these areas are generally not located near transit or services, which would make them unlikely locations for affordable housing. Existing regulations, such as the General Plan prohibition on new developments located within fault traces without a comprehensive geological study, as well as construction standards that will be applied at the project level, will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Other aspects of the ordinance, including equity sharing on for-sale units, fee exemptions and reductions for projects, one-for-one replacement of existing affordable units, and the requirement for affordability covenants for 55 years do not involve construction of additional units and therefore would not result in projects that cause significant impacts to geology and soils, to expose people to significant hazards from faults or unstable soils, or to conflict with the HMA ordinance.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

| 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) Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in the production of new housing. However, it is unlikely that the ordinance will create a significant cumulative increase in GHGs. The County’s Community Climate Action Plan (CCAP), which was adopted as part of the General Plan Air Quality Element, describes Los Angeles County’s plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the unincorporated areas of LA County by at least 11% below 2010 levels by the year 2020. The CCAP contains policies and implementing ordinances intended to promote energy efficiency and reduce the urban heat island effect.

The ordinance supports the CCAP in promoting housing that will be energy efficient, given that housing would need to comply with Los Angeles County’s Green Building regulations in Title 31 and the California Green Building Code (CALGreen), which reference provisions for energy efficiency measures, and housing that promotes alternative modes of transportation. Affordable and senior housing and special needs housing development are most likely to be located in built-out, urbanized areas near transit and services. The ordinance incentivizes the location of housing near transit by further reducing parking requirements for affordable housing near transit. Low-income residents are more transit-dependent and less likely to generate vehicle miles traveled that contribute to GHG emissions. The ordinance also provides incentives for mixed use projects, which would further reduce vehicle miles traveled.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in the production of new housing. However, it is unlikely that the ordinance will create a significant cumulative increase in GHGs. The County’s Community Climate Action Plan (CCAP), which was adopted as part of the General Plan Air Quality

Element, describes Los Angeles County's plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the unincorporated areas of LA County by at least 11% below 2010 levels by the year 2020. The CCAP contains policies and implementing ordinances intended to promote energy efficiency and reduce the urban heat island effect.

The ordinance supports the CCAP in promoting housing that will be energy efficient, given that housing would need to comply with Los Angeles County's Green Building regulations in Title 31 and the California Green Building Code (CALGreen), which reference provisions for energy efficiency measures, and housing that promotes alternative modes of transportation. Affordable and senior housing and special needs housing development are most likely to be located in built-out, urbanized areas near transit and services. The ordinance incentivizes the location of housing near transit by further reducing parking requirements for affordable housing near transit. Low-income residents are more transit-dependent and less likely to generate vehicle miles traveled that contribute to GHG emissions. The ordinance also provides incentives for mixed use projects, which would further reduce vehicle miles traveled.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

While the ordinance could result in more housing development, it is unlikely that the ordinance will create a significant cumulative increase in GHGs. The ordinance supports Los Angeles County's Community Climate Action Plan in the General Plan by promoting housing that will be energy efficient and housing that promotes alternative modes of transportation. Affordable and senior housing and special needs housing development are most likely to be located in built-out, urbanized areas near transit and services. The ordinance incentivizes the location of housing near transit by further reducing parking requirements for affordable housing near transit. Low-income residents are more transit-dependent and less likely to generate vehicle miles traveled that contribute to GHG emissions. The ordinance also provides incentives for mixed use projects, which would further reduce vehicle miles traveled. Overall, the impacts for the ordinance on greenhouse gas emissions are less than significant.

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?

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to create a significant public or environmental hazard due to transport, production, use, storage or disposal of hazardous materials. The scope of the ordinance does not include or provide incentives for industrial uses, which routinely handle, produce, use, store, and dispose of hazardous materials.

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in the production of new housing. Construction could result in the demolition of existing buildings, which could contain hazardous materials such as asbestos or lead paint. Handling of hazardous materials in the course of construction would be regulated by existing Health & Safety Code and Fire Code requirements. In some cases, a project-level environmental assessment would determine the potential impacts as well as any required mitigation.

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?

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to create a significant public or environmental hazard through accidental release of hazardous materials. The scope of the ordinance does not include or provide incentives for uses that require the handling of hazardous materials or waste.

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in the production of new housing. Construction could result in the demolition of existing buildings, which could contain hazardous materials such as asbestos or lead paint. Handling of hazardous materials in the course of construction would be regulated by existing Health & Safety Code and Fire Code requirements. In some cases, a project-level environmental assessment would determine the potential impacts as well as any required mitigation.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in production of new housing, which could be located within one-quarter mile of a sensitive land use. However, the ordinance is unlikely to cause uses that emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste near those uses. The scope of the ordinance does not include or provide incentives for industrial uses, which for uses that require the handling of hazardous materials or waste. Furthermore, General Plan policies also seek to minimize potential impacts from accidental releases by minimizing conflicts between residential and industrial land uses through buffering, distancing and site design.

Construction of housing as a result of the ordinance could result in the demolition of existing buildings, which could contain hazardous materials such as asbestos or lead paint. Handling of hazardous materials in the course of construction would be regulated by existing Health & Safety Code and Fire Code requirements. In some cases, a project-level environmental assessment would determine the potential impacts as well as any required mitigation.

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 Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in production of new housing. However, the sites pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 are likely to be located in industrially zoned areas, which do not permit residential uses.

Housing that is located on or near these sites as a result of this ordinance would be regulated by existing Health & Safety Code and Fire Code requirements. In some cases, a project-level environmental assessment would determine the potential impacts as well as any required mitigation.

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 Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in production of new housing near public airports and public use airports. A project-level assessment would determine whether the site is located within an area covered by Los Angeles County’s Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) or within an Airport Influence Area.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare; be detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would reduce any potential airport safety impacts to less than significant.

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 Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in production of new housing near private airstrips, but the potential for safety hazards would be less than significant. Airstrips are subject to federal safety

regulations as well as a discretionary review of potential impacts by DRP. An assessment of potential impacts from private airstrips would be done at the project level.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare; be detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would reduce any potential airstrip safety impacts to less than significant.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in production of new housing. Disaster routes mapped in the General Plan Safety Element are freeways and highways and therefore it is unlikely that a project would be approved that blocks access to the public right-of-way. Development could potentially cause additional people to have to be served by a disaster route. In some cases, project-level mitigation may

be required based on consultation with the Fire Department, Public Works, Sheriff or other County department.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare; be detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would reduce any emergency response impacts to less than significant.

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)?

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

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

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in production of new housing. However, Los Angeles County’s Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones are mostly zoned to support low density single-family, open space and agricultural development. A density bonus is unlikely to be utilized for single-family development because of the amount of land that would be required and the discretionary subdivision process that would result. The ordinance is likely to result in affordable housing, which tends to serve transit-dependent populations and is built in urban areas that are accessible to services and municipal water systems. These attributes are not typical of fire hazard areas.

Housing that is located in these areas as a result of this ordinance would be regulated by existing Health & Safety Code, Building Code and Fire Code requirements. In some cases, a project-level environmental assessment would determine whether a project located in a VHFHSZ meets fire flow requirements and/or requires upgrades to fire control infrastructure or other mitigations.

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

The scope of the ordinance does not include or provide incentives for uses that require the handling, storage, or transport of flammable materials. To the extent that such materials are located on the site of the project, their use would be regulated by applicable Fire and Health & Safety codes. In some cases, a project-level environmental assessment would determine the potential impacts as well as any required mitigation.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

While the ordinance could result in more housing development, the scope of the ordinance does not include or provide incentives for industrial uses, which for uses that require the storage, handling, or transport of hazardous materials or waste, or flammable materials. Construction of housing as a result of the ordinance could result in the demolition of existing buildings, which could contain hazardous materials such as asbestos or lead paint. Handling of hazardous materials in the course of construction would be regulated by existing Health & Safety Code and Fire Code requirements. In some cases, a project-level environmental assessment would determine the potential impacts as well as any required mitigation.

Housing that results from the ordinance is not likely to be located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, which are mostly zoned to support low density single-family, open space and

agricultural development. The ordinance is likely to result in affordable housing, which tends to serve transit-dependent populations and is built in urban areas that are accessible to services. These attributes are not typical of VHFHSZs. In addition, housing that results from the ordinance are not likely to be on or near sites pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5, which tend to be designated and zoned for industrial uses. Housing that is located in these areas as a result of this ordinance would be regulated by existing Health & Safety Code and Fire Code requirements.

In addition, the Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in production of new housing near private airstrips or public/public use airports. A project-level assessment would determine whether the site is located within an area covered by Los Angeles County's Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) or within an Airport Influence Area.

Disaster routes mapped in the General Plan Safety Element are freeways and highways and therefore it is unlikely that a project would be approved that blocks access to the public right-of-way. Development could potentially cause additional people to have to be served by a disaster route.

However, the overall impacts for the ordinance on hazards and hazardous materials are less than significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; jeopardize, endanger,

or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare; be detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would reduce any hazard impacts to less than significant.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

| 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) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update will not result in projects that would violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

Affordable and senior housing is almost always located in built-out areas with access to transit and services, zoned to permit multifamily development. This is because residents of these projects tend to be transit-dependent and in need of services. By extension, the areas where density bonus projects tend to locate are served by municipal wastewater systems that would be subject to the wastewater treatment standards set by the RWQCB. Projects would be subject to Los Angeles County’s Low-Impact Development (LID) requirements and best management practices to minimize polluted runoff as part of the construction permitting process. It is unlikely that affordable housing would be located on a contaminated site, as such contamination would need to be remediated prior to construction. In some cases, project-level environmental review would explain how the project complies with NPDES standards.

