HOUSING AUTHORITY
of the County of Los Angeles
Administrative Office
2 Coral Circle • Monterey Park, CA 91755
323.890.7001 • TTY: 323.838.7449 • www.lacdc.org

Gloria Molina
Yvonne Brathwaite Burke
Zev Yaroslavsky
Don Knabe
Michael D. Antonovich
Commissioners

William K. Huang
Acting Executive Director

October 14, 2008

Honorable Board of Commissioners
Housing Authority of the
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Commissioners:

APPROVAL OF ALLOCATION OF CITY OF INDUSTRY REDEVELOPMENT HOUSING SET-ASIDE FUNDS AND APPROVAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION (1, 2, 5)(3 Vote)

SUBJECT:

This letter requests that your Board approve the allocation of City of Industry Redevelopment Housing Set-Aside Funds for seven affordable rental housing developments located within a 15-mile radius of the City of Industry.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Acting as a responsible agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), certify that the Community Development Commission of the County of Los Angeles (Commission) has considered the attached Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the Hollydale Plaza Apartments project, prepared by the City of South Gate, as lead agency, and find that the mitigation measures identified in the IS/MND are adequate to avoid or reduce potential impacts below significant levels.

2. Acting as a responsible agency pursuant to CEQA, certify that the Commission has considered the attached Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND) for the Garfield Gardens project, prepared by the City of Glendale, as lead agency, and find that this project will not cause a significant impact on the environment.

3. Acting as a responsible agency pursuant to CEQA, certify that the projects listed in the Environmental Documentation section of this Board Letter are exempt from the provisions of CEQA, as described herein, because these projects do not have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment.

4. Approve loans to developers using City of Industry Redevelopment Housing Set-Aside Funds (Industry Funds) in a total amount of up to $9,866,352 for the development of one multifamily, one affordable senior and five special needs housing developments, identified in Attachment B, which have been selected through a Notice Of Funding Availability (NOFA) jointly issued by the Housing Authority and the Commission on April 9, 2008.

5. Authorize the Acting Executive Director to negotiate Loan Agreements with the recommended developers, for the purposes described above and to execute the Loan Agreements and all related documents, including documents to subordinate the loans to permitted construction and permanent financing and any intergovernmental, interagency, or inter-creditor agreements necessary for the implementation of each development, following approval as to form by County Counsel.

6. Authorize the Acting Executive Director to execute amendments to the Loan Agreements and any related document, as may be necessary for the implementation of each development, following approval as to form by County Counsel.

7. Authorize the Acting Executive Director to incorporate, as needed, up to $9,866,352 in Industry Funds into the Housing Authority's approved Fiscal Year 2008-2009 budget, for the purposes described above.

PURPOSE /JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

The purpose of the recommended actions is to approve the allocation of Industry Funds to seven developments that will provide affordable multifamily, senior and special needs housing within a 15-mile radius of the City of Industry. The purpose is also to approve environmental documentation for these developments.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING:

There is no impact on the County general fund.

The Housing Authority is recommending loans to developers in a total amount up to $9,866,352 to construct seven developments. Funds for these loans will be incorporated into the Housing Authority's approved Fiscal Year 2008-2009 budget on an as-needed basis.

Final loan amounts will be determined following completion of negotiations with the developers and arrangements with other involved lenders. Each loan will be evidenced by a promissory note and secured by a deed of trust, with the term of affordability enforced by a recorded Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions document.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS:

Industry Funds consist of tax increment funds collected by the City of Industry's Redevelopment Agency, which have been transferred to the Housing Authority to administer for the development of low- and moderate-income housing. On June 2, 1998, your Board adopted an Allocation and Distribution Plan for the disbursement of Industry Funds in incorporated and unincorporated areas within a 15-mile radius of the City of Industry. Eleven previous solicitations for proposals processes have awarded a total of an estimated $170,226,335 in Industry Funds to 175 developments, created 6,050 units of affordable and special needs housing, and leveraged over $1,309,722,273 in external funds.

On April 9, 2008, a Notice Of Funding Availability (NOFA) was jointly issued by the Housing Authority and the Commission, making available approximately $11,900,000 in Industry Funds and $2,500,000 in County HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) funds for the development of affordable rental housing. Twenty-three requests for Industry funds and three requests for HOME funds were received by the May 13, 2008 deadline. One application was submitted for both Industry and HOME funds.

The total demand for funds exceeded the amount of available funding in the eleventh round of the NOFA. However, due to the large numbers of applications not meeting threshold criteria the remaining funds were made available to developers through issuance of a twelfth round of the NOFA. Projects selected through the issuance of the twelfth round are now being presented to your Board for approval.

Review and evaluation has been completed for all of the initial applications under the NOFA process. Thirteen of the 26 projects met threshold criteria. Seven projects met technical scoring criteria and will receive Industry Funds. HOME funds will be recommended for the eighth qualified project in a future Board letter presented to the Board of Commissioners of the Commission. Environmental clearances and funding

recommendations for the seven projects receiving Industry funds are being presented to your Board at this time. A detailed description of the NOFA and selection process is provided as Attachment A.

The current funding recommendations will provide Industry Funds to the developers through Loan Agreements with the Housing Authority, to be executed by the Acting Executive Director, following completion of negotiations and approval as to form by County Counsel. All Loan Agreements will incorporate affordability restrictions and provisions requiring developers to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws.

The Loan Agreements will set aside a minimum of 20% of each development's rental units at rates affordable to low-income households earning less than 50% of the median income for the Los Angeles-Long Beach Metropolitan Statistical Area, adjusted for family size, as established by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. For special needs housing, a minimum of 35% of the units will be reserved for households with incomes below 50% of median income. The Loan Agreements will require that the affordable housing units be set-aside for a period of 55 years.

This board letter has been reviewed by County Counsel. Attachment B hereto is a complete list of developments recommended for funding at this time.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION:

The proposed projects identified in Attachment A have been reviewed by the Commission pursuant to the requirements of CEQA.

As a responsible agency, and in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the Commission reviewed the IS/MND prepared by the City of South Gate for the Hollydale Plaza Apartments project and determined that the project will not have significant adverse impact on the environment. The Commission's consideration of the IS/MND and filing of the Notice of Determination, satisfies the State CEQA Guidelines as stated in Article 7, Section 15096.

As a responsible agency, and in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the Commission reviewed the IS/ND prepared by the City of Glendale for the Garfield Gardens project and determined that the project will not have significant adverse impact on the environment. The Commission's consideration of the IS/ND and filing of the Notice of Determination, satisfies the State CEQA Guidelines as stated in Article 7, Section 15096.

The Broadway Apartments, Renato Apartments, 36th Street Apartments, and Vendome Palms Apartments projects have been determined exempt from the requirements of CEQA by the City of Los Angeles in accordance with City CEQA Guidelines Class 1, Category 40. The Nehemiah Court project has been determined exempt from the requirements of CEQA by the City of Pasadena in accordance with City of Pasadena CEQA Guidelines, Class 32 (infill). The Commission's consideration of these determinations satisfies the requirements of CEQA.

IMPACT ON CURRENT PROGRAM:

The recommended allocation of Industry Funds, totaling up to $9,866,352 for the seven recommended projects, will leverage more than $89,215,164 in additional external resources, approximately 9 times the amount of Industry Funds being recommended for allocation at this time. The requested actions will increase the supply of affordable special needs and non-special needs housing in the County of Los Angeles.

Respectfully submitted,

Bobbette L. Glover

for WILLIAM K. HUANG
Acting Executive Director

Attachments: 3

ATTACHMENT A

NOTICE OF FUNDING AVAILABILITY AND SELECTION PROCESS

On April 10, 2008, advertising for the NOFA began in local newspapers. The NOFA was released on April 9, 2008, and subsequent informational workshops were held to provide prospective applicants with technical assistance.

Applications were accepted between April 30 and May 13, 2008. The total demand exceeded available funding. Developers applied for funds according to target population.

Non-Special Needs Housing Developments

TYPE	CITY OF INDUSTRY DEMAND	ALLOCATION
Seniors	$4,696,000 2 Applications	$1,696,000 1 Development: *Hollydale Plaza Apartments*
Multi-Family	$20,396,532 13 Applications	$861,035 1 Development: *Garfield Gardens*
TOTAL	**$25,092,532** **15 Applications**	**$2,557,035** **2 Developments**

Special Needs Housing

TYPE	CITY OF INDUSTRY DEMAND	ALLOCATION
Mental Illness	$4,895,388 3 Applications	$4,895,388 3 Developments: *Nehemiah Court Apartments, Renato Apartments, Vendome Palms Apartments*
Domestic Violence	$232,177 1 Application	
Transitional Age Youth	$4,413,929 3 Applications	$2,413,929 2 Developments: *Broadway Apartments for Transition Aged Youth, 36th Street Apartments for Transition Aged Youth*
Homeless	$315,264 1 Application	
TOTAL	**$9,856,758** **8 Applications**	**$7,309,317** **5 Developments**

Each recommended proposal has undergone a review by technical consultants. In addition, in order to verify expertise and service linkages submitted by applicants, proposals for special needs housing were reviewed by a Task Force established by the Acting Executive Director. The Task Force was comprised of persons with experience in serving the targeted special needs populations. Following this process, the proposals were forwarded to the Housing Authority/Commission's Independent Review Panel which provided independent review of the Task Force's scoring and also heard the appeals.

The NOFA included a process for applicants to appeal individual scores for procedural or technical errors. Applicants were notified of the scoring results and given seven days to appeal. Eight appeals were filed. The appeals were presented to the Independent Review Panel, and have been heard and administratively adjudicated.

The recommended funding awards are based on threshold criteria and only proposals scoring a minimum of 70% of the total points for each of the (1) Development Feasibility and (2) Supportive Services and Operation Plan and a minimum of 70% of the total overall points were considered for an award. The recommended awards are being made in accordance with the County's current Housing and Community Development Plan (HCDP) and the planning documents of other affected jurisdictions. The Acting Executive Director may enter into memoranda of understanding and other agreements with other jurisdictions, if necessary for development of the proposed projects.

ATTACHMENT B

PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR INDUSTRY FUNDS

INDUSTRY FUNDS - SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS

Applicant	Project Name	Address	Uninc.	Dist.	Type	Total Units	Industry Assisted Units	Industry Funds Recommended	Local and Other Sources	Total Development Cost
Coalition for Responsible Community Development	Broadway Apartments for Transition Aged Youth	4775 S. Broadway, Los Angeles	No	2	TAY	16	10	$1,194,989	$4,441,689	$5,636,678
A Community of Friends	Nehemiah Court Apartments	877 N. Orange Grove Blvd., Pasadena	No	5	Mental Illness	6	6	$895,388	$3,522,155	$4,417,543
Single Room Occupancy Housing Corp.	Renato Apartments	531 S Julian Street, Los Angeles	No	2	Mental Illness	57	21	$2,000,000	$23,057,416	$25,057,416
LTSC Community Development Corporation	36th Street Apartments for Transition Aged Youth	157 E. 36th Street, Los Angeles	No	2	TAY	11	10	$1,218,940	$3,315,723	$4,534,663
A Community of Friends	Vendome Palms Apartments	975 N. Vendome Street, Los Angeles	No	1	Mental Illness	35	35	$2,000,000	$11,271,246	$13,271,246
					TOTAL	125	82	$7,309,317	$45,608,229	$52,917,546

INDUSTRY FUNDS - NON-SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS

Applicant	Project Name	Address	Uninc.	Dist.	Type	Total Units	Industry Assisted Units	Industry Funds Recommended	Local and Other Sources	Total Development Cost
Thomas Safran & Assocites	Garfield Gardens	295-307 E. Garfield Avenue, Glendale	No	5	Multi-family	30	21	$861,035	$11,753,216	$12,614,251
Beyond Shelter Housing Development Corporation	Hollydale Plaza Apartments	12222 Garfield Avenue, South Gate	No	1	Seniors	101	49	$1,696,000	$31,853,719	$33,549,719
					TOTAL	131	70	$2,557,035	$43,606,935	$46,163,970
					GRAND TOTAL	**256**	**152**	**$9,866,352**	**$89,215,164**	**$99,081,516**

ATTACHMENT C

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS

CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA
Planning Department

PROPOSED
NEGATIVE DECLARATION
PEIF 2006-044
30-Unit Affordable Multi-Family Residential
295–307 E. Garfield Avenue