Areas not connected to municipal wastewater systems are located in places where a density bonus would be difficult to utilize, such as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, Significant Ecological Areas, Hillside Management Areas, or sensitive habitat areas in the Coastal Zone. These areas have development standards and permitting requirements that are intended to protect people, property, and biological resources. These areas are generally zoned for open space, where density bonus projects are not permitted. In addition, these areas are generally zoned for low density single-family development, where it would be difficult to utilize a density bonus. Even if a density bonus development contained single-family homes, the amount of land required for such a project would most likely restrict the project’s potential to be built, and the subdivision process, which is subject to CEQA, would likely require mitigations.

Areas not connected to municipal wastewater systems are not generally located in the commercial zones where density bonus apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review under the ordinance. These exemptions mostly apply to infill sites or sites previously developed with urban uses in urbanized areas and/or areas near transit. Areas not connected to municipal wastewater systems are not generally located in these areas.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would not create wastewater impacts. This is because the MXD zone and commercial zones are not generally located in areas not connected to municipal wastewater systems.

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 Density Bonus Ordinance Update will not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.

Affordable housing is usually located in built-out areas that support multifamily or commercial development. Construction of affordable housing is likely to take place on land that has previously been developed with impervious surfaces, and therefore the additional impact of the new housing would be minimal. In addition, built-out areas are typically connected to retail water providers that do not rely on groundwater wells. Affordable and senior housing is typically located near transit and services, not in environmentally sensitive areas that would be impacted by dewatering during construction. Projects would be subject to LID requirements that would mitigate impacts to groundwater.

Areas reliant on wells and environmentally sensitive areas are not generally located in the commercial zones where density bonus apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review under the ordinance. These exemptions mostly apply to infill sites or sites previously developed with urban uses in urbanized areas and/or areas near transit.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would not create groundwater impacts. This is because the MXD zone and commercial zones are not generally located in areas reliant on wells and environmentally sensitive areas.

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 Density Bonus Ordinance Update will not result in projects that would alter the course of a stream or river or otherwise result in substantial erosion.

Affordable and senior housing tend to locate in built-out areas near transit and services, in areas that are zoned to permit multifamily uses. These are areas that have generally been previously developed with impervious surfaces. Any grading or paving would need to comply with LID and NPDES requirements to receive construction permits. In some cases, project-level mitigations would be required as applicable to address any erosion or siltation impacts.

Areas with on-site streams and areas that require extensive grading and would be vulnerable to erosion are not generally located in the commercial zones where density bonus apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review under the ordinance. These exemptions mostly apply to infill sites or sites previously developed with urban uses in urbanized areas and/or areas near transit.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns. This is because the MXD zone and commercial zones are not generally located in areas with on-site streams and areas that require extensive grading.

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 Density Bonus Ordinance Update will not result in projects that would alter the course of a stream or river or otherwise result in flooding.

Affordable and senior housing tend to locate in built-out areas near transit and services, in areas that are zoned to permit multifamily uses. These are areas that have generally been previously developed with impervious surfaces. Any grading or paving would need to comply with LID and NPDES requirements to receive construction permits. Project-level mitigations would be required as applicable to address any runoff impacts.

Areas with on-site streams are not generally located in the commercial zones where density bonus apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review under the ordinance. These exemptions mostly apply to infill sites or sites previously developed with urban uses in urbanized areas and/or areas near transit.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns in a way that would result in flooding. This is because the MXD zone and commercial zones are generally located in areas previously developed with impervious surfaces.

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 Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in projects that would 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. Swimming pools, man-made lakes and other large water features would add a relatively significant expense to projects that contain below-market-rate units. Project-level mitigations would be required as applicable to ensure proper drainage on-site.

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 Density Bonus Ordinance Update would not result in projects that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

Affordable and senior housing tend to locate in built-out areas near transit and services, in areas that are zoned to permit multifamily uses. These are areas that have generally been previously developed

with impervious surfaces. Any grading or paving would need to comply with LID and NPDES requirements to receive construction permits. Project-level mitigations would be required as applicable to address impacts to storm drain capacity.

Areas not previously developed with impervious surfaces are not generally located in the commercial zones where density bonus apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review under the ordinance. These exemptions mostly apply to infill sites or sites previously developed with urban uses in urbanized areas and/or areas near transit.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. This is because the MXD zone and commercial zones are generally located in areas previously developed with impervious surfaces.

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential impact of the ordinance on housing production would be less than significant.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update would not result in projects that would generate construction- or post-construction runoff that would violate NPDES permits or significantly affect surface or groundwater quality.

Affordable and senior housing tend to locate in built-out areas near transit and services, in areas that are zoned to permit multifamily uses. These are areas that have generally been previously developed and would require less grading than previously undeveloped areas. Any grading or excavation would need to comply with NPDES requirements to receive construction permits.

The parking requirements for density bonus projects near transit, and eliminating the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households, would potentially result in less grading and fewer runoff impacts.

Areas not previously developed are not generally located in the commercial zones where density bonus apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review under the ordinance. These exemptions mostly apply to infill sites or sites previously developed with urban uses in urbanized areas and/or areas near transit.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would not create significant runoff. This is because the MXD zone and commercial zones are generally located in areas previously developed.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update would not result in projects that would conflict with LID requirements, as the projects would have to comply with the LID ordinance and do not entail emergency health and safety construction. Compliance with LID will be described at a project level.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update would not result in the discharge of pollution into an Area of Special Biological Significance.

The County's Areas of Special Biological Significance are offshore areas near Santa Catalina and San Clemente Island, as well as areas off the Santa Monica Mountains Coastal Zone near Mugu Lagoon and Latigo Point. Affordable and senior housing is usually located in built-out areas that are zoned to support multifamily and commercial uses, and that are near transit and services. Areas adjacent to Los Angeles County's Areas of Special Biological Significance are not zoned to permit most density bonus projects. Even a single-family density bonus project would be unlikely because of the amount of land required and the subdivision process, which would introduce a discretionary review subject to CEQA.

Construction of affordable housing is likely to take place on land that has previously been developed with impervious surfaces, and therefore the additional impact of runoff from the new housing would be minimal. Projects would be subject to LID requirements that would mitigate nonpoint sources of runoff pollution. In addition, built-out areas are typically connected to the Sanitation District's wastewater

system and would not generate point sources of pollutants. This would further diminish the potential of projects to pollute Areas of Special Biological Significance.

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 Density Bonus Ordinance Update will not result in projects that would use septic systems.

Affordable and senior housing is almost always located in built-out areas with access to transit and services, zoned to permit multifamily development. This is because residents of these projects tend to be transit-dependent and in need of services. By extension, the areas where density bonus projects tend to locate are served by municipal wastewater systems that would be subject to the wastewater treatment standards set by the RWQCB.

Areas not connected to municipal wastewater systems are located in places where a density bonus would be difficult to utilize, such as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, Significant Ecological Areas, Hillside Management Areas, or sensitive habitat areas in the Coastal Zone. These areas have development standards and permitting requirements that are intended to protect people, property, and biological resources. These areas are generally zoned for open space, where density bonus projects are not permitted. In addition, these areas are generally zoned for low density single-family development, where it would be difficult to utilize a density bonus. Even if a density bonus development contained single-family homes, the amount of land required for such a project would most likely restrict the project's potential to be built, and the subdivision process, which is subject to CEQA, would likely require mitigations.

Areas not connected to municipal wastewater systems are not generally located in the commercial zones where density bonus apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review under the ordinance. These exemptions mostly apply to infill sites or sites previously developed with urban uses in urbanized areas and/or areas near transit. Areas not connected to municipal wastewater systems are not generally located in these areas.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would not create wastewater impacts. This is because the MXD zone and commercial zones are not generally located in areas not connected to municipal wastewater systems.

k) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update will not result in projects that would substantially degrade water quality. Affordable and senior housing is almost always located in built-out areas that have previously been developed with impervious surfaces, with access to transit and services, and by extension to public wastewater and sewer systems. These systems would be subject to the wastewater treatment standards set by the RWQCB. Projects would be subject to Los Angeles County’s Low-Impact Development (LID) requirements and best management practices to minimize polluted runoff as part of the construction permitting process. It is unlikely that affordable housing would be located on a contaminated site, as such contamination would need to be remediated prior to construction. A project-level environmental review would determine impacts to water quality.

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?

It is unlikely that the Density Bonus Ordinance Update will result in housing within a mapped 100-year flood hazard area, or within a floodway or floodplain. Almost all the unincorporated area that is within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodplain or floodway is located in areas of the Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley and Santa Monica Mountains that are not zoned in a way that supports density bonus projects. Density bonus projects tend to locate in areas zoned to permit multifamily development. These 100-year flood hazard areas and floodways are mostly zoned for open space, agriculture, watershed and low-density residential development. There are some flood-prone areas that are commercially zoned, but the ordinance only allows ministerial review of density bonus projects in commercial zones if they are exempt from CEQA. These exemptions mostly apply to infill sites or sites previously developed with urban uses in urbanized areas and/or areas near transit. Other regulations, such as the HMA and SEA ordinance, could limit development and introduce a discretionary review. Even if a density bonus development contained single-family homes, the amount of land required for such a project would most likely restrict the project’s potential to be built, and the subdivision process would be subject to a discretionary review with CEQA review.

Furthermore, any density bonus housing will comply with County Code for building within flood-prone areas, if applicable, rendering the potential impact less than significant.

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

It is unlikely that the Density Bonus Ordinance Update will result in housing within a mapped 100-year flood hazard area, or within a floodway or floodplain. Almost all the unincorporated area that is within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodplain or floodway is located in areas of the Antelope Valley, Santa Clarita Valley and Santa Monica Mountains that are not zoned in a way that supports density bonus projects. Density bonus projects tend to locate in areas zoned to permit multifamily development. These 100-year flood hazard areas and floodways are mostly zoned for open space, agriculture, watershed and low-density residential development. There are some flood-prone areas that are commercially zoned, but the ordinance only allows ministerial review of density bonus projects in commercial zones if they are exempt from CEQA. These exemptions mostly apply to infill sites or sites previously developed with urban uses in urbanized areas and/or areas near transit. Other regulations, such as the HMA and SEA ordinance, could also limit development and introduce a discretionary review. Even if a density bonus development contained single-family homes, the amount of land required for such a project would most likely restrict the project's potential to be built, and the subdivision process would be subject to a discretionary process with CEQA review.

Furthermore, any density bonus housing will comply with County Code for building within flood-prone areas, if applicable, rendering the potential impact less than significant.

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?

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update will not result in significant exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of levee or dam failure.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site; or jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would render the potential for the Density Bonus Ordinance Update to result in projects that exposure people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of levee or dam failure, less than significant.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in the production of more housing. The presence of a potential landslide hazard will be determined at the project level. The only unincorporated area in a tsunami hazard zone is Marina del Rey, which is built-out with high-density housing, so the impact of projects approved under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update would be less than significant. Furthermore, development in Marina del Rey is subject to the Marina del Rey Local Coastal Program, which contains analysis and policies governing assessment of tsunami and seiche risk.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update could result in the production of new housing. However, it is unlikely the update would create a significant impact on hydrology, would significantly pollute biologically significant waterways, or would expose people to significant flood risk. Affordable and senior housing is usually located in built-out, urbanized areas that have previously been developed with impervious surfaces; are zoned to permit multifamily uses; and are connected to public wastewater and sewer systems. These factors, as well as the requirements of Los Angeles County to incorporate LID best management practices, as well as the requirement for an NPDES permit to regulate construction runoff on projects of more than an acre, would mitigate the potential hydrological impacts.

Since the unincorporated areas overlap or border flood zones, dam inundation areas and tsunami zones, it is possible that the Density Bonus Ordinance could be used in such areas. Any density bonus project will comply with County Code for building within flood-prone areas, if applicable.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site; or jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would render the potential for the Density Bonus Ordinance Update to result in significant hydrology impacts less than significant.

Other aspects of the ordinance, including equity sharing on for-sale units, fee exemptions and reductions for projects, one-for-one replacement of existing affordable units, and the requirement for affordability covenants for 55 years, would not increase the amount of housing and therefore the impact to hydrology would be less than significant.

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | <i>Less Than Significant</i> | | |
| | <i>Potentially Significant Impact</i> | <i>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 Density Bonus Ordinance Update will not result in significant physical divisions in communities.

While new housing could result from the ordinance, it will not result in the construction of new freeways, rail lines or other infrastructure of sufficient bulk and impenetrability to divide a community. In addition, areas lacking infrastructure are generally zoned for low density single-family development, where it would be difficult to utilize a density bonus. Even if a density bonus development contained single-family homes, the amount of land required for such a project would most likely restrict the project’s potential to be built, and the subdivision process, which is subject to CEQA, would likely require mitigations.

Affordable and senior housing tends to locate in infill areas near transit and services because occupants of affordable housing are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. Infill areas are less likely to require significant new infrastructure, and are zoned to permit multifamily uses, including density bonus projects, which are commonly multifamily developments. Affordable and senior housing tends to be located on existing parcels and would most likely conform to the existing street grid. In addition, density bonus projects are typically located on a limited number of parcels, at a scale that would be unlikely to physically divide an established community.

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

The granting of density bonuses, waivers and incentives, allowing unlimited waivers of development standards that physically preclude a density bonus project from being built at the densities and/or with the incentives permitted by the density bonus, and requiring density bonuses and affordable housing set-asides to be calculated by rounding fractional units up to the nearest whole number, could result in

more housing at a higher density than what the land use designation allows on a given site. However, the Land Use Element of the General Plan permits deviations to the Land Use Legend and Land Use Policy Map, such as an increase in density above the maximum allowable density, for density bonuses for affordable and senior citizen housing.

The General Plan Transit-Oriented Districts program is being implemented with the creation of TOD Specific Plans within ½-mile areas surrounding Metro Rail stations. The TOD specific plans encourage higher-density housing as well as bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Density bonus projects support TOD goals. Residents of affordable housing tend to be dependent on transit or non-motorized transportation and are less likely to own a car, so density bonus projects are likely to house residents that will utilize transit, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.

Furthermore, the Density Bonus Ordinance does not provide for uses that are inconsistent with the applicable land use category. If a plan amendment were requested by a density bonus project, the plan amendment would be subject to a discretionary review process and project-level mitigations may be required. The requirement for one-for-one replacement of existing affordable units would be unlikely to create inconsistency with a land use plan, since residential uses are permitted in commercial and residential land use categories where density bonus projects are likely to locate.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update creates new incentives for housing that would be eligible for relief from development standards dictated by zoning. In addition, the Density Bonus Ordinance Update would allow ministerial review of apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemption in commercial zones, where apartments would otherwise require a conditional use permit.

However, the review processes and findings described below will render any potential impacts less than significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen

housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or on any real property that is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site; or jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare.

Other discretionary findings are that the project site must be adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, parking and loading facilities, landscaping and other development features prescribed in Title 22, or as is otherwise required in order to integrate said use with the uses in the surrounding area; the proposed project has been designed to be complimentary to the surrounding area in terms of land use patterns and design; and that any proposed incentives will contribute to the use and enjoyment of persons residing within the proposed project.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would reduce any potential impacts from inconsistency with development standards to less than significant.

The Density Bonus Ordinance would allow ministerial review of apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions in some commercial zones (C-H, C-1, C-2, and C-3). These zones do not otherwise allow apartments by right, but apartments are allowed with a conditional use permit. However, this provision would have a less than significant impact because only projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be eligible.

Furthermore, density bonus apartment projects would not be ministerially permitted in the Commercial Manufacturing (C-M) zone under the ordinance. In addition, the ordinance would not permit apartment projects in the Commercial Recreation (C-R) zone, where apartments are not permitted.

The other commercial zone, C-MJ (Major Commercial), is not currently mapped, so the potential impact of the Density Bonus Ordinance Update on housing in this zone would be less than significant. The ordinance does not provide additional density bonuses as incentive with ministerial review in the rural mixed use or rural commercial zone.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in the construction of housing in areas subject to the Hillside Management Areas Ordinance or Significant Ecological Areas Ordinance. This is because affordable and senior housing is usually built in previously urbanized areas near transit and services, and where the zoning supports multifamily housing or commercial development. Hillside Management Areas and SEAs are not generally zoned to facilitate multifamily housing.

If a density bonus project were to locate in a Hillside Management Area or SEA, the discretionary HMA or SEA process would apply, regardless of whether the housing use was reviewed ministerially or under a discretionary process. Furthermore, if an affordable homeownership project were to be built using the density bonus, impacts would be mitigated through the discretionary subdivision process. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update does not contain provisions that would provide relief from these requirements.

In addition, the parking requirements in the ordinance, and eliminating the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households, would not conflict with the HMA or SEA ordinance. Affordable and senior housing tends to be built in infill areas near transit and services because these occupants are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent.

Furthermore, density bonus apartment projects would not be a ministerially permitted use in the Commercial Manufacturing (C-M) zone under the ordinance. In addition, the ordinance would not permit apartment projects in the Commercial Recreation (C-R) zone, where apartments are not permitted.

The other commercial zone, C-MJ (Major Commercial), is not currently mapped, so the potential impact of the Density Bonus Ordinance Update on housing in this zone would be less than significant.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would be unlikely to result in projects that are subject to the SEA or HMA ordinance. This is because the MXD zone and commercial zones do not generally contain HMAs or SEAs.

The ordinance does not provide additional density bonuses as incentive with ministerial review in the Rural Mixed Use (MXD-RU) or Rural Commercial zone (C-RU), even if the project were to meet the criteria for a CEQA exemption. Furthermore, these zones are not located in infill areas

where affordable and senior housing tends to locate, rendering any potential impact less than significant.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The granting of density bonuses, waivers and incentives, allowing unlimited waivers of development standards that physically preclude a density bonus project from being built at the densities and/or with the incentives permitted by the density bonus, and requiring density bonuses and affordable housing set-asides to be calculated by rounding fractional units up to the nearest whole number, could result in more housing that does not conform to development standards or densities in the underlying land use category. However, the Density Bonus Ordinance Update will not result in significant land use impacts.

Affordable and senior housing tends to be located in built-out areas near transit and services with an existing street grid, on parcels that are zoned to permit multifamily development. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update does not allow for uses that are not permitted by underlying land use or zoning, or provide relief from SEA and HMA requirements. Furthermore, areas subject to SEA and HMA criteria are more remote and not generally zoned to permit multifamily housing. If a density bonus project were to locate in an SEA or HMA, the applicable ordinances and mitigation measures protecting ecological resources and hillsides would apply to the project.

In addition, the review processes and findings in the Density Bonus Ordinance Update would ensure that waivers, incentives and density bonuses do not have a significant land use impact.

Other aspects of the ordinance, including equity sharing on for-sale units, fee exemptions and reductions for projects, one-for-one replacement of existing affordable units and the requirement for affordability covenants for 55 years would not increase the amount of housing and therefore would not have land use impacts.