The following Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended, the State Guidelines, and the Environmental Guidelines and Procedures of the City of Glendale.	
Project Title/Common Name:	30-Unit Affordable Multi-Family Residential
Project Location:	295 – 307 E. Garfield Avenue, Glendale, Los Angeles County
Project Description:	The project involves the development of a 30-unit multi-family development constructed on three adjoining lots totaling approximately 27,550 square feet (See Project Description on page 4 for additional information.)
Project Type:	☒ Private Project ☒ Public Project
Project Applicant:	Andrew Gross Thomas Safran & Associates 11812 San Vicente Blvd , Ste. 600 Los Angeles, CA 90049
Findings:	The Director of Planning, on **January 4, 2007**, after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning Department, found that the above referenced project would not have a significant effect on the environment and instructed that a Negative Declaration be prepared
Mitigation Measures:	No mitigation measures are necessary.
Attachments:	Initial Study Checklist PEIF No 2006-044
Contact Person:	Hassan Haghani, Acting Director of Planning City of Glendale Planning Department 633 East Broadway Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 548-2140 Fax: (818) 240-0392

CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA
Planning Department

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
PEIF No. 2006-044
30-Unit Affordable Multi-Family Residential
295–307 E. Garfield Avenue

1.	**Project Title:** 30-Unit Affordable Multi-Family Residential
2.	**Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Glendale Planning Department 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206
3.	**Contact Person and Phone Number:** Erik Krause, Senior Planner Tel (818) 548-2140 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	**Project Location:** 295 – 307 E. Garfield Avenue, Glendale, Los Angeles County
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Andrew Gross Thomas Safran & Associates 11812 San Vicente Blvd., Ste 600 Los Angeles, CA 90049
6.	**General Plan Designation:** Multi-Family Residential (South Brand Boulevard Specific Plan)
7.	**Zoning**: R2250 (South Brand Boulevard Specific Plan)
8.	**Description of the Project:** (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary support or off-site features necessary for its implementation.) The project involves the development of a 30-unit affordable multi-family rental housing project to households earning between 30 and 60 percent of median income. The project site is located on three adjoining lots totaling approximately 27,550 square feet (0 63 acre). A total of 56 parking spaces will be provided in a semi-subterranean parking garage Access to the parking garage will be located in the alley along the eastern edge of the property The applicant is applying for Design Review Board approval and Zoning Administrator approval under the City's Density Bonus Ordinance. Requested concessions include interior setbacks, height and floor area ratio. (see Project Description on page 4 for more detail)
9.	**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** *North*: Single- and multi-family Residential Uses *South*: Single- and Multi-family Residential Uses *East*: Multi-family Residential and Commercial Uses *West*: Multi-family Residential Uses; Future Public Park
10.	**Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).** None.

11. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agricultural Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology / Soils
☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology / Water Quality	☐ Land Use / Planning
☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise	☐ Population / Housing
☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation / Traffic
☐ Utilities / Service Systems	Mandatory Findings of Significance	

LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:

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.

Prepared by _____ Date: 1/4/07

Reviewed by _____ Date: _____

Signature of Director of Planning or his or her designee authorizing the release of environmental document for public review and comment.

Director of Planning _____ Date: 1/4/07

Project Description

The project site is located at 295 through 307 East Garfield Avenue in the City of Glendale. The project involves the development of a 30-unit affordable multi-family rental housing project to households earning between 30 and 60 percent of median income. The project site totals approximately 27,550 square feet (0.63 acre). The project site is located within the South Brand Boulevard Specific Plan and is zoned R2250 (Medium Density Residential) with a General Plan designation of Multi Family Residential.

Units will range from 605 square foot one bedroom, one bathroom units to 1,180 square foot three bedroom, two bathroom units including a dedicated onsite manager's unit. The following includes a breakdown of each unit:

- 8 - one bedroom/one bathroom (1 BH/1BA) 605 square feet (SF);
- 12 - (2 BH/1.25 BA) 962 SF;
- 9 - (3 BH/2BA) 1,180 SF; and
- 1 - (3 BH/2BA) 1,331 SF (manager's unit).

Public alleys line the site along the eastern and northern edges. Development of the project requires a 5 foot dedication along the alley sides of the property to provide for a 15 foot wide alley. A total of 56 parking spaces will be provided in a semi-subterranean parking garage. Access to the parking garage will be located in the alley along the eastern edge of the property. This alley will be widened to 20 feet from Garfield Avenue for a distance of approximately 80 feet to allow for two way traffic in and out of the parking garage. However, the extra 5 feet will be located on the project site and not within the dedicated public right-of-way.

Request Entitlements

The applicant is applying for Design Review Board approval and Zoning Administrator approval under the City's Density Bonus Ordinance (Chapter 30.36 of the Glendale Municipal Code). Requested concessions include interior setbacks, height, and floor area ratio. Funding for the project includes the City of Glendale, County of Los Angeles, Federal Low Income Housing Tax Credits, and Federal Home Loan Bank.

The proposed project includes three separate buildings connected on the second and third floor by covered walkways and the roof line. Each building is three stories in height with a not to exceed height of 41 feet above the finished grade. The first floor will include a total of 9 units; 2 one bedroom/one bathroom units, 4 two bedroom/one and one-quarter bathroom units, and 3 three bedroom/two bathroom units. A community room with kitchen, public bathroom, office, maintenance and storage area, and the elevator lobby and mailboxes will be located on the first floor along Garfield Avenue in the southwest side of the property.

The second floor will include 11 units: 4 one bedroom/one bathroom units, 4 two bedroom/one and one-quarter bathroom units, and 3 three bedroom/two bathroom units. A Laundry room and the elevator lobby will also be located on the second floor along Garfield Avenue in the southwest side of the property. The third floor includes 10 units: 2 one bedroom/one bathroom units, 4 two bedroom/one and one-quarter bathroom units, 3 three bedroom/two bathroom units, and the manger's unit that includes three bedrooms and two bathrooms.

12. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The following section provides an evaluation of the impact categories and questions contained in the checklist and identifies mitigation measures, if applicable.

A. AESTHETICS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1 Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
2 Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
3 Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X
4 Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

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

No Impact. The project site is located within a heavily urbanized area of the City with relatively flat topography. No scenic vistas, as identified in the Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993), exist within, or in proximity to, the project site. Therefore, no impacts to scenic vistas would result from project implementation.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. No state scenic highway is located adjacent to, or within view of, the project site. No impacts to scenic resources within a state scenic highway would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

No Impact. The project site consists of three adjoining lots that are currently undeveloped. The area surrounding the project includes some single- and multi-family residential dwelling units in addition to commercial uses. Nearby buildings were constructed during various time periods with a variety of architectural styles and various building heights. The proposed project will require Design Review Board approval. The Board will review the site planning, architecture, materials and landscaping to ensure the project design is compatible with the surrounding built environment. Review by the DRB will ensure that no significant impacts would occur associated with the existing character of the surrounding area.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Day and nighttime lighting for the project would slightly increase as a result of the proposed project but would be similar to the existing multi-family uses within the project vicinity. Because the surrounding area is already developed, a large portion of which is developed with multi-family and commercial uses, no significant impacts associated with light or glare are anticipated as a result of the proposed project

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

B. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project, Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
1. 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?				X
2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
3. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X

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

No Impact. There is no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance within or adjacent to the proposed project site and no agricultural activities take place on the project site. No agricultural use zone currently exists within the City of Glendale, nor are any agricultural zones proposed. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. The proposed project site is located in a highly urbanized area No portion of the project site is proposed to include agricultural zoning designations or uses, nor do any such uses exist within the City of Glendale under the current General Plan and zoning. There are no Williamson Act contracts in effect for the project site or surrounding vicinity. No conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contract would result No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. There is no farmland in the vicinity of or on the proposed project site. No farmland would be converted to non-agricultural uses under the proposed project. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required

C. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:		**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
1	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
2	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
3	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)?			X	
4	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
5	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

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

No Impact. The project site is located within the City of Glendale, which is part of the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) and is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD is the agency responsible for preparing the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the Basin. Since 1979, a number of AQMPs have been prepared. The most recent comprehensive plan fully approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) is the 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (2003 AQMP), which includes a variety of strategies and control measures.

The 2003 AQMP was prepared to accommodate growth, to reduce the high levels of pollutants within the areas under the jurisdiction of SCAQMD, to return clean air to the region, and to minimize the impact on the economy. Projects that are considered to be consistent with the AQMP would not interfere with attainment because this growth is included in the projections utilized in the formulation of the AQMP. Therefore, projects, uses, and activities that are consistent with the applicable assumption used in the development of the AQMP would not jeopardize attainment of the air quality levels identified in the AQMP, even if they exceed the SCAQMD's recommended daily emissions thresholds.

Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified in the Growth Management Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since the Growth Management Chapter forms the basis of the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP.

Population growth associated with the proposed project is included in the Southern California Associations of Government (SCAG) projects for growth in the City of Glendale. The proposed project does not result in population and housing growth that would cause growth in Glendale to exceed the SCAG forecast. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with AQMP attainment forecasts. Therefore, no impact would occur with relation to a conflict with, or obstruction of, the implementation of the SCAQMD AQMP.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Both the state of California and the federal government have established health based Ambient Air Quality Standards for six criteria air pollutants. These pollutants include ozone (O_3), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), sulfur oxides (SO_x), particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of less than 10 microns (PM_{10}) and lead (Pb). Currently, O_3, CO, and PM_{10} are designated by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) as non-attainment in Los Angeles County. O_3 (smog) is formed by a photochemical reaction between oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) and reactive organic gases (ROG). Thus, impacts from O_3 are assessed by evaluating impacts from NO_x and ROG.

As the agency principally responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in the Basin, the SCAQMD recommends that projects should be evaluated in terms of air pollution control thresholds established by the SCAQMD and published in the *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. These thresholds were developed by the SCAQMD to provide quantifiable levels to which individuals projects can be compared. The following quantifiable thresholds are currently recommended by the SCAQMD and are used to determine the significance of air quality impacts associated with the proposed project.

Construction - The following significance thresholds for air quality have been established by the SCAQMD on a daily basis for construction emissions:

- 75 pounds per day of ROG;
- 100 pounds per day of NO_x;
- 550 pounds per day of CO;
- 150 pounds per day of PM_{10}; and
- 150 pounds per day of SO_x.

During construction, if any of the identified daily air pollutant thresholds area exceeded by the proposed project, then the proposed project's air quality impacts would be considered significant.

Operational – Specific criteria pollutants have been identified by the SCAQMD as pollutants of special regional concern. Based upon this categorization, the following significant thresholds for operational emission have been established by the SCAQMD for all types of project operations:

- 55 pounds per day of ROG;
- 55 pounds per day of NO_x;
- 550 pounds per day of CO;
- 150 pounds per day of PM_{10};
- 150 pounds per day of SO_2; and
- California 1-hour or 8-hour CO standards

Projects within the Basin with daily operation-related emissions that exceed any of the above emission thresholds may be considered significant.

Standard Conditions – Construction Activities

The proposed project is required to comply with regional rules that assist in reducing short-term air pollutant emissions SCAQMD Rule 403 requires that fugitive dust be controlled with best available control measures (BACM) so that the presence of such dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emission source. In addition, SCAQMD Rule 402 requires implementation of dust suppression techniques to prevent fugitive dust from creating a nuisance off-site Applicable dust suppression techniques from Rule 403 are summarized below. Implementation of these dust suppression techniques would reduce the fugitive dust generation (and thus the PM_{10} component) Compliance with these rules would ensure that impacts to nearby sensitive receptors are less than significant.

The following are the applicable Rule 403 Measures:

- Apply nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more);
- Water active sites at least twice daily (locations where grading is to occur will be thoroughly watered prior to earthmoving); and
- All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).

In addition, compliance with the SCAQMD Rules and Regulations (Rule 1113) on the use of architectural coatings would be required

Construction Emission Impacts

Construction emissions were calculate according to the SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, and construction emission factors contained in the URBEMIS 2002 Air Quality Impact Model. Table 1 below identifies the peak daily emissions that would be generated during construction activities associated with the proposed project. These estimates are based on the expected location, size and development of the project. The analysis assumes that all the construction equipment and activities would occur continuously over the day and that activities would overlap. In reality, this would not occur, as most equipment would operate only a fraction of each workday and many of the activities would not overlap on a daily basis. Therefore, Table 1 represents a worst-case scenario for construction activities. These calculations also assume that appropriate dust control measures would be implemented during each construction activity of the project as required by SCAQMD Rule 403-Fugitive Dust

Table 1
Highest Daily Estimated Construction Emissions

	Emissions in Pounds per Day				
Emission Source	**ROG**	**NO_x**	**CO**	**SO_x**	**PM_{10}**
2007- Maximum Pounds/Day-All Phases	4.45	35 67	32.88	0 00	3 52
SCAQMD Thresholds	75 00	100.00	550.00	150.00	150 00
Exceeds Thresholds?	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**
2008 - Maximum Pounds/Day-All Phases	56 69	33 84	34 14	0 00	3 40
SCAQMD Thresholds	75 00	100 00	550 00	150.00	150.00
Exceeds Thresholds?	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**

The construction emission presented in Table 1 above represent the worst-case daily emission estimate Under the worst-case conditions, emissions generated during construction activities would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, impacts are considered to be less than significant.