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) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in significant loss of the availability of known mineral resources.

The General Plan contains goals and policies to protect mineral resources. The County’s Mineral Resource Zones are based on State data and mapped in the General Plan. Many of them are located within cities or in areas where the underlying land use or zoning does not permit dense multifamily or commercial development, and instead are intended for open space, agriculture, public or semi-public use, or mineral resources.

Density bonus projects tend to locate in areas zoned to permit multifamily and commercial use because multifamily and mixed-use projects are permitted in these zones. Density bonus projects also tend to locate in built-out areas near transit and services, because the residents of affordable and senior housing tend to be transit-dependent. Therefore, many Mineral Resource Zones are located in areas where density bonus projects are unlikely to locate.

Other Mineral Resource Zones are located in largely built-out urban or suburban areas where density bonus projects are more likely to locate. Since these areas are largely already built-out, any impacts to mineral resource availability would not increase significantly as a result of a density bonus project. In some cases, a density bonus project were to locate in a Mineral Resource Zone, additional project-level mitigations may apply.

Oil and gas resources identified by the State and mapped in the General Plan overlap with many unincorporated areas, including infill areas. While the Density Bonus Ordinance Update may result in more development, density bonus projects tend to be located on previously developed parcels in infill areas near transit and services. Since these areas are largely already built-out, any impacts to oil and gas availability would not increase significantly as a result of a density bonus project. It is unlikely that projects eligible for a density bonus would be proposed on land currently used for oil and gas extraction because the land use and/or zoning would protect the current oil and gas extraction use, but in such cases the State would oversee the decommissioning process. Any plan amendment or rezoning in conjunction with a density bonus project would introduce the discretionary process.

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?

Los Angeles County only uses State of California data to identify mineral resource areas and does not designate any areas itself. Therefore, the Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in significant loss of locally-important mineral resource recovery sites.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in significant loss of the availability of known mineral resources.

The General Plan contains goals and policies to protect mineral resources. The County’s Mineral Resource Zones are based on State data and mapped in the General Plan. Many of them are located within cities or in areas where the underlying land use or zoning does not permit dense multifamily or commercial development, and instead are intended for open space, agriculture, public or semi-public use, or mineral resources.

Density bonus projects tend to locate in areas zoned to permit multifamily and commercial use because multifamily and mixed-use projects are permitted by right in these zones. Density bonus projects also tend to locate in built-out areas near transit and services, because the residents of affordable and senior housing tend to be transit-dependent. Therefore, many density bonus projects are located in areas that are unlikely to contain Mineral Resource Zones.

Other Mineral Resource Zones are located in largely built-out urban or suburban areas where density bonus projects are more likely to locate. Since these areas are largely already built-out, any impacts to mineral resource availability would not increase significantly as a result of a density bonus project. If a density bonus project were to locate in a Mineral Resource Zone, additional project-level mitigations may apply.

Oil and gas resources identified by the State and mapped in the General Plan overlap with many unincorporated areas, including infill areas. While the Density Bonus Ordinance Update may result in more development, density bonus projects tend to be located on previously developed parcels in infill areas near transit and services. Since these areas are largely already built-out, any

impacts to oil and gas availability would not increase significantly as a result of a density bonus project. It is unlikely that projects eligible for a density bonus would be proposed on land currently used for oil and gas extraction because the land use and/or zoning would protect the current oil and gas extraction use, but in such cases the State would oversee the decommissioning process. Any plan amendment or rezoning in conjunction with a density bonus project would introduce the discretionary process.

Other aspects of the ordinance, including equity sharing on for-sale units, one-for-one replacement of existing affordable units, fee exemptions and reductions for projects, and the requirement for affordability covenants for 55 years would not increase the amount of housing and therefore would not impact mineral resources.

13. NOISE

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | <i>Less Than Significant</i> | | |
| | <i>Potentially Significant Impact</i> | <i>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 Los Angeles County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies?

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in significant exposure to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of County standards.

The ordinance would result in projects that would generate some construction noise and could expose residents to sources of noise. However, the projects would be subject to Title 12 of Los Angeles County Code, which regulates construction noise and establishes acceptable noise exposure standards for different land use types. In addition, the General Plan noise contour maps identify areas where noise levels are particularly high due to proximity to major thoroughfares or airports. Projects located in such areas could be required to provide noise insulation beyond what is required in the Building Code for multifamily developments. In addition, density bonus projects in an Airport Influence Area would be reviewed for a consistency determination with the applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. General Plan policies in the Noise Element provide for reduction of noise exposure through site design, buffering, attenuation, orientation, and consideration of land use compatibility at the project planning stage.

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update does not provide incentives for industrial uses, which tend to generate the most significant noise impacts. In addition, as a residential use, density bonus projects would not generate significant amounts of noise compared to other types of uses.

Affordable and senior housing tends to locate in infill areas near transit and services because occupants of affordable housing are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. These areas are zoned to permit multifamily uses, including density bonus projects, which are commonly multifamily developments. Infill areas have existing levels of noise typical of urban areas, so density bonus projects would not generate or expose residents to significantly more noise.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in significant exposure to, or generation of, groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels in excess of County standards.

The ordinance would result in projects that would generate some construction noise and could expose residents to sources of noise. However, the projects would be subject to Title 12 of Los Angeles County Code, which regulates construction noise and establishes acceptable noise exposure standards for different land use types. In addition, the General Plan noise contour maps identify areas where noise levels are particularly high due to proximity to major thoroughfares or airports. Projects located in such areas could be required to provide noise insulation beyond what is required in the Building Code for multifamily developments. In addition, density bonus projects in an Airport Influence Area would be reviewed for a consistency determination with the applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. General Plan policies in the Noise Element provide for reduction of noise exposure through site design, buffering, attenuation, orientation, and consideration of land use compatibility at the project planning stage.

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update does not provide incentives for industrial uses, which tend to generate the most significant groundborne noise impacts. In addition, as a residential use, density bonus projects would not generate significant amounts of groundborne noise compared to other types of uses.

Affordable and senior housing tends to locate in infill areas near transit and services because occupants of affordable housing are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. These areas are zoned to permit multifamily uses, including density bonus projects, which are commonly multifamily developments. Infill areas have existing levels of noise typical of urban areas, so density bonus projects would not generate or expose residents to significantly more groundborne noise.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare; be detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would reduce any potential groundborne noise impacts to less than significant.

Density Bonus Ordinance Update may result in more housing in commercial zones, which are usually located along major thoroughfares with more vehicle traffic and potentially more groundborne noise. However, the ability of a density bonus project to locate in a commercial zone with ministerial review is a benefit that would only apply to CEQA-exempt projects and only in some commercial zones (C-H, C-1, C-2, and C-3).

Density bonus apartment projects in the Commercial Manufacturing (C-M) zone, which allows some industrial uses and could therefore be a source of significant groundborne noise, would not be eligible for ministerial review under the ordinance.

The other commercial zone, C-MJ (Major Commercial), is not currently mapped, so the potential impact of the Density Bonus Ordinance Update on housing in this zone would be less than significant.

The ordinance does not provide additional density bonuses as incentive with ministerial review in the rural mixed use or rural commercial zone, even if the project were to meet the criteria for a CEQA exemption. This would further reduce the potential noise impact of the ordinance in zones that are closer to rural areas, which do not have urban levels of noise and would be potentially more impacted by noise.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would be unlikely to create significant groundborne noise impacts, as these zones are located in more urbanized areas with existing levels of noise typical of urban environments.

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 Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels, including from parking areas.

The ordinance would result in projects that would generate some noise and could expose residents to sources of noise. However, the projects would be subject to Title 12 of Los Angeles County Code, which regulates construction noise and establishes acceptable noise exposure standards for different land use types. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update does not provide incentives for industrial uses, which tend to generate the most significant noise impacts. Furthermore, affordable and senior housing tends to locate in urban areas near transit and services, zoned to permit multifamily use. These areas tend to be built-out and have existing ambient noise levels typical of urban environments, so the potential increase in ambient noise generated by a density bonus project would not be significant compared to existing levels.

Furthermore, if a density bonus project were to locate in a commercial area, the residential use would likely generate less noise from traffic, parking and deliveries than a commercial use. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update includes reduced parking requirements compared to non-density bonus projects for projects close to transit and the elimination of parking requirements for extremely low income resident units, so the noise generated by parking areas would potentially be reduced by the ordinance. Since residents of affordable and senior housing tend to be transit-dependent, noise generated by vehicles would be less than significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that

the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare; be detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would reduce any potential permanent ambient noise impacts to less than significant.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels above levels existing without the project, including from amplified sound systems. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update does not provide incentives for industrial uses, which tend to generate the most significant periodic noise impacts.

It is unlikely that housing would generate noise from an amplified sound system, but it is possible that a project created under the ordinance would produce periodic amplified sound that could be heard outside of the development.

The ordinance would result in projects that would generate some noise and could expose residents to sources of noise. However, the projects would be subject to Title 12 of Los Angeles County Code, which regulates construction noise and establishes acceptable noise exposure standards for different land use types. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update does not provide incentives for industrial uses, which tend to generate the most significant periodic noise impacts. Furthermore, affordable and senior housing tends to locate in urban areas near transit and services, zoned to permit multifamily use. These areas tend to be built-out and have existing ambient noise levels typical of urban environments, so the potential increase in periodic ambient noise generated by a density bonus project would not be significant compared to existing levels.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets

the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare; be detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would reduce any potential periodic ambient noise impacts to less than significant.

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 Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to expose residents or workers to excessive airport noise levels.

Affordable and senior housing tends to locate in infill areas near transit and services because occupants of affordable housing are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. These areas are zoned to permit multifamily uses, including density bonus projects, which are commonly multifamily

developments. Many of the unincorporated Airport Influence Areas are zoned for low-density residential uses, where it is unlikely that a density bonus project would locate. There are some unincorporated Airport Influence Areas that are zoned to permit multifamily uses.

However, the projects would be subject to Title 12 of Los Angeles County Code, which regulates construction noise and establishes acceptable noise exposure standards for different land use types. In addition, the General Plan noise contour maps identify areas where noise levels are particularly high due to proximity to major thoroughfares or airports. Projects located in such areas could be required to provide noise insulation beyond what is required in the Building Code for multifamily developments. In addition, density bonus projects in an Airport Influence Area would be reviewed for a consistency determination with the applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. General Plan policies in the Noise Element provide for reduction of noise exposure through site design, buffering, attenuation, orientation, and consideration of land use compatibility at the project planning stage.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare; be detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would reduce any potential airport noise impacts to less than significant.

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update may result in more housing in commercial zones. However, the ability of a density bonus project to locate in a commercial zone with ministerial review is a benefit that would only apply to CEQA-exempt projects and only in some commercial zones (C-H, C-1, C-2, and C-3).

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would be unlikely to create significant airport noise impacts, as these are permitted uses and would be subject to an ALUCP consistency determination and findings described above.

The ordinance does not provide additional density bonuses as incentive with ministerial review in the rural mixed use or rural commercial zone, even if the project were to meet the criteria for a CEQA exemption. This would further reduce the potential noise impact of the ordinance in rural zones in Airport Influence Areas.

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 Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to expose residents or workers to excessive noise levels from private airstrips. While the ordinance could result in more residential development, the noise exposure would depend on the distance of the density bonus project to a private airstrip. The County’s Noise Control Ordinance and noise standards in the Building Code would apply to the project. Airstrips are also subject to federal noise regulations as well as a discretionary review of potential impacts by DRP.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for

senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare; be detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would reduce any potential airstrip noise impacts to less than significant.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in significant generation of noise or exposure to noise by residents and workers. The ordinance may result in more housing development, which would generate some noise during construction and operation. The ordinance could also increase residential development in commercial zones, which tend to be located along major thoroughfares with more vehicle traffic, noise and vibration.

However, density bonus projects would be subject to Title 12 of Los Angeles County Code, which regulates construction noise and establishes acceptable noise exposure standards for different land use types via the Noise Control Ordinance. Projects would also be subject to noise standards in the Building Code, and depending on noise exposure, may be required to exceed noise standards in the Building Code. Since affordable housing tends to locate in built-out urban areas near services and transit, the noise exposure and/or generation would not be significantly greater than it would be in any other project in an urban environment.

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update does not provide incentives for industrial uses, which tend to generate the most significant periodic noise impacts. Density bonus projects in an Airport Influence Area would need to be consistent with the applicable ALUCP.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project

meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare; be detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would reduce any potential noise impacts to less than significant.

Other aspects of the ordinance, including equity sharing on for-sale units, one-for-one replacement of affordable units, fee exemptions and reductions for projects, and the requirement for affordability covenants for 55 years would not increase the amount of housing and therefore would have less than significant impact on exposure to, or generation of, excessive noise.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

Would the project:

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

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to induce substantial population growth. While the ordinance could result in more housing development, it is unlikely to result in population growth that would exceed projections in the General Plan. According to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG RTP 2012-2035), the existing population of LA County unincorporated areas is 1,051,989 million people, and is projected to increase to 1,399,500 by 2020. According to the 2017 Housing Element Progress Report, Los Angeles County only met 14 percent of its projected regional housing needs from 2014. There is a need for Los Angeles County unincorporated areas to build 25,139 units by 2021 to meet its regional housing needs. This ordinance will help fill in gaps to provide more housing to accommodate the increase in population, and the increased need for affordable housing.

In addition, density bonus projects are likely to locate in areas with zoning that permits multifamily and mixed uses. Furthermore, affordable and senior housing tend to locate in urban areas near transit and services. These areas tend to be built-out infill areas that were previously developed, so new density bonus projects would not induce substantial population growth compared to what is existing.

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

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, either market rate or affordable. However, in the event that a site is redeveloped and existing housing is replaced, the ordinance requires the replacement of housing occupied or formerly occupied by low and very low income households onsite in order to qualify for a density bonus. The ordinance will also extend affordability covenants on rental units to 55 years, which would prevent further displacement of low-income occupants.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to displace substantial numbers of people. However, in the event that a site is redeveloped and existing occupied housing is replaced, the ordinance requires the replacement of housing occupied by low and very low income households onsite in order to qualify for a density bonus. The ordinance will also extend affordability covenants on rental units to 55 years, which would prevent further displacement of low-income occupants. In limited instances, such as HOME funded projects or mobilehome parks, the redevelopment of the site will require the owner to provide relocation assistance and/or offer right of first refusal to people who are displaced.

d) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to lead to projects that will cumulatively exceed population projections. While the ordinance could result in more housing development, it is unlikely to result in population growth that would exceed projections in the General Plan. According to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG RTP 2012-2035), the existing population of LA County unincorporated areas is 1,051,989 million people, and is projected to increase to 1,399,500 by 2020. According to the 2017 Housing Element Progress Report, Los Angeles County only met 14 percent of its projected regional housing needs from 2014. There is a need for Los Angeles County unincorporated areas to build 25,139 units by 2021 to meet its regional housing needs. This ordinance will help fill in gaps to provide more housing to accommodate the increase in population, and the increased need for affordable housing.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

While the ordinance could result in more housing development, it is unlikely to lead to projects that will significantly induce population growth and cumulatively exceed population projections in the General Plan. This ordinance will help fill in gaps to provide more housing to accommodate the increase in population, and the increased need for affordable housing. Furthermore, the Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or people. However, in the event that a site is redeveloped and existing housing is replaced, the ordinance requires the replacement of housing occupied or formerly occupied by low and very low income households onsite in order to qualify for a density bonus. The ordinance will also extend affordability covenants on rental units to 55 years, which would prevent displacement of low-income occupants. Furthermore, in limited instances, such as HOME funded projects or mobilehome parks, the redevelopment of the site will require the owner to provide relocation assistance and/or offer right of first refusal to people who are displaced.

Furthermore, the granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential impact of extremely the ordinance on fire protection service levels or construction of new fire stations, would be less than significant.

Overall, the impacts for the ordinance on population and housing are less than significant.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to significantly impact fire protection service levels or necessitate the construction of new fire stations that would have a significant environmental impact.

While the ordinance could result in more housing, density bonus projects tend to locate in built-out urban areas near transit and services. These areas are likely to have already been previously developed and have existing fire protection services and facilities.

Affordable and senior housing tends to locate in infill areas near transit and services because occupants of affordable housing are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. These areas are zoned to permit multifamily uses, including density bonus projects, which are commonly multifamily developments.

In addition, areas with the highest fire risk in Los Angeles County, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, are places where a density bonus is difficult to utilize. These areas have development standards and permitting requirements that are intended to protect people, property and resources such as hillsides and habitat through the HMA and SEA ordinance. These areas are generally zoned for open space, where density bonus projects are not permitted. In addition, these areas are generally zoned for low density single-family development, where it would be difficult to utilize a density bonus. Even if a density bonus development contained single-family homes, the amount of land required for such a project would most likely restrict the project’s potential to be built, and the subdivision process, which is subject to CEQA, would likely require mitigations.

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In

addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential impact of density bonus projects on fire protection service levels or construction of new fire stations, would be less than significant.

While the Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to produce housing on a scale that would significantly impact public services, the review processes and findings applicable to density bonus projects would ensure that impacts from individual projects are less than significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare; and that the proposed site is adequately served by public or private service facilities as are required.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would render any potential impact to fire protection service levels or the need to construct new fire stations that would have a significant environmental impact, less than significant.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would be unlikely to significantly impact fire protection service levels or necessitate the construction of new fire stations that would have a significant environmental impact, as these zones are located in more urbanized areas with existing fire protection services and facilities.

Density bonus projects would be subject to fire suppression requirements in the Fire and Building Codes, and may need to incorporate additional fire protection measures at the project level if Fire determines that additional fire prevention/suppression measures are needed.

Sheriff protection?

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update will not significantly impact Sheriff protection service levels or necessitate the construction of new Sheriff stations that would have a significant environmental impact.

Affordable and senior housing tends to locate in infill areas near transit and services because occupants of affordable housing are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. These areas are zoned to permit multifamily uses, including density bonus projects, which are commonly multifamily developments. These areas are likely to have already been previously developed and have existing Sheriff protection services and facilities.

Areas that are sparsely populated in Los Angeles County are generally zoned for agriculture and low-density residential development, where a density bonus project would be difficult to utilize. Even if a density bonus development contained single-family homes, the amount of land required for such a project would most likely restrict the project’s potential to be built, and the subdivision process, which is subject to CEQA, would likely require mitigations.

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential impact of the ordinance on fire protection service levels or construction of new fire stations, would be less than significant.

While the Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to produce housing on a scale that would significantly impact fire services, the review processes and findings applicable to density bonus projects would ensure that impacts from individual projects are less than significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare; and that the proposed site is adequately served by public or private service facilities as are required.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would render any potential impact to Sheriff protection service levels or the need to construct new Sheriff stations that would have a significant environmental impact, less than significant.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would be unlikely to significantly impact Sheriff protection service levels or necessitate the construction of new Sheriff stations that would have a significant environmental impact, as these zones are located in more urbanized areas with existing Sheriff services and facilities.