Operational Emission Impacts

Operational emissions would be generated by both stationary and mobile sources as a result of normal day-to-day activity on the project site after occupation Stationary emissions would be generated by the consumption of natural gas for space and water heating devises, and from electric power generation sources located elsewhere within Southern California. Mobile emissions would be generated by the motor vehicles traveling to and from the project site.

The analysis of daily operational emissions using the data and methodologies identified in the SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* and current motor vehicle emission factors in the URBEMIS 2002 Air Quality Impact Model The predicted emissions are based upon development of the proposed project and are presented in **Table 2** below

Table 2
Operational Emissions of Proposed Project

Emission Source	Emissions in Pounds per Day				
	ROG	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM_{10}
Vehicular Sources	1 69	1 60	17 48	0 01	1 68
Stationary Source (Area Source)	2 07	0.23	0 79	0 00	0 00
Total	3.76	1.83	18.27	0.01	1.68
SCAQMD Thresholds	55 00	55 00	550.00	150 00	150.00
Exceeds Thresholds?	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**

As the operational emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds, the operational emissions generated by the proposed project would not result in a significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***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)?***

Less Than Significant Impact. The SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook identifies three possible methods to determine the cumulative significance of land use projects. These methods are different than the analysis in which all-foreseeable future development within a given service boundary or geographical area is predicted and its impacts measured The SCAQMD has not identified thresholds to which the total emissions of all cumulative development can be compared The thresholds identified and used earlier in this section only apply to the emissions generated by individual projects rather than the emissions generated by a cumulative project set Instead, the SCQAMD's recommended methods for determining cumulative impacts are based on performance standards and emission reduction targets necessary to attain the federal and state air quality standards identified in the AQMP

The 2003 AQMP was prepared to accommodate growth, to reduce high levels of pollutants within the Basin, to meet state and federal air quality standards, and to minimize the fiscal impact that pollution control measures have on the local economy. If the analysis shows that an individual project is consistent with the AQMP performance standards, the project's cumulative impact could be considered less than significant. If the analysis shows that the project does not comply with the

standards, then cumulative impacts are considered to be significant, unless there is other pertinent information to the contrary.

The following analysis assesses the proposed project's cumulative impacts based on the performance standards and emissions reduction targets that are recommended in the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook and which are appropriate to the proposed project.

According to the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the one percent per year reduction analysis is performed by calculating a project's total unmitigated emissions and then dividing them by the reductions from the application of mitigation measures or design features incorporated into the project. This will provide the percent reduction in project emissions.

The URBEMIS 2002 Air Quality Model allows for projects to account for specific design and environmental factors that result in the incremental reduction of operational emissions. As such, design features were accounted for in the calculation of the operational emissions generated by the proposed project. Specifically, features that have been accounted for in the emission modeling conducted for the proposed project include; presence of local service retail and affordable housing. Table 3 below compares the proposed project with and without accounting for the design and environmental features incorporated into the emission modeling.

Table 3
Operational Emission Reduction

Emission Source	Emissions in Pounds per Day				
	ROG	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM_{10}
Operational Emissions - without project design features	1 69	1 60	17 48	0 01	1 68
Operational Emissions - with project design features	1 62	1 50	16 43	0 01	1 58
Percent Reduction	4 1%	6 3%	6 0%	0 0%	6 0%

As indicated in Table 3 above, the projects design features result in a one percent reduction pursuant to the SCAQMD requirements with the exception of SO_x, which is far below the SCAQMD operational thresholds of 150 pounds per day and is not considered as non-attainment in Los Angeles County. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?***

Less Than Significant Impact. Sensitive residential receptors are located directly adjacent to the project site to the west, across the public alley north of the project site, and across Garfield Avenue south of the project site. However, as indicated above the project would be required to comply with all applicable rules that govern construction related impacts. In addition, as indicated it the model run performed for this project, no construction or operational impacts are anticipated. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration; impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) ***Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?***

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activity associated with the proposed project may generate detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust in proximity to sensitive receptor locations. However, any detectable odors or heavy-duty equipment exhaust would be associated with initial construction and would be considered short-term. Significant long-term odor impacts are

not anticipated to occur from the project since it is a residential use. No significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
4 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?				X
5 Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
6. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

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

No Impact. The proposed project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years. No natural vegetation exists onsite or adjacent to the site with the exception of non-native invasive vegetation. No wildlife species other than those which can tolerate human activity and/or are typically found in urban environments are known to exist onsite. These human-tolerant species are neither sensitive, threatened, nor endangered. Implementation of the project would not result in any impacts to species identified as endangered, threatened, sensitive or being of special concern by the California Department of Fish and Game or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. The site does not provide suitable habitat for endangered or rare species. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The proposed project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years. No riparian habitat and/or other sensitive natural communities are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present onsite or adjacent to the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?***

No Impact. The proposed project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years. No federally protected wetlands are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present onsite or adjacent to the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***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?***

No Impact. The proposed project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years. The area has been substantially modified by human activity. Implementation of the proposed project will not interfere with the movement of 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. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The proposed project lies within an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years. No protected biological resources are present onsite. In addition, there are no indigenous trees, as defined pursuant to Chapter 12.44 of the Glendale Municipal Code (GMC), located on the project site. Implementation of the proposed project will not conflict with any local policy designed to protect biological resources. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. No Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved habitat conservation plan has been adopted to include the project site. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any such plans. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1 Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064 5?				X
2 Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064 5?			X	
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	
4 Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	

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

No Impact. The project site is currently undeveloped No impacts would occur with project implementation

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site has been previously graded and any surficial archaeological resources, which may have existed at one time, have likely been previously disturbed or destroyed and therefore, implementation of the proposed project is not likely to uncover any such resources However, should any such resources be discovered at any time during the development of the project, they would be treated in accordance with state and federal guidelines for disclosure, recovery and preservation, as appropriate No significant impacts to archaeological resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed project

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site has been previously graded and any surficial paleontological resources, which may have existed at one time, have likely been previously disturbed or destroyed and therefore, implementation of the proposed project is not likely to uncover any such resources However, should any such resources be discovered at any time during the development of the project, they would be treated in accordance with state and federal guidelines for disclosure, recovery and preservation, as appropriate. No significant impacts to paleontological resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed project

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located within a heavily urbanized area and has been previously developed Within the project site, any traditional burial resources, which included archaeological sites, burial sites, ceremonial areas, gathering areas, or any other natural area important to a culture for religious or heritage reasons, would likely be associated with the Native American group know as the Gabrielino. No known traditional burial sites exist within the project site, nor have any resources been identified in the vicinity However, should any discovery of resources occur at any time during the development of the project, they would be treated in accordance with state and federal guidelines for disclosure, recovery and preservation, as appropriate, including contacting the Los Angeles County Coroner. No significant impacts to human remains are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required

F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
2. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
3. 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?			X	
4. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
5. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

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

*i) **Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.***

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is not within an established Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone for surface fault rapture hazards. While the Verdugo Fault is the closest active fault to the project site, the closest Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone is located approximately 2.8 miles to the east-southeast along the Raymond Fault. Based on the available geologic data, active or potentially active faults with the potential for surface fault rapture are not known to be located directly beneath or projecting toward the project site. Therefore, the potential for surface rapture as a result of fault plane displacement during the design life of the project is less than significant.

***Mitigation Measures*:** No mitigation measures are required.

*ii) **Strong seismic ground shaking?***

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site could be subject to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake originating along one of the faults listed as active or potentially active in the Southern California area. This hazard exists throughout Southern California and could pose a risk to public safety and property by exposing people, property, or infrastructure to potentially adverse effects including strong seismic ground shaking. However, since all structures are required to be designed in accordance with the California Building Code (CBC) and applicable City codes to ensure safety in the event of an earthquake, this impact is considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

*iii) **Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?***

No Impact. Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which saturated silty to cohesionless soils below the groundwater table are subject to a temporary loss of strength due to the buildup of excess pore pressure during cyclic loading conditions such as those induced by an earthquake. Liquefaction-related effects include loss of bearing strength, amplified ground oscillations, lateral spreading, and flow failures. The project site is not located within an area prone to liquefaction as indicated in the City's Safety Element (August 2003). Therefore, no impacts associated with liquefaction would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

*iv) **Landslides?***

No Impact. The project site and immediate area are relatively flat. The probability of seismically induced landslides occurring on the site is considered to be low due to the lack of elevation difference and slope geometry across or adjacent to the site. In addition, the project site is not located within a designated landslide hazard zone, as indicated in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). No landslide impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed project could result in exposure of onsite soils during construction. Since the project site is relatively flat and soils would be exposed for

a limited amount of time, substantial erosion is not expected to occur. An erosion control plan, subject to review and approval by the City Engineer will be required prior to any construction-related activities. Such plans must include procedures and equipment necessary to contain onsite soils and minimize potential for contaminated runoff from the construction site. As a result, no significant impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***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 an onsite or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?***

Less Than Significant Impact. Subsidence is the process of lowering the elevation of an area of the earth's surface and can be caused by tectonic forces deep within the earth or by consolidation and densification of sediments sometimes due to withdrawal of fluids such as groundwater. The project site is not located in an area of significant subsidence activity and would not include fluid withdrawal or removal. In addition, as indicated in Response F-1 (iii), above, the soil under the project site is not prone to liquefaction. Therefore, no significant impacts related to unstable soils are anticipated to occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property?***

Less Than Significant Impact. The soil around the project site is generally Hanford Sandy Loam that can be characterized as well-drained soils found on nearly level topography. Hanford Sandy Loam has a low shrink-swell potential because it is well drained and moderately permeable. Compliance with the California Building Code (CBC) would serve to further reduce impacts to less than significant levels. No significant impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The proposed project site is currently connected to the City's sewer system. No septic tanks will be utilized as part of the project. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

G. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962 5 and as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
5 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 site?				X
6 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 site?				X
7 Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
8 Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

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

No Impact. The project involves the development of residential uses. Such uses do not generally involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of significant amounts of hazardous materials No new hazardous materials will be generated at the site. No impacts are anticipated to occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would be required to comply with all applicable rules established by the SCAQMD, included Rule 403 and 402, during the construction phase of the project that would prevent dust from migrating beyond the project site. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. There are two public schools and one private school located within one-quarter mile of the project site The two public schools include Theodore Roosevelt Middle School and Horace Mann Elementary School located at 222 and 501 East Acacia Avenue respectfully. The private school includes Glendale Christian School located at 411 East Acacia

Avenue. However, the project would not emit any new hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials since residential uses are proposed.