Schools?

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to significantly impact school capacities or necessitate the construction of new schools that would have a significant environmental impact.

Affordable and senior housing tends to locate in infill areas near transit and services because occupants of affordable housing are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. These areas are zoned to permit multifamily uses, including density bonus projects, which are commonly multifamily developments. These areas are likely to have already been previously developed with similar densities and intensities and have existing schools that would not be significantly impacted.

This ordinance will not have a significant impact on schools in sparsely populated areas in Los Angeles County, which are likely to have lower school capacity and are generally zoned for agriculture and low-density residential development, where a density bonus project would be difficult to utilize. Even if a density bonus development contained single-family homes, the amount of land required for such a project would most likely restrict the project's potential to be built, and the subdivision process, which is subject to CEQA, would likely require mitigations.

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential impact of the ordinance on schools or construction of new schools, would be less than significant.

While the Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to produce housing on a scale that would significantly impact schools, the review processes and findings applicable to density bonus projects would ensure that impacts from individual projects are less than significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; and that the proposed site is adequately served by public or private service facilities as are required.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would render any potential impact to schools or the need to construct new school facilities that would have a significant environmental impact, less than significant.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would be unlikely to significantly impact schools or necessitate the construction of new schools that would have a significant environmental impact, as these zones are located in more urbanized areas with existing schools.

Density bonus projects may need to incorporate mitigations at the project level, such as school district fees.

Parks?

It is unlikely that the Density Bonus Ordinance Update will significantly impact park capacities or necessitate the construction of new parks that would have a significant environmental impact.

According to the General Plan Parks and Recreation Element, the unincorporated areas face a deficit in local parkland of over 3,719 acres, and nine of the 11 Planning Areas have deficits in regional parkland. The Department of Parks and Recreation’s Parks Needs Assessment, completed in 2016, inventories existing park resources, quantifies the need for additional resources in 188 Los Angeles County sub-areas (cities and unincorporated areas), and estimates the potential cost of meeting that need. Funding from a parcel tax approved in 2016 will be allocated locally according to need by the Regional Parks and Open Space District.

Furthermore, affordable and senior housing tends to locate in infill areas near transit and services because occupants of affordable housing are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. These areas are zoned to permit multifamily uses, including density bonus projects, which are commonly multifamily developments. These areas are likely to have already been previously developed with similar densities and intensities and have existing parks that would not be significantly impacted. Even if a density bonus project were to result in an increase in the number of people using a park, the overall effect on the existing parkland-to-population ratio would be less than significant in areas where density bonus projects tend to locate.

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential impact of the ordinance on parks or construction of new parks, would be less than significant.

While the Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to produce housing on a scale that would significantly impact parks, the review processes and findings applicable to density bonus projects would ensure that impacts from individual projects are less than significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or

working in the surrounding area or within the project; and that the proposed site is adequately served by public or private service facilities as are required.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would render any potential impact to parks less than significant.

Density bonus projects that are subdivisions could also be required to pay Quimby fees for parks.

Libraries?

It is unlikely that the Density Bonus Ordinance Update will significantly impact library capacities or necessitate the construction of new libraries that would have a significant environmental impact.

The ordinance could result in more housing development, which could increase the demand for library services. Affordable and senior housing tends to locate in infill areas near transit and services because occupants of affordable housing are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. These areas are zoned to permit multifamily uses, including density bonus projects, which are commonly multifamily developments. These areas are likely to have already been previously developed with similar densities and intensities and have existing libraries that would not be significantly impacted. Density bonus projects would also be subject to property tax payments and library mitigation fees based on the number of dwelling units.

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential impact of the ordinance on libraries or construction of new libraries, would be less than significant.

While the Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to produce housing on a scale that would significantly impact libraries, the review processes and findings applicable to density bonus projects would ensure that impacts from individual projects are less than significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income

housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; and that the proposed site is adequately served by public or private service facilities as are required.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would render any potential impact to libraries less than significant.

Other public facilities?

It is unlikely that the Density Bonus Ordinance Update will significantly impact public facilities or necessitate the construction of new public facilities that would have a significant environmental impact. The ordinance could result in more housing development, which could increase the demand for public facilities and impact the capacity of existing facilities.

However, density bonus projects tend to locate in multifamily or commercial zones, in built-out urban areas near transit and services. These areas are likely to have already been previously developed with similar densities and intensities and have existing public facilities that would not be significantly impacted by the project.

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a

covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential impact of the ordinance on public facilities or construction of new public facilities, is less than significant.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

It is unlikely that the Density Bonus Ordinance Update will significantly impact public services and facilities or necessitate the construction of new public facilities that would have a significant environmental impact. While the ordinance could result in more housing development, and therefore increased demand for public facilities, density bonus projects tend to locate in built-out urban areas near transit and services with multifamily or commercial zoning. These areas are likely to have already been previously developed with similar densities and intensities and have existing public services and facilities that would not be significantly impacted. These areas also tend not to be High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones as mapped in the General Plan, thereby reducing the potential impact to fire protection services and facilities.

Other types of services and facilities, such as parks, libraries and schools, would be subject to mitigation fees as applicable.

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential impact of the ordinance on public services and facilities would be less than significant.

Other aspects of the ordinance, including equity sharing on for-sale units, one-for-one replacement of affordable units, and the requirement for affordability covenants for 55 years would not increase the amount of housing and therefore would have less than significant impact on public facilities. Exemption from planning fees for 100% affordable projects and reduced planning fees for other affordable housing projects is unlikely to result in significant amounts of new housing, because planning fees are a relatively small percentage of total development costs.

16. RECREATION

| | <i>Potentially Significant Impact</i> | <i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i> | <i>Less Than Significant Impact</i> | <i>No Impact</i> |
|---|---|--|---|--------------------------|
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

It is unlikely that the Density Bonus Ordinance Update will significantly impact existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.

According to the General Plan Parks and Recreation Element, the unincorporated areas face a deficit in local parkland of over 3,719 acres, and nine of the 11 Planning Areas have deficits in regional parkland. The Department of Parks and Recreation’s Parks Needs Assessment, completed in 2016, inventories existing park resources, quantifies the need for additional resources in 188 Los Angeles County sub-areas (cities and unincorporated areas), and estimates the potential cost of meeting that need. Funding from a parcel tax approved in 2016 will be allocated locally according to need by the Regional Parks and Open Space District.

Affordable and senior housing tends to locate in infill areas near transit and services because occupants of affordable housing are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. These areas are zoned to permit multifamily uses, including density bonus projects, which are commonly multifamily developments. These areas are likely to have already been previously developed with similar densities and intensities and have existing parks that would not be significantly impacted. Even if a density bonus project were to result in an increase in the number of people using a park, the overall effect on the existing parkland-to-population ratio would be less than significant in areas where density bonus projects tend to locate. If the density bonus project is a subdivision, it could trigger payment of a Quimby fee for parks.

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential impact of the ordinance on parks would be less than significant.

While the Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to produce housing on a scale that would significantly impact parks, the review processes and findings applicable to density bonus projects would ensure that impacts from individual projects are less than significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; and that the proposed site is adequately served by public or private service facilities as are required.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would render any potential impact to parks less than significant.

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?

It is unlikely that the Density Bonus Ordinance Update will 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.

The ordinance could result in more housing, which could increase the demand for recreational facilities or result in the creation of an on-site recreational component for a residential project. Affordable and senior housing tends to locate in infill areas near transit and services because occupants of affordable housing are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. These areas are zoned to permit multifamily uses, including density bonus projects, which are commonly multifamily developments. These areas are likely to have already been previously developed with similar densities and intensities and have existing parks or recreational facilities available for use by the project.

If the density bonus project is a subdivision, it could trigger payment of a Quimby fee for parks. However, while some density bonus projects contain an on-site recreational component, they rarely trigger mitigations that would involve the creation of new parks or recreational facilities that themselves would trigger mitigations.

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential impact of the ordinance on parks and recreation facilities would be less than significant.

While the Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to produce housing on a scale that would significantly impact parks and recreation facilities, the review processes and findings applicable to density bonus projects would ensure that impacts from individual projects are less than significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review.

The review processes and findings described above would render any potential impact from the construction of park and recreation facilities less than significant.

c) Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity?

It is unlikely that the Density Bonus Ordinance Update would interfere with regional open space connectivity. Density bonus projects tend to locate in built-out urban areas zoned to permit multifamily uses. Density bonus projects would not be permitted in areas zoned for open space.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

It is unlikely that the Density Bonus Ordinance Update will significantly impact recreation facilities or necessitate the construction of new recreational facilities that would have a significant environmental impact. The ordinance could result in more housing development, which could increase the demand for recreational facilities. However, density bonus projects tend to locate in multifamily or commercial zones, in built-out urban areas near transit and services. These areas are likely to have already been previously developed with similar densities and intensities and have existing recreational facilities that would not experience a significant additional impact due to density bonus projects. Density bonus projects may include a recreational component, but these would not be at a scale that would generate significant impacts or interfere with regional open space connectivity.

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the

specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential impact of the ordinance on parks and recreation facilities would be less than significant.

While the Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to produce housing on a scale that would significantly impact parks and recreation facilities, the review processes and findings applicable to density bonus projects would ensure that impacts from individual projects are less than significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; and that the proposed site is adequately served by public or private service facilities as are required.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would render any potential impact to or from parks and recreation facilities less than significant.