As indicated above in Response G-3, the project would be required to comply of all applicable rules established by the SCAQMD, included Rule 403 and 402, during the construction phase of the project that would prevent dust from migrating beyond the project site. In addition, since the proposed project includes residential uses no hazardous materials other than household cleaning products would be located on the project site. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) ***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 site?***

No Impact. The proposed project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) ***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 site?***

No Impact. No private airstrips are located in the City of Glendale or in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any safety hazards for people residing on the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

7) ***Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

No Impact. There is no "City Disaster Response Route" or "County Disaster Response Route" located on any streets adjacent to the project site. The nearest designated street is Brand Boulevard which as identified as a "City Disaster Response Route" in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). The proposed project does not involve any changes to Brand Boulevard nor would the project result in the alteration of an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. As such, no impacts to emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

8) ***Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?***

No Impact. The project site is located within an area that has been heavily urbanized for years and is not classified as a Fire Hazard Area by the City of Glendale Fire Department, as indicated in the

City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). No wildlands or naturally vegetated areas are located within or near the project site, as the area is built out. No impacts associated with wildland fires would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
2.	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)?			X	
3	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
4.	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?			X	
5.	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?			X	
6	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
7.	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?				X
8	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
9	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?				X
10.	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established regulations under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program to control direct storm water discharges. In City of Glendale,

the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWCQB) administers the NPDES permitting program and is responsible for developing NPDES permitting requirements. The NPDES program regulates industrial pollutant discharges that include construction activities. Implementation of the proposed project will require compliance with all the NPDES requirements including the submittal and certification of plans and details showing both construction and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) that are integrated into the design of the project. The submittal of a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), as approved by the City Engineer, will also be required to be integrated into the design of the project. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste water discharge requirements since the project will be required to comply with applicable permitting requirements. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***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)?***

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project does not involve additions or withdrawals of groundwater. The amount of hardscape proposed on the project site would be more than the current on-site conditions but similar to existing conditions on surrounding sites containing multi-family development. The proposed project would comply with minimum landscape requirements. The proposed project would not significantly interfere with the recharge of local groundwater or deplete the groundwater supplies relative to existing conditions. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?***

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is relatively flat and no water courses run through it. Currently, water which falls on the site either is absorbed into the ground on-site or drains either to East Garfield Avenue or the public alleys. These conditions would not change as a result of the project. The project will not alter the course of a stream or river since no river or stream is located on the site nor would the project result in a substantial increase in runoff. No significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***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?***

Less than Significant Impact. Flood hazards due to heavy precipitation can result in inundation of developed areas due to overflow of nearby stream courses or from inadequate local storm drain facilities, if not sized to accommodate large storm events. However, the City has developed a flood control system that provides protection for its residents. The amount of surface runoff would increase as a result of the project, however, the increase would not be substantial. The proposed project would not alter the course of a stream or river. In addition, no Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)-designated flood zones are located within the project site as indicated in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). Therefore, no significant flooding impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required

5) ***Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?***

Less than Significant Impact. Please refer to Responses H-1, H-3 and H-4 above The amount of impervious surfaces would increase resulting in an increase in runoff from the site, however, the increase would not be substantial. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Please refer to Response H-1 above.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

7) ***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?***

No Impact. No portion of the project site is located within a 100-year floodplain, as shown on the latest FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map and in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003) No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

8) ***Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?***

No Impact. As previously stated in Response H-7 above, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts in this regard.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

9) ***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?***

No Impact. According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003), the project site is not located within inundation zones from failure of upstream dams Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

10) ***Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?***

No Impact. Tsunamis are large ocean waves generated by sudden water displacement caused by a submarine earthquake, landslide, or volcanic eruption A review of the County of Los Angeles Flood and Inundation Hazards Map indicates that the site does not lie within the mapped tsunami inundation boundaries Therefore, no seiche, tsunami, or mudflow impacts would occur

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1	Physically divide an established community?				X
2	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	
3	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

1) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The project site is located on an infill site, which is currently undeveloped. The project site includes three adjoining lots totaling approximately 27,550 square feet (0.63 acres) and is surrounded by existing single- and multi-family residential units. No established community would be divided as a result of the project. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Less Than Significant Impact. The existing zoning designation on the project site is R2250 (Medium Density Residential) and the General Plan designation is Multi-Family Residential (South Brand Boulevard Specific Plan). The proposed project exceeds that allowable density for this zone; however, Section 30 36 of the Glendale Municipal Code (GMC) allows for an increase in the density provided that affordable units are included in the project. Section 30.36 of the GMC is consistent with the states density bonus laws (SB1818) requiring that local agencies allow for increased density when affordable housing is proposed. Since all 30-units will be made available to affordable households the project qualifies for such a density bonus Therefore, no impacts associated with applicable land use plans and policies would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impact. There is no habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan in the project site or vicinity. As such, the implementation of the proposed project could not conflict with any such plans No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures No mitigation measures are required.

J. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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?				X
2. 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?				X

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

No Impact. The project site is completely urbanized and is not within an area that has been identified as containing valuable mineral resources, as indicated in the City's Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993). In addition, residential development has occurred on the site in the past. Therefore, development on the project site would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. No impacts would occur

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

No Impact. As indicated in Response J-1 above, there are no known mineral resources within the project site No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

K. NOISE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
2. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
3. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
4 A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	

Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5	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 site to excessive noise levels?				X
6	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?				X

1) ***Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?***

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project involves the construction of a 30-unit affordable multi-family residential development. This type of use is permitted on the subject site. Surrounding land uses include larger multi-family complexes and commercial uses. While this residential use will be more intensive than the by-right density, it is not anticipated to generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element. In addition, common open space would be partially buffered from roadway noise by the proposed buildings. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Excessive groundborne vibration is typically associated with activities such as blasting used in mining operations, or the use of pile drivers during construction. The project would not require any blasting activities and any earth movement associated with project construction is not anticipated to require pile driving. Therefore, the project is not expected to generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

Less Than Significant Impact. As indicated in Response K-1 above, significant noise impacts are not anticipated to result from the long-term operation of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

Less Than Significant Impact. Short-term noise impacts could occur as a result of construction activities. All development within the project site will be required to comply with the City of Glendale Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 8.36), which prohibits construction activities to between the hours of 7:00 p.m. on one day and 7:00 a.m. of the next day or from 7:00 p.m. on Saturday to 7:00 a.m. on Monday or from 7:00 p.m. preceding a holiday. Compliance with the City's noise ordinance would ensure that no significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) ***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 site to excessive noise levels?***

No Impact. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) ***For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?***

No Impact. There are no private airstrips located on or within the vicinity of the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

L. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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)?			X	
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
3. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

1) ***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)?***

Less Than Significant Impact. The project proposed involves the construction of 30 affordable multi-family residential units. The subject site is zoned R2250 with a General Plan Land Use Designation of Multi Family Residential. The project site has a by-right density of 15 units (one dwelling unit for each 1,800 square feet of lot area on lots having a width of 90 feet or greater). The project is inconsistent with the zoning and land use designation of the area however, is it not considered growth inducing since it meets the requirements for project requesting a density bonus pursuant to Chapter 30.36 of the Glendale Municipal Code (GMC). Chapter 30 36 allows an additional 35 percent increase in units provided that the project meets the provisions of 30 36. Section 30.36 606(E) allows for density bonus greater than 35 percent at the discretion of the City. The density bonus requested by the applicant for the project site was previously approved by City Council as the proposed density is within the population forecasts for the City of Glendale. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

No Impact. The project site is currently undeveloped and therefore, no amount of housing will be removed as part of the project. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. No people currently reside on the project site. No impacts would occur

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

M. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services				
a) Fire protection?			X	
b) Police protection?			X	
c) Schools?			X	
d) Parks?			X	
e) Other public facilities?			X	

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

a) ***Fire protection?***

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Glendale Fire Department (GFD) provides fire and paramedic services to the project site. The nearest fire station is Station 22 located at 1201 South Glendale Avenue, approximately one quarter mile from the project site. The project will be required to comply with the Uniform Fire Code, including installation of fire sprinklers, and to submit plans to the Glendale Fire Department at the time building permits are submitted for approval. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Glendale Police Department (GPD) provides police services to the project site. The nearest police facility is located at 131 North Isabel Street Project construction will add residential units to the area as well as the people who will live in these units. The site is located in an urban, heavily developed area of the City and the additional population that this project will bring is not anticipated to significantly impact Police services. No significant impacts are anticipated

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c) Schools?

Less than Significant Impact. Section 65995 of the Government Code provides that school districts can collect a fee on a per square foot basis for new residential units or additions to existing units to assist in the construction of or addition to schools. The current fee schedule for residential development is $2.14 per square foot Payment of these fees under the provisions of Government Code Section 65995 5 reduces potentially significant impacts that could occur as a result of the project to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d) Parks?

Less than Significant Impact. See discussion under **Sections N.1 and N.2** below.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e) Other public facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is a previously developed infill parcel and can be adequately served by existing public facilities. No significant impacts would occur

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

N. RECREATION

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1 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?			X	
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	

1) 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located within the immediate vicinity of a new park (Maryland Mini-Park) planned at 810, 812 and 816 S. Maryland Avenue. The park will be

developed on three adjacent lots each measuring approximately 50 feet in width and 140 to 145 feet in depth. The total park site is approximately 21,250 square feet (0.49 acres).

The park will include pedestrian walkways, seating areas, children's play area, and picnic area. The majority of the park will be designed as passive park space primarily in the form of large grass area. The mini-park would be designed to serve residents of all ages primarily within the immediate neighborhood including the future residents of the project site Direct access to the park is incorporated in the neighborhood plan that wad developed by the Community Housing Department and approved by City Council.

Additional recreational opportunities exist with the two public schools located within ¼ mile of the project site. The city of Glendale Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department and the Glendale Unified School District are working towards a joint use agreement that would allow public use of the recreational amenities at the local schools during none school hours These two schools include Theodore Roosevelt Middle School and Horace Mann Elementary School. Therefore, potential demand for new parks, or increased maintenance and additional improvements at existing parks, would be minimal and, therefore, is not anticipated to result in a significant impacts associated with the demand of existing park facilities

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project includes a 1,411 square foot community room designed with a kitchen, lounge, and game room The project also includes an outdoor barbeque area with seating and a large gathering area at the center of the complex as well as other common open space areas throughout the site As indicated in Response N-1 above, the project is anticipated to increase the demand on existing parks, however, this increase would be minimal. No significant impacts to recreation resources are anticipated with implementation of the proposed project

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

O. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1 Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i e , result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X	
2 Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
3 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?				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
5. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
6 Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X	
7 Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

1) ***Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?***

Less than Significant Impact. There would be a slight increase in day time population as a result of the construction activities. However, the increase in daytime population is not considered substantial since the construction phase is short-term in nature; approximately 12 months.

The proposed project would result in an increase of 30 units above the current conditions and therefore, would result in a slight increase in the number of vehicles using the area streets. Based on the trip generation rate of 5.53 trips per day the project is expected to add approximately 166 average daily trips. This increase, however, is anticipated to create a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?***

Less than Significant Impact. Garfield Avenue is classified as a "collector street" in the South Brand Boulevard Specific Plan and as a "local street" in the City's Circulation Element. As discussed above in Response O-1, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any significant increase in traffic on the area roadway network. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***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?***

No Impact. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private air strip. No impacts on air traffic patterns would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

No Impact. The proposed project would not result in any changes to the existing roadway network. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) Result in inadequate emergency access?

No Impact. The proposed project will be designed to utilize the existing network of regional and local roadways located in the vicinity of the project site Access to the proposed semi-subterranean parking garage would be provided in the public alley on the east side of the property. No changes to the existing roadway network are proposed as a result of the project. Therefore, no impacts to emergency access would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project involves the development of a low income residential property that would provide 30 affordable units to households earning between 30 and 60 percent of the median income. As a result, the project is evaluated under Chapter 30.36 (Density Bonus Incentives) of the Glendale Municipal Code The following parking concession may be applied to projects meeting the minimum requirements to qualify for a density bonus.

Number of Bedrooms	Minimum Number of Parking Spaces
0 to 1 bedroom	1 onsite parking space
2 to 3 bedrooms	2 onsite parking spaces
4 or more bedrooms	2 5 onsite parking spaces

The parking concession provided in the table above is inclusive of handicapped and guest parking. Based on the requirements Chapter 30 36 of the GMC, the project is required to provide 51 parking spaces As currently proposed, the project would provide 56 parking spaces within a subterranean garage resulting in a surplus of 5 spaces.

The project will have access off the public alley located on the easterly edge of the project site and no new curb cuts on the street will be made. In addition, the existing curb cuts for the three lots that make up the project site will be removed and allow for a few additional on-street parking spaces.

Additional on-street parking will likely be used by the future residents on the project site; however, this demand is not anticipated to result in significant impacts.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

7) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

No Impact. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) and Glendale Beeline provide bus service in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding alternative transportation since no changes to the existing transportation policies, plans, or programs would result from project implementation. Therefore, no impacts would occur

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required

P. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X	
2. Require 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?			X	
3. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
4. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
5. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	
6. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
7. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

1) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Less Than Significant Impact. Under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) issues National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits to regulate waste discharged to "waters of the nation," which includes reservoirs, lakes and their tributary waters. Waste discharges include discharges of stormwater and construction project discharges. A construction project resulting in the disturbance of more than 1 acre requires an NPDES permit Construction project proposed area also required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). In addition, the project will be required to submit a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) to mitigate urban storm water runoff Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant will be required to satisfy the requirements related to the payment of fees and/or provisions of adequate wastewater facilities. Because the project will comply with the waste discharge prohibitions and water quality objectives established by the RWQCB, impacts are considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Require 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?***

Less than Significant Impact. The project would connect to the existing sewer line in Garfield Avenue. Wastewater treatment services are provided to the area in the vicinity of the project site by the City of Glendale's Public Works Department. Wastewater generated within the City flows to the Los Angeles-Glendale Water Reclamation Plant (LAGWRP) and the Hyperion Treatment Plant near El Segundo. The LAGWRP has a capacity to process 20 million gallons per day (mgd). The City of Glendale has a capacity of 10 mgd at the LAGWRP facility. Wastewater flows that exceed the City's 10 mgd capacity at LAGWRP are treated at the Hyperion Treatment Plant. The Hyperion Treatment Plant processes and average of 360 mgd and has the capacity for 450 mgd. The areas surrounding the project site are developed and currently served by sewer lines directing wastewater to the respective treatment plants. The proposed project will generate approximately 4,800 gallons of wastewater per day (based on a generation factor of 160 per day per multi-family unit). Because the quantity of new wastewater generated by the project is within the limits of existing capacity, impacts to wastewater treatment facilities area considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is currently undeveloped and 100 percent permeable. Development of the project would result in the addition of impermeable surface to the project site. As proposed, landscaping would account for approximately 10,280 square feet or approximately 37 percent of project site. The project would convey onsite runoff during storms to the existing drainage system and no new drainage facilities would be required. Therefore, impacts associated with the construction of the drainage facilities associated with the project would not result in a significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?***

Less than Significant Impact. Glendale Water and Power provides water service for domestic, irrigation, and fire protection purposes to the City of Glendale. The City has four sources of water to meet existing and projected water demands. These sources consist of water imported from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD), groundwater from the San Fernando Groundwater Basin and the Verdugo Groundwater Basin, and recycled water.

The City of Glendale uses approximately 33,000 acre-feet of water on an annual basis. Of this total, approximately 78 percent is provided by the MWD, 12 percent is pumped from the San Fernando Groundwater Basin, 6 percent is pumped from the Verdugo Groundwater Basin, and the remaining 4 percent is supplied by the City's water reclamation system.

New development on the project site would result in an increase in demand for operational water use, including landscape irrigation, maintenance and other activities on the site. Based on the water generation factors of 60 gallons per day for multi-family units, the project require approximately 1 84 million gallons or 5 65 acre-feet of water on an annual basis.

Due to an increasing reliance on local resources, the amount of water the City would purchase from MWD to meet demand is projected to remain stable or slightly increase between the present time and the year 2025. However, MWD water would continue to be the main source of supply for the

City. Based on available water supplies, the MWD has indicated that is can meet the 100 percent of its member agencies' needs over the next 20 years

Overall the status of Glendale's water supply is highly reliable. The San Fernando and Verdugo Basins, to which Glendale possesses water rights, are managed under court order by a court-appointed watermaster in order to preserve water levels in these basins, thereby, assuring reliability of those in possession of pumping rights Glendale is one of the original member agencies of the MWD, and has reliably received water from it over 60 years, and would continue to receive water from MWD into the future. Additionally, Glendale has a sizable source of reclaimed water available to it, and has recently completed a reclaimed water distribution system. The use of reclaimed water is important, as it frees portable water in Glendale's system to be used to satisfy other water users. These water sources enable the City to meet all its projected demands, including those of the proposed project Consequently, this impact is considered to be less than significant

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required

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

Less than Significant Impact. See response provided under **Subsection P.2**

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Project implementation would result in an increase in residential development onsite. The total annual solid waste of the project is estimated to be 46 tons per year All solid waste generated on the project site will be deposited at the Scholl Canyon Landfill, which is owned by the City of Glendale. The annual disposal rate at the Scholl Canyon facility is approximately 360,000 tons per year with a remaining capacity of 8.6 million tons. Combined with the additional generated by the project, the annual disposal rate would increase to approximately 360,046 tons per year, and remaining capacity of 8.6 million tons, the Scholl Canyon facility could meet the demand of the proposed project and the City for approximately 24 years. Overall, the increase in solid waste generation associated with the operation of the proposed project would not exacerbate landfill capacity shortages. Therefore, the impact of the project on permitted landfill capacity is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to implement a waste diversion program in an effort to help the City meet it waste diversion goal of 50 percent as mandated by Assembly Bill 939. Examples of waste diversion programs efforts include recycling programs for cardboard boxes, paper, aluminum cans, and both glass and plastic bottles through the provisions of recycling areas within garbage disposal areas. In addition, the proposed project would enclose trash collection areas. No federal statues apply to the project site. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on compliance with federal, state, and local statues and regulations is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Q. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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, 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?			X	
2. 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)?			X	
3. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

1) 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, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is located in a developed urban area. No impacts are anticipated to occur to the quality of the environment, fish or wildlife habitats, fish or wildlife populations, plant or animal communities, or to rare, threatened or endangered plant and animal species as a result of the proposed project. No historical resources, as defined by CEQA, are located on the project site. No significant impacts would occur.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Development of the proposed project will not substantially increase traffic nor would it result in a substantial increase in population. Public facilities are available to accommodate the slight increase in usage due to the increase in area population. No significant impacts are anticipated.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the proposed project would not create direct and indirect adverse effects on humans. Many of the less than significant impacts that were identified are considered short-time effects and no significant impacts are anticipated.

13. Earlier Analyses

None

14. Project References Used to Prepare Initial Study Checklist

One or more of the following references were incorporated into the Initial Study by reference, and are available for review in the Planning division Office, 633 E. Broadway, Rm 103, Glendale, CA 91206-4386. Items used are referred to by number on the Initial Study Checklist.

1 Environmental Information Form application and materials submitted on November 29, 2006.

2 The City of Glendale's General Plan, Open Space and Conservation Element, January 1993

3 The City of Glendale's General Plan, Safety Element, August 2003.

4 The City of Glendale's Municipal Code, as amended

5 "Guidelines of the City of Glendale for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended," August 19, 2003, City of Glendale Planning Division

6 Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq and California Code of Regulations, Title 14 Section 15000 et seq.

7 *"CEQA Air Quality Handbook,"* April, 1993, South Coast Air Quality Management District

8 *"CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook,"* updated October 2003, South Coast Air Quality Management District

9 The City of Glendale's General Plan, Noise Element, 1978.

INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

HOLLYDALE PLAZA

LEAD AGENCY:

City of South Gate
8650 California Avenue
South Gate, CA 90280

Contact:
Mr. Oliver Mujica
(323) 563-9562

CONSULTANT:

RBF CONSULTING

PLANNING ▮ DESIGN ▮ CONSTRUCTION

14725 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618
Contact: Mr. Kevin Thomas
(949) 855-3659

JN 10-102067

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1

2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST 8

3.0 DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION 19

3.1 Aesthetics 19
3.2 Agriculture Resources 20
3.3 Air Quality 21
3.4 Biological Resources 24
3.5 Cultural Resources 25
3.6 Geology and Soils 25
3.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials 28
3.8 Hydrology and Water Quality 29
3.9 Land Use Planning 32
3.10 Mineral Resources 32
3.11 Noise 33
3.12 Population and Housing 34
3.13 Public Services 35
3.14 Recreation 36
3.15 Transportation/Traffic 36
3.16 Utilities and Service Systems 39

4.0 FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE 42

5.0 DETERMINATION 43

6.0 REFERENCES 44

Appendix A - Traffic Impact Study

LIST OF TABLES

Table #		Page
1	V/C and LOS Ranges	37
2	Existing Peak Hour LOS	37
3	Forecast Year 2003 Project LOS	38
4	Forecast Year 2025 Project LOS	38

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit #		Page
1	Regional Vicinity	2
2	Site Vicinity	3
3	Site Plan	4

1.0 INTRODUCTION

INITIAL STUDY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1.0 Introduction

1.1. Project Title:
Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the "Hollydale Plaza"

1.2. Lead Agency Name and Address:
City of South Gate Economic Development Department, 8650 California Avenue, South Gate, California, 90280.

1.3. Contact person(s) and phone number(s):
Mr. Oliver Mujica, (323) 563-9562

1.4. Project Location:
12222 Garfield Avenue
Approximately 61,350 square feet consisting of four parcels, comprised of Assessor's Parcel Numbers 6243-013-002, 6243-013-003, 6243-013-905 and 6243-013-906 (refer to Exhibits 1 and 2, *Regional Vicinity and Site Vicinity*, respectively).

1.5. Project sponsor's name and address:
Southland Companies
187 North Hill Street
Pasadena, CA 91106

1.6. General Plan designation:
The project site is designated as Commercial in the City of South Gate General Plan.

1.7. Zoning:
The zoning classification is C3 General Commercial Zone and R3 Multiple Residential Zone by the City of South Gate

1.8. Description of Project:
The project proposes a four-story mixed-use development comprised of retail and senior residential uses. This development will include approximately 10,130 square feet of retail space (ground floor) and a total of 101 moderately affordable senior residential units (top three floors). Approximately 76 of the senior residential units will be one bedroom/one bath units, 18 units will be two bedroom/two bath, and 7 units will be one bedroom/one bath with a den. Each residential unit will feature individual laundry facilities and outdoor terraces. A central, landscaped, open-air courtyard is proposed for the second level, and will include a recreation facility, gardens, walkways, and a pool area. The top two levels of senior residential units will provide views of the courtyard. The overall design of the project will accommodate the needs of an active senior lifestyle. A total of 92 parking spaces will be provided on the ground level, adjacent to the retail portion of the project. The main entry point to the residential units will be on Lincoln Avenue.

The project site currently consists of a vacant commercial building and a parking lot.



NOT TO SCALE

RBF

H:\PDATA\10102067\Traffic\Hollydale\Exhibits\Exh1.ai JUNE/2002

Regional Project Location

Exhibit 1



Source: The Thomas Guide Los Angeles and Orange County, 2001.

Not to Scale

RBF CONSULTING — PLANNING ■ DESIGN ■ CONSTRUCTION

INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Site Vicinity Map

Exhibit 2



Not to Scale

RBF

Project Site Plan

H:\PDATA\10102067\Traffic\Exhibits\Exh9.ai JUNE/2002

Photos of existing condition on site:



Photos of surrounding vicinity:





1.9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The City of South Gate is located in the southeastern portion of Los Angeles County, east of the City of Los Angeles and north of the City of Lynwood (see Exhibit 1, *Regional Vicinity*). The project site is located in the southeastern portion of the City, approximately 0.5 miles east of Interstate 710 (I-710) and 0.25 miles north of Interstate 105 (I-105). The project site is bounded by Harding Avenue to the north, Lincoln Avenue to the South, Garfield Avenue to the west, and residential uses to the east. Additional surrounding uses include: residential and commercial uses to the north; commercial uses to the west; residential/industrial uses and the Union Pacific Railroad to the east; and residential uses to the south. Several public facilities exist within a one-mile radius of the subject site, including Hollydale Elementary School to the west, Hollydale Park to the northwest, Hollydale Senior Citizen's Center to the southeast, a United States Post Office to the east, and Hollydale Library to the north. Topographically, the project area is relatively flat, and no distinguishing natural features or sensitive resources are present.

1.10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST OF POTENTIALLY AFFECTED ISSUES:

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

	Aesthetics		Land Use and Planning
	Agriculture Resources		Mineral Resources
	Air Quality	X	Noise
	Biological Resources		Population and Housing
	Cultural Resources		Public Services
X	Geology and Soils		Recreation
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Transportation/Traffic
	Hydrology & Water Quality		Utilities & Service Systems
	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. *Would the project:*				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				✓
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				✓
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				✓
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			✓	
2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. *In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:*				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				✓
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson act contract?				✓
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				✓
3. AIR QUALITY. *Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:*				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				✓
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			✓	
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the 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)?			✓	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				✓
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			✓	
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				✓
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				✓
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				✓
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				✓
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				✓
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				✓
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?				✓
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?				✓

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				✓
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				✓
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. *Would the project:*				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				✓
2) Strong seismic ground shaking?		✓		
3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		✓		
4) Landslides?				✓
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			✓	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				✓
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			✓	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				✓
7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: *Would the project:*				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			✓	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			✓	
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				✓
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				✓
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				✓
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				✓
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			✓	
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				✓
8. **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** *Would the project:*				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			✓	
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				✓

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			✓	
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			✓	
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			✓	
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				✓
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			✓	
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			✓	
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			✓	
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				✓
9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. *Would the project:*				
a. Physically divide an established community?				✓
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			✓	
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				✓
10. MINERAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			✓	
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?				✓
11. NOISE. *Would the project result in:*				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		✓		
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			✓	
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			✓	
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		✓		
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				✓
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				✓
12. POPULATION AND HOUSING. *Would the project:*				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			✓	
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: 1) Fire protection?			✓	
2) Police protection?			✓	
3) Schools?			✓	
4) Parks?			✓	
5) Other public facilities?			✓	
14. RECREATION.				
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			✓	
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				✓
15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. *Would the project:*				
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			✓	
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			✓	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				✓
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			✓	
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?				✓
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?				✓
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				✓

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. *Would the project:*				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			✓	
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?		✓		
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			✓	
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			✓	
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			✓	
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			✓	
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			✓	
17. 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, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				✓
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other				✓

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				✓

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

3.0 DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

This section analyzes the potential environmental impacts which may result from the proposed project. For the evaluation of potential impacts, the questions in the Initial Study Checklist (Section 2) are stated and answers are provided according to the analysis undertaken as part of the Initial Study. The analysis considers the project's short-term impacts (construction-related), and its operational or day-to-day impacts. For each question, there are four possible responses. They include:

1. *No Impact*. Future development arising from the project's implementation will not have any measurable environmental impact on the environment and no additional analysis is required.