Other aspects of the ordinance, including equity sharing on for-sale units, one-for-one replacement of affordable units, and the requirement for affordability covenants for 55 years would not increase the amount of housing and therefore would have less than significant impact on the need for new parks and recreation facilities. Exemption from planning fees for 100% affordable projects and reduced planning fees for other affordable housing projects is unlikely to

result in significant amounts of new housing, because planning fees are a relatively small percentage of total development costs.

17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in projects that conflict with transportation plans and the General Plan Mobility Element. The General Plan specifically allows for density bonus projects to exceed baseline densities. In addition, the Density Bonus Ordinance Update does not allow for uses that are not permitted by underlying General Plan land use or Title 22 zoning. The General Plan is based upon growth assumptions from the Southern California Association of Governments’ Regional Transportation Plan, and since density bonus projects are consistent with the General Plan, they are consistent with the RTP.

The General Plan Transit-Oriented Districts program is being implemented with the creation of TOD Specific Plans within ½-mile areas surrounding Metro Rail stations. The TOD specific plans encourage higher-density housing as well as bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Density bonus projects support TOD goals. Residents of affordable housing tend to be dependent on transit or non-motorized transportation and are less likely to own a car, so density bonus projects are likely to house residents that will utilize transit, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Projects may be subject to requirements for sidewalk, curb, gutter and other pedestrian improvements as determined by the Department of Public Works. Projects would also be subject to bicycle parking requirements.

In addition, the Density Bonus Ordinance promotes use of non-motorized transportation by incentivizing housing near transit. The parking requirements in the Density Bonus Ordinance, the elimination of the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households, and the local incentives for affordable housing in the ordinance would promote the use of non-motorized transportation. The ordinance allows for ministerial approval of density bonus apartment projects in commercial zones (C-

H, C-1, C-2, and C-3) if the project meets thresholds for CEQA exemptions. These exemptions mostly apply to infill sites or sites previously developed with urban uses in urbanized areas and/or areas near transit.

Other County policies to incentivize affordable housing near transit include the addition of an extremely low income affordability category and ministerial review of a density bonus for a rental or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside, for projects that meet the criteria for a CEQA exemption.

Similarly, the ordinance allows mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, which are also served by transit.

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?

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in projects that conflict with Metro’s Congestion Management Plan.

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus.

While the Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to produce housing on a scale that would conflict with the CMP, the review processes and findings applicable to density bonus projects would ensure that impacts from individual projects are less than significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses

to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

Under the discretionary review, whether a density bonus project will impact a street or highway in the CMP will be determined at the project level in consultation with the Department of Public Works.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including: that the project will not be detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site; that the proposed project has been designed to be complimentary to the surrounding area in terms of land use patterns and design; and that the project is served by highways or streets of sufficient width, and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would minimize any potential conflicts with the CMP.

Furthermore, density bonus projects are generally located in infill areas near transit and services. This provides alternative transportation options and, therefore, density bonus projects are unlikely to create significant new traffic impacts or vehicle trips. Residential uses generally generate fewer vehicle trips than commercial uses, so allowing projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemption in commercial zones by right will not significantly exacerbate traffic conditions. Finally, residents of affordable and senior housing tend to be transit-dependent and are less likely to own a car, so density bonus projects are not likely to generate significant vehicle traffic. For this reason, the parking requirements in the Density Bonus Ordinance Update and elimination of the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households, would not conflict with the CMP.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would not conflict with the CMP, as these types of developments are efficient uses of land and tend to be located near transit.

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 Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in projects that change air traffic patterns or create significant new demand for air travel.

While the Density Bonus Ordinance Update would allow projects in the vicinity of an airport, these projects would be limited in number and therefore unlikely to significantly affect flight paths or air travel. And although the Density Bonus Ordinance Update could increase the amount of housing that would be eligible for incentives such as height increases, it is unlikely that projects would exceed 200 feet in height (a threshold for consultation with the Federal Aviation Administration).

In addition, density bonus projects in an Airport Influence Area would be reviewed for a consistency determination with the applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Existing FAA regulations and the ALUCPs and are intended to identify and properly address potential airport hazards prior to implementation of specific projects.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in projects that substantially increase hazards due to site design or heavy machinery.

Affordable and senior housing tends to locate in infill areas near transit and services because occupants of affordable housing are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. Density bonus projects are generally on lots that have been previously developed with residential or commercial uses accessible to vehicles, and are therefore likely to conform to existing street grids. In some instances, if construction machinery would create potential hazards, these can be mitigated at the project review level. As density bonus projects are primarily residential uses, farm equipment is unlikely to be present.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income

housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare; be detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site. Other findings include that the proposed project has been designed to be complimentary to the surrounding area in terms of land use patterns and design; that the proposed site is served by highways or streets of sufficient width, and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate; and that any proposed incentives will contribute to the use and enjoyment of persons residing within the proposed project.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would render the potential of hazardous design or incompatible uses less than significant.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in inadequate emergency access.

Affordable and senior housing tends to locate in infill areas near transit and services because occupants of affordable housing are less likely to own cars and more likely to be transit-dependent. Density bonus projects are generally on lots that have been previously developed with residential or commercial uses

accessible to vehicles, and are therefore likely to conform to existing street grids. In some instances, access issues and any mitigations will be determined by the Fire Department at the project level.

In addition, areas with limited access in Los Angeles County are in places where density bonuses would be difficult to utilize, such as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, Significant Ecological Areas, Hillside Management Areas, or sensitive habitat areas in the Coastal Zone. These areas have development standards and permitting requirements that are intended to protect people, property, and biological resources. These areas are generally zoned for open space, where density bonus projects are not permitted. In addition, these areas are generally zoned for low density single-family development, where it would be difficult to utilize a density bonus. Even if a density bonus development contained single-family homes, the amount of land required for such a project would most likely restrict the project's potential to be built, and the subdivision process, which is subject to CEQA, would likely require mitigations.

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential for the ordinance to substantially increase hazardous design features would be less than significant.

While the Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to produce housing on a scale that would significantly impact emergency access, the review processes and findings applicable to density bonus projects would ensure that impacts from individual projects are less than significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that

the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare; be detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site. Other findings include that the proposed project has been designed to be complimentary to the surrounding area in terms of land use patterns and design; that the proposed site is served by highways or streets of sufficient width, and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate; and that any proposed incentives will contribute to the use and enjoyment of persons residing within the proposed project.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would render the potential of inadequate emergency access less than significant.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in projects that conflict with transportation plans and the General Plan Mobility Element.

The General Plan Transit-Oriented Districts program is being implemented with the creation of TOD Specific Plans within ½-mile areas surrounding Metro Rail stations. The TOD specific plans encourage higher-density housing as well as bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Density bonus projects support TOD goals. Residents of affordable housing tend to be dependent on transit or non-motorized transportation and are less likely to own a car, so density bonus projects are likely to house residents that will utilize transit, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Projects may be subject to requirements for sidewalk, curb, gutter and other pedestrian improvements as determined by the Department of Public Works. Projects would also be subject to bicycle parking requirements.

In addition, the Density Bonus Ordinance Update promotes use of non-motorized transportation by incentivizing housing near transit. The parking requirements in the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the elimination of the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households, and the local incentives for affordable housing in the ordinance would promote the use of non-motorized transportation. The ordinance allows for ministerial approval of density bonus apartment projects in commercial zones (C-H, C-1, C-2, and C-3) if the project meets thresholds for CEQA exemptions. These exemptions mostly apply to infill sites or sites previously developed with urban uses in urbanized areas and/or areas near transit.

Other County policies to incentivize affordable housing near transit include the addition of an extremely low income affordability category and ministerial review of a density bonus for a rental or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside, for projects that meet the criteria for a CEQA exemption.

Similarly, the ordinance allows mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, which are also served by transit.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in projects that conflict with transportation plans, or cause significant traffic or transportation safety impacts. The General Plan specifically allows for density bonus projects to exceed baseline densities, and residential uses are permitted in commercial zones. The General Plan is based upon growth assumptions from the Southern California Association of Governments' Regional Transportation Plan. Density bonus projects are generally located in infill areas near transit and services, on lots that have previously been developed with residential or commercial uses on an existing street grid, and are therefore unlikely to create significant new transportation hazards or impacts.

Residential uses usually generate fewer trips than commercial uses, so allowing projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemption in commercial zones by right will not significantly exacerbate traffic conditions. Finally, residents of affordable housing tend to be transit-dependent and are less likely to own a car, so density bonus projects are not likely to generate significant vehicle traffic. The Department of Public Works may require sidewalk, curb, gutter and other pedestrian improvements, or a traffic study in the case of a discretionary project or any project in the Mixed Use Development (MXD), Major Commercial (C-MJ), or High Density Multiple Residence (R-5) zones.

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and

includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential for the ordinance to substantially impact transportation or traffic would be less than significant.

While the Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to produce housing on a scale that would significantly impact transportation and traffic, the review processes and findings applicable to density bonus projects would ensure that impacts from individual projects are less than significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings including that the project will not: adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare; be detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site. Other findings include that the proposed project has been designed to be complimentary to the surrounding area in terms of land use patterns and design; that the proposed site is served by highways or streets of sufficient width, and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate; and that any proposed incentives will contribute to the use and enjoyment of persons residing within the proposed project.

The required findings for ministerial approval of incentives and waivers from development standards, as well as the findings for discretionary review, would render the potential of transportation impacts or transportation safety hazards less than significant.

Other aspects of the ordinance, such as equity sharing on for-sale units, one-for-one replacement of affordable units, fee exemptions and reductions for density bonus projects, and the requirement for affordability covenants for 55 years would not increase the amount of housing and therefore would not result in transportation impacts.