2. *Less Than Significant Impact*. The development associated with project implementation will have the potential to impact the environment; these impacts, however, will be less than the levels or thresholds that are considered significant and no additional analysis is required.

3. *Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated*. The development will have the potential to generate impacts which will have a significant effect on the environment; however, mitigation measures will be effective in reducing the impacts to levels that are less than significant.

4. *Potentially Significant Impact*. Future implementation will have impacts that are considered significant, and additional analysis is required to identify mitigation measures that could reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

The following is a discussion of potential project impacts as identified in the Initial Study. Explanations are provided for each item.

3.1 AESTHETICS. *Would the project:*

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

No Impact. Project development would not adversely affect a scenic vista since none are located in the project vicinity, which is a highly developed commercial corridor.

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

No Impact. The project site is bounded by Garfield Avenue, Harding Avenue, and Lincoln Avenue, none of which are state designated scenic highways. No scenic resources, including trees, rock outcroppings or historic buildings, are situated on-site.

c) *Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*

No Impact. The project site is located in the southeastern portion of the City of South Gate, within a fully developed urban setting. Most parcels in the project area are developed and occupied with commercial, retail, light industrial, and residential uses. The existing site is entirely developed with a vacant commercial/retail building and parking lot.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The existing project site includes lighting for nighttime security and the on-site parking lot. Project implementation may introduce new sources of light to the site vicinity, including lighting for activity areas involving nighttime uses, parking structure illumination, security/walkway lighting, and illuminated exterior signage. Lighting impacts may also occur due to headlights from project-generated traffic. The nearest light-sensitive receptors to the project site are residential uses to the east and south of the subject site.

To ensure the project's exterior lighting does not spill over onto neighboring residences and adjoining properties, all exterior light fixtures, including parking structure lighting, shall be shielded or directed away from adjoining parcels pursuant to South Gate Municipal Code Chapter 7.45. The City Traffic Engineer and City Planner will review parking area lighting plans to confirm the project's adherence to this Code Section. In addition, the City's Design Review Board will review the project's exterior lighting plans to ensure any potential lighting impacts to neighboring residences are reduced to less than significant levels. It should also be noted that the site is in a highly urbanized setting. With implementation of existing requirements and standard building conditions, no significant impacts are anticipated.

3.2 AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

Would the project:

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

No Impact. The project site is located within a fully developed urban setting. Most parcels in the project area are developed and occupied with commercial, retail, light industrial, and residential uses. No agricultural uses exist within the project site vicinity. Therefore, project implementation would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland).

b) *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

No Impact. Implementation of the project would not result in any conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract, as no agricultural uses exist within the vicinity of the project site. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

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

No Impact. As previously stated, the subject site is not used for agricultural production and agricultural operations do not occur within the project vicinity. Thus, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any changes to the environment that would result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use. Impacts are not anticipated in this regard.

3.3 AIR QUALITY.

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

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

No Impact. Of primary concern is that project-related impacts have been properly anticipated in the regional air quality planning process and reduced whenever feasible. Therefore, it is necessary to assess the project's consistency with the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP).

The project site is located in the South Coast Air Basin, which is managed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD has prepared multiple Air Quality Management Plans (AQMPs). The most recent AQMP was adopted in 1997. The AQMP relies on a multi-level partnership of governmental agencies at the federal, state, regional and local level. These agencies (EPA, CARB, local governments, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and the SCAQMD) are the cornerstones that implement the AQMP programs.

SCAG is responsible under the Federal CAA for determining conformity of projects, plans and programs with the SCAQMD AQMP. SCAG released the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG, May 1995). The RCPG is a compilation of the summaries of Plans for the Southern California Region. It establishes a broad set of goals for the region, and identifies strategies for agencies at all levels to use in guiding their decision-making toward implementation of the proposals.[1] The Growth Management and Regional Mobility Chapters contain policies to help guide local agencies in developing a more balanced number of houses and jobs.

Prior to adoption of the RCPG, formal AQMP Conformity Review Procedures were provided by SCAG for local agencies to follow when determining consistency of projects with the AQMP. These guidelines were primarily based on a project 's influence on the subregional jobs/housing balance. Since adoption of the RCPG, SCAG released the Intergovernmental Review Procedures Handbook dated June 1, 1995, which states that project consistency with the RCPG policies, particularly the core chapters, should be analyzed to determine project consistency with regional growth and air quality documents. Core chapters include Growth Management, Regional Mobility, Air Quality, Hazardous Waste and Water Quality.

Policies within these chapters of the RCPG are aimed at SCAG's overall goals to: 1) reinvigorate the region's economy; 2) avoid social and economic inequities and the geographical isolation of communities; and 3) maintain the region's quality of life. Selected policies include the following:

- "SCAG shall encourage existing or proposed local jurisdictional programs aimed at designing land uses which encourage the use of transit and thus reduce the need of roadway expansion, reduce the number of auto trips and vehicle miles traveled, and create opportunities for residents to walk or bike."

[1] *Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide*, Southern California Association of Governments, May 1995, page 1.

- "SCAG shall encourage local jurisdictional plans that maximize the use of existing urbanized areas accessible to transit through infill and redevelopment."

- "SCAG shall support local plans to increase density of future development located at strategic points along the regional commuter rail, transit centers and activity centers."

- "SCAG shall encourage efforts of local jurisdictions in the implementation of programs that increase the supply and quality of housing and provide affordable housing as evaluated in the Regional Housing Needs Assessment."

Although air quality is a regional problem, SCAG's RCPG and SCAQMD's AQMP place a heavy reliance on local implementation measures, such as land use decisions and local employment transportation programs. The implementation process stresses the freedom of cities to choose attainment measures that best suit local conditions.

As indicated in SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, there are two main indicators of consistency:

- Whether the project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the AQMP; and

- Whether the project would exceed the AQMP's assumptions for 2010 or increments based on the year of project build-out and phase.

The site is zoned Commercial, and R3 Residential, the proposed mixed use development would generate less traffic, and the project would provide senior residential in proximity to local retail and transit services. Therefore, the project is considered consistent with the AQMP.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook contains screening tables to provide guidance to local governments regarding the various types/amounts of land uses which may exceed state or federal air quality standards and would, therefore, result in potentially significant air quality impacts. Two different screening significance thresholds are provided and include: 1) Construction thresholds for non-residential uses; and 2) operation thresholds for non-residential uses. The construction and operations significance thresholds, as applicable to the proposed project, are discussed below. If the use proposes development in excess of the screening threshold, a significant air quality impact may occur and additional analysis is warranted to fully assess the significance of impacts.

CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS

Pursuant to Table 6-3, Screening Table for Construction, of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the SCAQMD significance screening threshold for construction of an apartment is 1,410,000 square feet of gross floor area. The applicant proposes the construction of 148,817 square feet, which is well below the screening threshold of 1,410,000 square feet. Additionally, it should be noted that project implementation would require the demolition of the abandoned retail spaces which presently exists onsite. The significance screening threshold for demolition is 23,214,000 cubic feet of building materials. This estimated volume to be demolished is well below the screening threshold. Based on SCAQMD's significance screening threshold for project

construction detailed above, project implementation would not create significant construction-related air quality impacts. Furthermore, the applicant/contractor will implement standard dust control measures during construction, in accordance with City and AQMD requirements, which will further reduce emissions.

LONG-TERM OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS

Long-term air quality impacts consist of mobile source emissions generated from project-related traffic and stationary source emissions (generated directly from on-site activities and from the electricity and natural gas consumed).

The proposed project would create an increased demand for electrical energy, which is generated from power plants utilizing fossil fuels. Electric power generating plants are distributed throughout the SoCAB, and their emissions contribute to the total regional pollution burden. The primary use
of natural gas by the project would be for combustion to produce space heating, water heating and other miscellaneous heating or air conditioning.

Pursuant to Table 6-2, Screening Table for Operation, of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the SCAQMD significance screening threshold for operation of an apartment is 261 units. The applicant proposes the construction of a 101units, which is well below the screening threshold of 261 rooms. The significance screening threshold for operation of a shopping center (small) is 22,000 square feet of gross floor area. The applicant proposes the construction of 10,130 square feet, which is well below the screening threshold of 22,000 square feet. Based on SCAQMD's significance screening thresholds for operation of the project detailed above, project implementation would not create significant operations-related air quality impacts. Furthermore, as previously noted, the project is consistent with the overall anticipated land uses and the City General Plan, and has therefore been included in AQMD long-range emission modeling. In addition, much of the "project-related" operational emissions from vehicle traffic is anticipated to have otherwise occurred on the local street system, destined for other retail stores in the area. Accordingly, it can reasonably be argued that, as the project provides additional local opportunities for South Gate visitors , the addition of this senior housing and retail project may reduce overall vehicle trips by reducing the distance that motorists need to drive to find suitable senior housing and comparable retail shops.

Overall, project-generated emissions from both construction activities and operations would not result in significant air quality impacts on a local or regional basis since State or Federal air quality thresholds or standards would not be exceeded.

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)?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Responses 5.3(a) and 5.3(b).

d) *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

No Impact. Sensitive populations (i.e., children, senior citizens and acutely or chronically ill people) are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than are the general population. Land uses considered sensitive receptors typically include residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, hospitals, convalescent homes and retirement homes. Sensitive receptors in proximity to the project site include adjacent residences situated to the east. These residences,

however, are not situated adjacent to roadways serving project-related traffic. Although construction and operation of the project would increase vehicle trips on area roadways and result in associated air pollutants, these increases would not significantly contribute to pollution levels, and project traffic would primarily occur on major city arterials.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The project will consist of approximately 61,350-square feet of senior housing and retail space, and would utilize standard construction techniques and materials.

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

a) *Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through mitigation measure obtain air district permit habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

No Impact. The project site is located within a fully developed urban setting. The existing site is comprised of a vacant retail/commercial building and parking lot. Most parcels in the project area are developed with commercial, retail, light industrial, and residential uses. The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

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

No Impact. The project area is void of riparian corridors and sensitive habitat, as it is entirely developed within an urbanized area. Thus, no impact to sensitive natural communities would occur.

c) *Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?*

No Impact. No wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act exist or have been identified on-site, as the site is entirely developed within an urbanized area. Thus, the project would not result in impacts in this regard.

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?*

No Impact. Project implementation would not 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, since none exist in the project area. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

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

No Impact. The project site is located within a fully developed urban setting. Project implementation would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, as no such policies or ordinances exist. Impacts in this regard are not anticipated to occur.

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

No Impact. The project area does not have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Plan or other habitat conservation plan and no other draft plan is in existence or proposed. Thus, the project would not result in impacts in this regard.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

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

No Impact. The project site is located within a fully developed urban setting. Therefore, project implementation would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical, archaeological, or unique paleontological resource.

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

No Impact. Refer to Response 3.5(a).

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

No Impact. Refer to Response 3.5(a).

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

No Impact. Due to the fully developed condition of the site, the disturbance of human remains is not anticipated, and impacts are not anticipated in this regard.

3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS. *Would the project:*

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

1) *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.*

No Impact. There are no known faults within the City's boundaries. According to the Hazards Management Element of the General Plan, surface rupture is considered to be a low level of risk within the City. In addition, the California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) Special

Publication 42 (revised 1997, supplemented 1999) indicates that no known Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones (EFZs) exist within the City of South Gate. See Response 3.6(a)(2) below.

2) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated. Southern California is a seismically active region. There are a number of active faults in the vicinity of the project site capable of producing earthquakes that could affect the proposed retail space and senior residential units and its tenants. However, no active or potentially active faults are known to traverse the City. Furthermore, no significant seismic hazards have been identified which suggest the project site is exposed to more potential damage from seismic events than the rest of Southern California.

Major faults closest to the site include the San Andreas, Whittier Elsinore, Newport-Inglewood, and Hollywood Faults. The seismic risk of the area is considered high based on the proximity of these known active faults. The four major faults in the region that are known to be active are discussed below:

San Andreas Fault: The San Andreas Fault is over 600 miles in length and has a slip rate of approximately 20 to 35mm per year. At its closest point, this fault is located approximately 40 miles north of the City of South Gate and is capable of a magnitude of 6.8 to 8.0 earthquake.

Whittier Elsinore Fault: The Whittier Elsinore Fault extends from the California-Mexico border northwestward for approximately 140 miles to the northwestern portion of the Puente Hills. The City of South Gate is approximately 25 miles southwest of the terminus of this fault in the Puente Hills. This fault system is capable of producing an earthquake of magnitude 6.0 to 7.2.

Newport-Inglewood Fault: This fault zone stretches for approximately 50 miles from Newport Bay to Beverly Hills. At its closest location, the fault is approximately five miles southwest of the City of South Gate and is capable of producing an earthquake of magnitude of 6.0 to 7.4.

Hollywood Fault: The Hollywood Fault is located north of the City South Gate, approximately 12 miles away. The fault is capable of a magnitude 5.8-6.5 earthquake alone, and larger if simultaneous with an adjacent fault.

No severe geological hazards or constraints have been found which would preclude implementation of the proposed project. Although the most important implication of seismic safety is building design, no special seismic design requirements other than adherence to seismic protection standards for new construction are indicated. Adherence to the seismic requirements of the latest Uniform Building Code (UBC) would provide specific standards for buildings designed to withstand ground shaking within an acceptable level of risk.

Mitigation Measures:

GEO 1 - Prior to issuing a Grading Permit, the applicant shall submit grading plans subject to the approval of the City Engineer and Building Official. All grading activities shall be carried out under the guidelines set forth in the UBC.

GEO 2 - Due to the potential for high intensity ground shaking, the applicant, prior to receiving building permits, shall comply with the standards set forth in the UBC to assure seismic safety to the satisfaction of the City Building Official.

3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated. The City of South Gate General Plan Hazards Management Element indicates that liquefaction is a high-level risk within the City of South Gate and surrounding region. Furthermore, the California Department of Conservation State of California Seismic Hazard Zone Map indicates that the City is in a liquefaction zone. Applicable mitigation measures shall be implemented to minimize impacts to less than significant levels, including requirements for a detailed liquefaction report and adherence the latest UBC.

Mitigation Measures:

GEO 3 - Due to the potential for liquefaction within the City of South Gate, the applicant shall comply with the standards set forth in the UBC (most recent edition) to assure safety of the occupants to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, including compliance with the California Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 117 (Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, adopted March 13, 1997) and "Recommended Procedures for Implementation of CDMG Special Publication 117 – Guidelines for Analyzing and Mitigating Liquefaction in California" (Dr. Geoffrey R. Martin et al, May 1999).

GEO 4 - Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit a detailed liquefaction report for review and approval by the City Engineer. The report shall document the findings of a subsurface investigation of the potential for liquefaction on the project site, and, if required, provide recommendations to reduce the potential for liquefaction. Methods of foundation design and/or geotechnical stabilization of the ground shall be evaluated. Verification of compliance with this measure shall be the responsibility of the City of South Gate Department of Planning.

4) Landslides?

No Impact. No landslide-inducing topographic features exist either on or surrounding the proposed project site. Consequently, project implementation would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects involving landslides. Additionally, the City of South Gate General Plan Hazards Management Element indicates that landslides are a low level of risk for the City and surrounding region.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Grading and trenching during the construction phase of the project would displace soils and temporarily increase the potential for soils to be subject to wind and water erosion. The impact of construction activities would be short-term and is considered a less than significant impact. The construction contractor will be required to comply with standard engineering practices for erosion control and a qualified soils engineer will monitor soils compaction during construction.

The proposed project would not result in significant long-term operational impacts in this regard, as the majority of the project site would be developed or paved. Drainage from landscaped areas would be contained on-site and directed to the local storm drain.

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?*

No Impact. Refer to Responses 3.6(a)(3) and 3.6(a)(4).

d) *Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Responses 3.6(a)(3) and 3.6(a)(4). According to the *General Soil Map of Los Angeles County* (United Stated Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, April 1994), the City of South Gate is underlain by soil from the Chino association. According to the *Report and General Soil Map, Los Angeles County* (United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, December 1969), this type of soil is usually over 60 inches deep, poorly drained, has a moderate level of shrink-swell behavior, and has moderately slow subsoil permeability. The association is composed of dark gray loam, silt loam or clay loam surface layers. This type of soil is used for residential areas in the Los Angeles basin, and is not known to pose risks due to expansive soils. Standard grading practices will be used to remove/remediate unsuitable soils. Impacts in this regard are anticipated to be less than significant.

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

No Impact. The proposed project does not include the implementation of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems, and, as such, no impacts are anticipated in this regard.

3.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. *Would the project:*

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Future uses on-site may handle materials that are considered hazardous, though these materials would be limited to solvents and chemicals used for cleaning, building maintenance, retail stores and those used in landscaping. These materials would not be substantially different from household chemicals and solvents. No on-site uses would engage in the production or disposal of hazardous materials; thus, significant impacts in this regard would not occur.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Due to the nature of the proposed project, there are no foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment (refer to Response 3.7(a)).

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Hollydale Elementary School is situated approximately one-quarter mile west of the proposed project site. However, as previously stated, hazardous materials would be limited to typical household solvents and chemicals to be used for cleaning, building maintenance, retail stores and landscaping. Impacts in this regard are anticipated to be less than significant.

d) *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*
No Impact. The proposed project site is not included on a list of sites containing hazardous materials, and would not result in a significant hazard to the public or to the environment.

e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

No Impact. The proposed project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

No Impact. The proposed project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would comply with all City of South Gate codes and regulations in regards to emergency response and emergency evacuation. A detailed Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will be prepared for approval by the City Engineer prior to construction for the proposed project. Vehicular traffic will be maintained upon the existing roadways or street closures with detours around the construction site. Street closures and detour routes would be approved in advance of construction by the Department of Public Works. No revisions to adopted emergency plans would be required as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated as a result of project implementation.

h) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?*

No Impact. The project site is fully developed and is located within an urban setting. Therefore, project implementation would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, as no such wildlands exist. Impacts in this regard are not anticipated.

3.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. *Would the project:*

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Impacts related to water quality would range over three different periods: 1) during the earthwork and construction phase, when the potential for erosion, siltation and sedimentation would be the greatest; 2) following construction, prior to the establishment of ground cover, when the erosion potential may remain relatively high; and 3) following completion of the project, when impacts related to sedimentation would decrease markedly, however, those associated with urban runoff would increase.

Stormwater quality is generally affected by the length of time since last rainfall, rainfall intensity, urban uses of the area, and the quantity of transported sediment. Typical urban water pollutants usually result from motor vehicle operations, oil and grease residues, fertilizer/pesticide uses, human/animal littering, careless material storage and handling, and poor property management. The majority of pollutant loads are usually washed away during the "first flush" of the storm occurring after the dry-season period.

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has identified street surfaces as the primary source of pollution in urban areas. The street-generated pollutants typically contain atmospheric pollution, tire-wear residues, petroleum products, oil and grease, fertilizer and pesticide wash-offs, industrial chemical spills, as well as litter and animal dropping types of wastes. The pollutants are washed from street surfaces by a rainfall adequate enough to produce sufficient runoff.

Stormwater management is the key in the control and prevention of water quality degradation. There are many Best Management Practices (BMPs) available for achieving the best possible water quality. BMPs are required by local authorities and with proper implementation, BMPs protect the receiving waters from degradation, and correct for existing problems. Common BMPs include structural control as well as nonstructural controls.

Due to the limited area and scale of the project, the project will implement standard design measures as required by the City Engineer, which may include on-site detention, and storm drain inlets with debris traps or other BMPs to minimize adverse water quality impacts. Project landscaping will utilize standard operation/maintenance procedures to minimize unnecessary use of fertilizers and pesticides.

NPDES/General Construction Permit: On August 19, 1999, the State Water Resources Control Board adopted a new General Construction permit. The permit provisions require that discharges of stormwater from construction activities of five acres or more must be regulated as an industrial activity and covered by a NPDES permit. The General Construction permit is implemented and enforced by the nine California Regional Water Quality Control Boards. Since the proposed project site is less than five acres in size, coverage under the general construction permit would not be required.

Betterment Measures (Not Required for a Significant Impact)

1 - Although the project is less than five acres in size and is not required to comply with the NPDES/General Construction Permit, standard City construction requirements and Stormwater Pollution Control requirements for grading will apply. Implementation of erosion control measures and Best Management Practices (BMPs) will also be required.

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)?*

No Impact. Project implementation would not result in the depletion of groundwater supplies or interference with groundwater recharge since the project does not involve the extraction of groundwater from the site.

c) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The site is void of existing drainage courses such as rivers or streams. Project implementation would not significantly alter the site's absorption rate nor would it affect the rate and volume of surface runoff, since the site presently contains impermeable surfaces (vacant retail/commercial building and associated paved parking lot). The proposed project would incorporate an adequate local drainage system capable of directing all on-site stormwater to the City storm drain.

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?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Response 3.8(c).

e) *Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Response 3.8(c).

f) *Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?*

No Impact. Due to the scope and nature of the proposed project, additional impacts that would degrade water quality beyond those identified above in Responses 3.8(a) through 3.8(e) are not anticipated.

g) *Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The Los Angeles County Drainage Area (LACDA) Project, a federally sponsored flood-control improvements program, was recently completed along the Los Angeles River from the Southern Pacific Railroad crossing to the confluence of the Rio Hondo Channel and downstream of the Whittier Narrows Dam. The LACDA Project included numerous levee improvements, modifications to bridge crossings, landscaping, and bike trail improvements to alleviate severe overflow potential from the Los Angeles River and Rio Hondo Channel. As a result of the improvements, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood designation for the project site was revised from Zone A99 to Zone X, thereby removing the site from the 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, impacts in this regard are anticipated to be less than significant.

h) *Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Response 3.8(g).

i) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The Whittier Narrows Dam, along the Rio Hondo Channel, is the nearest dam to the subject site. As this dam is situated approximately 10 miles northeast of the proposed project site, impacts in this regard are anticipated to be less than significant.

j) *Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?*

No Impact. There are no anticipated impacts to the proposed project from seiche, tsunami or mudflow, as no topographical features or waterbodies capable of producing such events occur within the project site vicinity.

3.9 LAND USE AND RELEVANT PLANNING. *Would the project:*

a) *Physically divide an established community?*

No Impact. The project site is located within a fully developed urban setting. Most parcels in the project area are developed and occupied with commercial, retail, light industrial, and residential uses. The proposed project is not of a scope or nature such that it would physically divide an established community. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

b) *Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

Less than Significant Impact. The City of South Gate General Plan designates the project site as Commercial, while the subject site is zoned G3 and R3 by the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed project would require a general plan amendment to change the designation and a zoning designation change to a mixed use residential development.

c) *Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?*

No Impact. As stated in Response 3.4(f) the project does not conflict with habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans.

3.10 MINERAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would result in the use of additional natural resources for both construction (building and foundation materials, energy for construction equipment) and long-term operations on the project site (energy for lighting, heating, cooling, and transportation). However, due to the scope and nature of the proposed uses, no significant impacts are anticipated in this regard.

b) *Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?*

No Impact. The project site is located within a fully developed urban setting. Most parcels in the project area are developed and occupied with commercial, retail, light industrial, and residential uses. No significant impacts are anticipated in this regard. The General Plan indicates that the soils do not contain any known mineral resources and there are no designated mineral resource areas in the City.

3.11 NOISE. *Would the project result in:*

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated. There are potential issues of project-related impacts upon adjacent sensitive receptors, and potential noise impacts upon proposed senior residential tenants.

Project Construction Noise. During construction, the project will generate noise associated with demolition of the existing building and construction of the proposed project. This will primarily affect the residential areas east of the project. Project construction will be limited to 7 AM - 7 PM, excluding City-recognized holidays.

Project-related Traffic Noise. With respect to project-related traffic noise impacts, this is not considered to be a significant impact. Garfield Avenue is currently a heavily developed commercial corridor. The main entrance to the senior units will be on Lincoln Avenue and truck loading areas for the retail space will be provided on Harding Avenue and Lincoln Avenue.

Project-related Stationary Noise. The proposed project is anticipated to include various stationary noise sources, including parking structure noise and noise from available air conditioning units of the senior residential units. The parking structure noise is not anticipated to significantly impact sensitive receptors, as it will occur only sporadically. Noise from air conditioning units will be minimized such that noise levels do not adversely impact residential areas located to the east.

Noise Impacts Upon the Project. With respect to potential noise impacts upon the proposed project, the primary noise sources will be from Garfield Avenue and the Union Pacific Railroad, which runs to the east of the project site approximately ¼ mile away. Activity on the rail line varies and is dependant upon the type of freight, season of the year and time of day; however, the General Plan indicates an average of 1 train per day on the railroad line. The architectural mass of the building will be designed in a way as to act as a buffer for the interior courtyard area.

Mitigation Measures

Short-Term Construction

1. Construction activities shall comply with the City of South Gate General Plan Noise Element related to construction noise. Construction is prohibited between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., and shall not occur during City-recognized public holidays.

2. Stationary on-site construction equipment and construction vehicle staging shall be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive noise receptors, to the satisfaction of the City Building Official. All construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers, to the satisfaction of the City Building Official.

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

Less than Significant Impact. Due to the nature of the proposed land use, project implementation would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

c) *A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Due to the nature of the proposed project, senior residential homes and a 10,130 square-feet retail space for the ground floor, there are no anticipated permanent increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

d) *A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated. Refer to Response 3.11(a).

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?*

No Impact. The proposed project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport and would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

No Impact. The proposed project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

3.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING. *Would the project:*

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project may have direct impacts in regards to population and housing as it would implement 101 senior residential units within the southeastern portion of the City of South Gate. In addition, the project may also have indirect impacts as it would create a new source of employment during both short-term construction and long-term operation of the facility. The project would also require a general plan amendment, changing the site's designation, which would allow for residential development. Due to the scope and nature of the proposed project, impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

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

No Impact. The existing subject site does not contain any residential units, and is developed retail/commercial uses. The project proposes to develop the site with a mixed-use residential/retail building, with 101 senior residential units. As such, no impacts are anticipated in this regard.

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

No Impact. The existing subject site is developed with retail/commercial uses. All structures on the subject site are currently vacant. As such, no impacts are anticipated in this regard.

3.13 PUBLIC SERVICES.

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

1) Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. Fire protection for the site is provided by the City of South Gate Fire Department, Station #57, located on 5720 Gardendale Street, approximately one-half mile north of the subject site. The proposed four-story residential/retail mixed-use project may cause an increase in demand for fire services, as the development would include 10,130-square feet of retail space (ground floor) and a total of 101 senior residential units (top three floors).

However, impacts are anticipated to be reduced to less than significant levels through the payment of applicable mitigation fees and compliance with standard City regulations in regards to fire safety, including the installation of an approved automatic fire sprinkler system and an approved smoke detector per Title 10-Fire Section of the South Gate Municipal Code.

Mitigation Measure:

PUB 1 - The applicant shall be required to pay all applicable mitigation fees to the City of South Gate Fire Department.

2) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of South Gate Police Department provides police protection to the proposed project site. Implementation of the proposed mixed-use project may increase demand for police services, as the development would introduce both retail and senior residential uses to the site vicinity. However, the applicant would be required to pay appropriate impact fees to the City of South Gate Police Department to mitigate any impacts in this regard to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure:

PUB 2 - The applicant shall be required to pay all applicable mitigation fees to the City of South Gate Police Department.

3) Schools?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project site is served by the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). Hollydale Elementary School is the nearest school facility to the project site, at a proximity of one-quarter mile to the west. As the proposed project would only provide housing to senior citizens, the generation of students and associated impacts to local schools is not anticipated. However, the project may create a slight enrollment increase for local adult schools. The nearest adult school to the subject site is the South Gate Adult Community School, located at 3351 Firestone Boulevard, approximately 5 miles northwest of the proposed project site. The project will pay prevailing school impact fees pursuant to state law.

4.) Parks?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project site is served by the 56-acre Hollydale Park located at 5400 Monroe Avenue approximately ½ mile west. Additionally, Hollydale Community Park is located on Industrial Avenue ¼ mile east of the proposed project site and includes a basketball court and tot lot. Due to the nature and scale of the proposed project, there are no anticipated impacts associated with parks.

5) Other public facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact. Due to the nature and scope of the proposed uses, project implementation is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to other public facilities within the City of South Gate.

3.14 RECREATION.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed project may result in increased use of local public parks and recreational facilities, as the development would include 101 senior residential units. However, due to the scope and nature of the proposed project, increased demand is anticipated to be so slight that impacts in this regard would be less than significant. In addition, it should be noted that the proposed senior residential component of the project would include a recreation center on-site.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As stated above in Response 3.14(a), the senior residential portion of the proposed project would include an on-site recreation center. The construction of this recreation center would not result in impacts other than those described within this document. Impacts are not anticipated to be significant.

3.15 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. *Would the project:*

a) *Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?*

Less Than Significant Impact. A Traffic Impact Study was completed for the proposed project by RBF Consulting in June 2002 (see Appendix A). The study analyzed current, year 2003, and 2025 impacts with and without the implementation of the proposed project. All study

intersections were forecast to operate at an acceptable level of service for years 2003 and 2025 with the project.

The Traffic Impact Study intersections, include:

- Garfield Avenue/Gardendale Street;
- Garfield Avenue/Harding Avenue;
- Garfield Avenue/Lincoln Avenue;
- Garfield Avenue/I-105 Westbound Ramps; and
- Garfield Avenue/I-105 Eastbound Ramps.

The intersections were analyzed during the a.m. peak and p.m. peak hours during typical weekday conditions.

Level of Service (LOS) is commonly used as a qualitative description of intersection operation and is based on the capacity of the intersection and the volume of traffic using the intersection. The Traffic Impact Study utilized the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) analysis method to determine the operating LOS of the study intersections.

Table 1
V/C and LOS Ranges

V/C Ratio	LOS
≤ 0.60	A
0.61 – 0.70	B
0.71 – 0.80	C
0.81 – 0.90	D
0.91 – 1.00	E
> 1.00	F

The City of South Gate target for peak hour intersection operation is LOS D or better at City intersections and LOS E or better at Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP) network study intersections. Garfield Avenue/I-105 Westbound Ramps intersection and Garfield Avenue/I-105 Eastbound Ramps intersections fall within the CMP network intersections.

Table 2*
Existing Peak Hour LOS

Study Intersection	AM Peak Hour V/C - LOS	PM Peak Hour V/C - LOS
Garfield Ave/Gardendale St	0.58 - A	0.53 - A
Garfield Ave/Harding Ave	0.37 - A	0.38 - A
Garfield Ave/Lincoln Ave	0.37 - A	0.39 - A
I-105 WB Ramps/Garfield Ave	0.69 - B	0.66 - B
I-105 EB Ramps/Garfield Ave	0.68 - B	0.80 - C

*Hollydale Plaza Traffic Impact Study, RBF Consulting, June 2002.

As shown in Table 4 above, all study intersections are currently operating at an acceptable LOS during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

A forecast year 2003 (project buildout) and 2025 traffic projections were conducted both with and without the implementation of the proposed project. Year 2003 traffic volumes without the project were derived by adding an annual growth rate factor of one-percent to the existing traffic volumes to account for one year of ambient traffic growth. All study intersection for year 2003 without project are forecast to operate at an acceptable LOS during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Year 2003 traffic forecasts with the proposed project were derived by adding forecast year 2003 project-generated trips to forecast year 2003 without project traffic volumes. Table 5 below, shows that all intersections are forecast to operate at an acceptable level of service for year 2003 with the proposed project.

Table 3*
Forecast Year 2003 Project LOS

Intersection	Forecast Year 2003 Without Project		Forecast Year 2003 With Project		Significant Impact?
	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
	V/C - LOS	V/C - LOS	V/C - LOS	V/C - LOS	
Garfield Ave/Gardendale St	0.58 - A	0.53 - A	0.58 - A	0.54 - A	No
Garfield Ave/Harding Ave	0.37 - A	0.38 - A	0.37 - A	0.39 - A	No
Garfield Ave/Lincoln Ave	0.37 - A	0.40 - A	0.37 - A	0.41 - A	No
I-105 WB Ramps/Garfield Ave	0.70 - B	0.66 - B	0.70 - B	0.67 - B	No
I-105 EB Ramps/Garfield Ave	0.69 - B	0.81 - D	0.69 - B	0.81- D	No

*Hollydale Plaza Traffic Impact Study, RBF Consulting, June 2002.

Year 2025 traffic volumes without the project were derived by adding an annual growth rate factor of one-percent to the existing traffic volumes to account for 23 years of ambient traffic growth. All study intersection for year 2025 without project are forecast to operate at an acceptable LOS during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Year 2025 traffic forecasts with the proposed project were derived by adding forecast year 2025 project-generated trips to forecast year 2025 without project traffic volumes. Table 6 below, shows that all intersections are forecast to operate at an acceptable level of service for year 2025 with the proposed project.

Table 4*
Forecast Year 2025 Project LOS

Intersection	Forecast Year 2003 Without Project		Forecast Year 2003 With Project		Significant Impact?
	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
	V/C - LOS	V/C - LOS	V/C - LOS	V/C - LOS	
Garfield Ave/Gardendale St	0.70 - C	0.64 - B	0.70 - C	0.64 - B	No
Garfield Ave/Harding Ave	0.43 - A	0.45 - A	0.44 - A	0.46 - A	No
Garfield Ave/Lincoln Ave	0.44 - A	0.47 - A	0.44 - A	0.48 - A	No
I-105 WB Ramps/Garfield Ave	0.84 - D	0.80 - C	0.84 - D	0.80 - D	No
I-105 EB Ramps/Garfield Ave	0.83 - D	0.98 - E	0.83 - D	0.98 - E	No

*Hollydale Plaza Traffic Impact Study, RBF Consulting, June 2002

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required for the proposed project. As previously mentioned, the City of South Gate's target for peak hour intersection operation is LOS D or better at City intersections and LOS E or better at Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program network study intersections. The project will pay any applicable traffic impact fees pursuant to local law.

b) *Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Response 3.15(a).

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?*

No Impact. The proposed project would not affect air traffic patterns and due to its limited scope, would not result in an increase in air traffic levels.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The main entry point to the senior units will be on Lincoln Avenue and truck loading areas will be provided on Harding Avenue and Lincoln Avenue for the retail space. These areas, along with the internal circulation of the parking areas, would be designed and constructed pursuant to City Codes and Standards. Therefore, project implementation is not anticipated to substantially increase hazards due to a design feature of the proposed hotel, restaurant and parking areas.

e) *Result in inadequate emergency access?*

No Impact. Refer to Response 3.7(g).

f) *Result in inadequate parking capacity?*

No Impact. A total of 92 parking spaces would be developed as part of the proposed project. Due to the nature of the proposed project, senior housing units and retail space of 10, 130 square feet, there are no anticipated inadequate parking capacity issues.

g) *Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?*

No Impact. Project implementation would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

3.16 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. *Would the project:*

a) *Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Improvements associated with the proposed project are not anticipated to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Therefore, significant impacts in this regard are not anticipated to occur.

b) *Require 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?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Due to the nature and scope of the proposed project, there is no anticipated construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities which could cause significant environmental effects. Any on-site domestic water connections shall be to City standards.

c) *Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Due to the scope and nature of the proposed project, project implementation would not require or result in the expansion of existing storm water drainage facilities. However, project design would incorporate appropriate on-site storm water drainage facilities, in accordance with all City ordinance requirements. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

d) *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Response 3.16(b).

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Response 3.16(b).

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Solid waste collection and disposal services for the project site would be provided by a private hauler that would transport the waste to the South Gate Transfer Station. The non-recyclable waste would then be transported to the Puente Hills Landfill in Whittier for ultimate disposal. The Puente Hills Landfill is anticipated to have the capacity to provide waste disposal for the residents and businesses of Los Angeles County until the year 2013.

To minimize the proposed projects potential impacts on Los Angeles County's landfills, the following betterment measures are proposed:

1. Recycling programs shall be included in the design and development of the project through the inclusion of space for and designation of facilities to support recycling, such as adequate storage areas and access by collection vehicles.

2. The projects landscaping shall incorporate drought resistant plant materials which have minimum maintenance requirements and generate less yard waste for disposal at County landfills.

3. Project occupants shall be encouraged to recycle, at a minimum, newspapers, glass bottles, aluminum and metal cans.

If hazardous materials are identified, the project developer(s) shall undertake the treatment and/or disposal of these wastes in a manner consistent with the California Code of Regulations, the rules and regulations of the State Department of Health Services, the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles and the South Coast Air Quality Management District, including but not limited to, any and all permitting and licensing requirements associated therewith.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Consistent with City Code and Standards, the proposed projects land uses within the City would be required to provide appropriate waste collection and recycling facilities.

4.0 FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

4.0 FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The following findings have been made, regarding the mandatory findings of significance set forth in Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines, based on the results of this environmental assessment:

a. The proposed project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major proceeds of California history or prehistory.

b. The proposed project would not 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.) Given the relatively small scale of the project, project-related cumulative impacts are not considered significant.

c. The proposed project would not have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, following implementation of recommended mitigation measures.

A Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be prepared for this project.