18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

| 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) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in projects that exceed wastewater treatment requirements.

Affordable and senior housing is almost always located in built-out areas with access to transit and services, zoned to permit multifamily development. This is because residents of these projects tend to be transit-dependent and in need of services. By extension, areas where density bonus projects tend to locate are connected to public wastewater systems that would be subject to the wastewater treatment standards set by the RWQCB. All public 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 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.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to create water or wastewater system capacity problems.

Density bonus projects are likely to be located in infill areas with access to transit and services and that are: zoned to permit multifamily uses; have been previously developed; and near uses at similar densities and intensities. By extension, these areas have existing wastewater systems that are adequate for the project. Public Works may require a sewer area study for a density bonus project subject to

discretionary review or density bonus projects located in the Mixed Use Development (MXD), Major Commercial (C-MJ) and High Density Multiple Residence (R-5) zones.

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 Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in projects that create drainage system capacity problems or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities.

Affordable and senior housing tend to locate in built-out areas near transit and services, in areas that are zoned to permit multifamily uses. These are areas that have generally been previously developed with impervious surfaces and would not require significant grading of undisturbed land. Any grading or paving would need to comply with LID and NPDES requirements to minimize runoff as part of the construction permitting process. In some cases, project-level mitigations would be required as applicable to address impacts to storm drain capacity.

Previously undeveloped or sparsely developed areas that would be significantly impacted by the drainage needs of a density bonus project are not generally located within a half-mile of transit, and thus would not be impacted by the parking requirements for density bonus projects near transit, or by eliminating the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households.

Areas not previously developed with impervious surfaces are not generally located in the commercial zones where density bonus apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review under the ordinance. These exemptions mostly apply to infill sites or sites previously developed with urban uses in urbanized areas and/or areas near transit.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would not create drainage system capacity problems or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities. This is because the MXD zone and commercial zones are generally located in areas previously developed with impervious surfaces.

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 Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in projects that would not have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources.

Density bonus projects are likely to be located in infill areas with access to transit and services, on land previously developed with residential or commercial uses, and served by water systems that would provide will-serve letters verifying water supply. Projects would be subject to Los Angeles County’s Low-Impact Development (LID) requirements, Los Angeles County’s drought-tolerant landscaping requirements, as applicable, and CalGreen construction requirements for low-flow fixtures and other water conservation features.

Previously undeveloped or sparsely developed areas with limited water supply are not generally located within a half-mile of transit, and thus would not be impacted by the parking requirements for density bonus projects, or by eliminating the parking requirement for units set aside for extremely low income households.

Previously undeveloped or sparsely developed areas with limited water supply are not generally located in the commercial zones where density bonus apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review under the ordinance. These exemptions mostly apply to infill sites or sites previously developed with urban uses in urbanized areas and/or areas near transit.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would not create water supply problems. This is because the MXD zone and commercial zones are generally located in areas previously developed with urban uses at similar densities and intensities.

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 Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in projects that would not have sufficient energy supplies or result in the construction of new energy facilities. Density bonus projects are likely to be located in infill areas with access to transit and services, on land previously developed with

residential or commercial uses, and served by existing energy utilities. Projects would also be subject to Los Angeles County’s Green Building Program, which promotes energy efficiency.

Previously undeveloped or sparsely developed areas with limited energy supply are not generally located in the commercial zones where density bonus apartment projects that meet the thresholds for CEQA exemptions would be allowed to use ministerial review under the ordinance.

The ability of mixed-use and joint live-work density bonus projects to ministerially waive or modify development standards in the Mixed Use Development (MXD) Zone and various commercial zones, would not create energy supply problems. This is because the MXD zone and commercial zones are generally located in areas previously developed with urban uses at similar densities and intensities.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in projects that would significantly impact landfill capacity. Density bonus projects are likely to be located in infill areas with access to transit and services, on land previously developed with residential or commercial uses, and served by existing landfills. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to produce projects so large in scale that their impacts to landfill capacity would be significant, or projects that would not comply with the IWMP.

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

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in projects that would not comply with solid waste regulations. Projects that obtain planning and building approvals would be consistent with solid waste regulations. The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to produce projects that would displace waste disposal/diversion sites, as building residential uses on areas previously used for waste would require remediation and further environmental review.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to result in projects that would significantly impact utilities. Density bonus projects are likely to locate in infill areas previously developed with residential or commercial uses, and served by existing utilities that are subject to County

management plans for water quality, stormwater and waste. They are unlikely to be of a scale that would require new water, wastewater, energy or waste facilities to be built. The Department of Public Works may require a traffic study for density bonus projects subject to discretionary review or that are located in the Mixed Use Development (MXD), Major Commercial (C-MJ) or R-5 (High Density Multiple Residence) zones. They would also be subject to Los Angeles County's Green Building Code (Title 31), which includes measures for water and energy efficiency, and minimizing waste.

The granting of density bonuses will not significantly increase the amount of housing. Affordable housing requires subsidies from a variety of funding sources to offset the low rents charged to residents. In addition, affordable housing often serves populations with special needs and includes on-site supportive services. The age restrictions on senior housing are enforced by a covenant requiring occupancy of the unit by a senior resident. These factors contribute to the specialized nature of density bonus projects that make them unlikely to significantly increase as a result of a density bonus. Therefore, the potential impact of the ordinance on utilities would be less than significant.

While the Density Bonus Ordinance Update is unlikely to produce housing on a scale that would significantly impact utilities, the review processes and findings applicable to density bonus projects would ensure that impacts from individual projects are less than significant.

Under the Density Bonus Ordinance Update, the following project types would be subject to discretionary review, which would include project-level environmental review, unless the project meets the thresholds for CEQA exemptions, in which case it will be reviewed ministerially: extremely low income housing; rental housing or a single-family residential development with a moderate income housing set-aside; projects requesting additional density bonuses as an incentive beyond the bonuses to which they are entitled under the State Density Bonus Law; and apartment projects in certain commercial zones.

All other projects will be reviewed ministerially if they include set-asides provided in State law for very low, lower and moderate income households (common interest developments), or for senior citizen housing; request bonuses provided by State law; and are located in the zones where residential uses are permitted by right.

To qualify for ministerial review, projects would be required to meet the findings for incentives or waivers from development standards as applicable. These findings stipulate that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

If the project does not meet these findings as well as thresholds for CEQA exemptions (if required for ministerial review), the project would be subject to a discretionary review, subject to findings

including that the proposed site is adequately served by public or private service facilities as are required.

The above review processes and findings would render any potential impact to and by utility services and facilities, less than significant.

Other aspects of the ordinance, such as equity sharing on for-sale units, one-for-one replacement of affordable units, and the requirement for affordability covenants for 55 years would not increase the amount of housing and therefore would not result in impacts to and from utilities.

Exemption from planning fees for 100% affordable projects and reduced planning fees for other affordable housing projects is unlikely to result in significant amounts of new housing, because planning fees are a relatively small percentage of total development costs.

19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

The project is an ordinance to increase affordable and senior housing. The housing that results from this ordinance will be in previously developed areas that permit multifamily housing and sited away from areas where development can have such impacts to special management areas and the environment. The housing that results from this ordinance will also be limited in scale and number due to its specialized nature.

The ordinance includes several provisions that would reduce any potential environmental quality impacts to less than significant. These include a discretionary review process for projects ineligible for ministerial review under the State Density Bonus Law or CEQA exemption, as applicable, as well as required findings that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment, or on any real property that is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, or that the impact can be mitigated without making the development unaffordable to extremely low, very low, lower or moderate-income households.

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

The project is an ordinance to increase affordable and senior housing. The housing that results from this ordinance will be in areas that permit multifamily housing and sited away from areas where development can have such impacts to special management areas and the environment. The ordinance can both achieve short-term and long-term environmental goals by incentivizing efficient uses of land and housing near transit.

The housing that results from this ordinance will also be limited in scale and number due to its specialized nature.

The ordinance includes several provisions that would reduce any potential environmental quality impacts to less than significant. These include a discretionary review process for projects ineligible for ministerial review under the State Density Bonus Law or CEQA exemption, as applicable, as well as required findings that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment.

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)?

The project is an ordinance to increase affordable and senior housing. A large majority of the housing that results from this ordinance will be in areas that permit multifamily housing and sited away from areas where development can have such impacts. The effects of this ordinance will accommodate the existing shortage of housing and affordable housing, but not to the scale of having a cumulatively considerable impact.

The housing that results from this ordinance will also be limited in scale and number due to its specialized nature.

The ordinance includes several provisions that would reduce any potential environmental quality impacts to less than significant. These include a discretionary review process for projects ineligible for ministerial review under the State Density Bonus Law or CEQA exemption, as applicable, as well as required findings that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment.

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

The project is an ordinance to increase affordable and senior housing. The housing that results from this ordinance will be in previously developed areas that permit multifamily housing and sited away from areas with known hazards. The ordinance can both achieve short-term and long-term environmental goals. Furthermore, the housing that results from this ordinance shall be subject to all building and residential standards to ensure safe, habitable housing.

The housing that results from this ordinance will also be limited in scale and number due to its specialized nature.

The ordinance includes several provisions that would reduce any potential environmental quality impacts to less than significant. These include a discretionary review process for projects ineligible for ministerial review under the State Density Bonus Law or CEQA exemption, as applicable, as well as required findings that the incentive or waiver would not have a specific adverse impact upon public health, safety or the physical environment. Findings for discretionary review include that the project will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area or within the project; and that the project will not jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare.