

---

---

# 1. INTRODUCTION/SUMMARY

---

---

This section includes information from the following items, which are included as Appendices A, B, and C to this Draft EIR:

- A Initial Study, CAJA Environmental Services, August 2016.
- B Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report, City of Lomita, August 26, 2016.
- C Comments Received in Response to Notice of Preparation.

## INTRODUCTION

### Purpose of the Draft EIR

The purpose of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) is to inform decision makers and the general public of the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed Picerne Lomita Apartments Project (the Project). The Project would involve the demolition and removal of the existing equipment rental yard and the construction of a five-story, 223-unit, multi-family residential development. A detailed description of the Project is contained in Section 2, Project Description, of this Draft EIR.

The Project would require approval of certain discretionary actions by the City of Lomita (City) and other governmental agencies. Therefore, the Project is subject to environmental review requirements under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).<sup>1</sup> For purposes of complying with CEQA, the City of Lomita, at 24300 Narbonne Avenue, Lomita, CA 90717 is identified as the lead agency for the Project.

As described in Sections 15121(a) and 15362 of the Guidelines for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Guidelines),<sup>2</sup> an environmental impact report is an informational document which will inform public agency decision-makers and the public of the potential significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to mitigate any significant environmental effects, and identify and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the project that have the potential to mitigate or avoid the project's potential significant environmental effects while feasibly accomplishing most of the project's basic purposes. Therefore, the purpose of this Draft EIR is to focus the discussion on the Project's potential effects on the environment, which the lead agency has determined are or may be significant. In addition, when applicable, the Draft EIR recommends feasible mitigation measures that can reduce or avoid significant environmental impacts. This Draft EIR was prepared in accordance with Section 15151 of the CEQA Guidelines, which defines the standards for adequacy of an environmental impact report:

---

<sup>1</sup> *Public Resources Code Sections 21000-21178.*

<sup>2</sup> *California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 3, Sections 15000-15387.*

*An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a Project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure.*

## **Organization of the Draft EIR**

The Draft EIR is organized into eight sections as follows:

Section 1 (Introduction/Summary): This section provides an introduction to the environmental review process and a summary of the Project description, alternatives, environmental impacts, and mitigation measures.

Section 2 (Project Description): A complete description of the Project including Project location, Project Site characteristics, Project characteristics, Project objectives, and required discretionary actions is presented.

Section 3 (Environmental Setting): An overview of the environmental setting of the Project is provided including a description of existing and surrounding land uses, and a list of related projects.

Section 4 (Environmental Impact Analysis): The Environmental Impact Analysis section is the primary focus of this Draft EIR. Separate discussions are provided to address the different categories of potential environmental effects of the Project. Each environmental issue contains a discussion of existing conditions, an assessment and discussion of the significance of impacts associated with the Project, mitigation measures, cumulative impacts, and level of impact significance after mitigation.

Section 5 (General Impact Categories): This section provides a summary of significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project, a discussion of potential growth inducing effects, and an explanation of the significant irreversible environmental changes.

Section 6 (Alternatives to the Project): This section includes an analysis of a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project. The range of alternatives selected is based on their ability to feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project while avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the Project.

Section 7 (Preparers of the Draft EIR and Persons Consulted): This section presents a list of City agencies and consultant team members that contributed to the preparation of the Draft EIR.

Section 8 (Acronyms and Terms): This section provides definitions for all of the acronyms and terms used in this Draft EIR.

## **EIR Process**

### ***Notice of Preparation***

In compliance with Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was prepared by the Community Development Department and distributed to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, responsible agencies, and other interested parties on August 26, 2016. The NOP for the Draft EIR was circulated for 30 days until September 26, 2016. Appendix B and Appendix C to this Draft EIR contain a copy of the NOP and written responses to the NOP, respectively. The following agencies, organizations, and individuals provided written comments during the NOP comment period or at the scoping meeting:

### **Agencies and Organizations**

1. South Coast Air Quality Management District
2. Native American Heritage Commission
3. City of Torrance
4. St. Mark's Presbyterian Church
5. First Lutheran Early Education Center
6. Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation (AB 52 consultation request)

### **Individuals**

7. Dr. Donald J. Baune
8. Hyung & Deok U. Lee
9. Harvey & Bonnie Siegel
10. Curtis & Paula Thompson
11. Rose Ungermann

### **Draft EIR Issues**

Based on a review of environmental issues by the City, the Initial Study, and the responses to the NOP this Draft EIR analyzes the following environmental issues:

- Aesthetics: Visual Character, Light/Glare
- Air Quality

- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services: Fire, Police, Schools, Parks and Recreation, Libraries
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems: Wastewater, Water, Solid Waste, Energy Conservation

### ***Environmental Review Process***

The Draft EIR will be circulated for review and comment by the public and other interested parties, agencies, and organizations for a period of 45 days. After completion of the 45-day review period, a Final EIR will be prepared that responds to comments on the Draft EIR submitted during the review period and modifies the Draft EIR as required. Public hearings on the Project will be held after completion of the Final EIR. The City will make the Final EIR available to agencies and the public prior to considering certification of the Final EIR. Notice of the time and location will be published prior to the public hearing date. All comments or questions about the Draft EIR should be addressed to:

Alicia Velasco, Principal Planner  
City of Lomita  
24300 Narbonne Avenue, Lomita, California 90717  
Email: [a.velasco@lomitacity.com](mailto:a.velasco@lomitacity.com)

## **PROPOSED PROJECT**

### **Existing Uses**

The Project Site is currently developed with a number of small commercial buildings and support structures that make up an equipment rental yard known as A-1 Coast Rentals. The Site contains a large number of vehicles, equipment, and maintenance areas used in support of the rental of construction equipment.

## Proposed Uses

The approximately 2.7-acre Project Site is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Crenshaw Boulevard and Lomita Boulevard. The Project includes the demolition and removal of the existing equipment rental yard and the construction of a five-story, 223-unit, multi-family residential development. The Project includes approximately 250,510 square feet of residential uses and approximately 208,379 square feet of parking area (including two levels of subterranean parking). Of the proposed 223 units, there would be 18 studio units, 131 one-bedroom units, and 74 two-bedroom units. The Project also includes residential amenities such as a pool, fitness center, community room, and a 750-square-foot fourth floor common area balcony. The floor area ratio (FAR) of the Project would be 2.26:1 and the maximum height would be 57'4" from the average grade plane to the top of sheathing and 64'10" to the top of the parapet.

## ALTERNATIVES

In order to provide informed decision-making in accordance with Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines, this Draft EIR considers a range of alternatives to the Project. Section 6, Alternatives to the Project, of this Draft EIR provides the analysis of each alternative. The Draft EIR analyzes the following alternatives:

|                       |                                   |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <u>Alternative 1:</u> | No Project                        |
| <u>Alternative 2:</u> | Reduced Density 1 (10% Reduction) |
| <u>Alternative 3:</u> | Reduced Density 2 (25% Reduction) |
| <u>Alternative 4:</u> | Increased Density                 |

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 1-1 summarizes the various environmental impacts associated with construction and operation of the Project. Mitigation measures are recommended for significant environmental impacts, and the level of significance after mitigation is also identified. Project design features are also noted. The environmental impacts summarized in Table 1-1 are analyzed in detail throughout Section 4, Environmental Impact Analysis, of this Draft EIR.

**Table 1-1  
Summary of Environmental Impacts/Mitigation Measures/Level of Significance after Mitigation**

| Environmental Impact  | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|
| <b>A. Impacts Found to Be Less Than Significant</b>   |   |  |
| <p>Agricultural and Forestry Resources - The Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to non-agricultural use, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The Project Site is not zoned for agricultural use, and the Project Site is not under Williamson Act Contract. The Project Site is not zoned as forest land or timberland.</p>  | None required.                                | No impact.                             |
| <p>Biological Resources – The Project Site is located in an urbanized area of the City and is surrounded by existing development. Therefore, it is not expected that the Project area contains habitat for any species identified or designated as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species.</p> <p>The Site does not contain any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community that is identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</p> <p>The Project Site does not contain any wetlands or other areas subject to the jurisdiction of the US Army Corps of Engineers, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, or State Water Resources Control Board under the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>The Project would not interfere 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.</p> <p>The Project would be confined to the previously developed Site and would not involved susbtantial changes in the existing environment. In addition, the Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protectin biological resoures.</p> <p>The Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat</p> | None required.                                | No impact.                             |

| Environmental Impact  | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.</p>   |  |  |
| <p>Cultural Resources – No historic structures are located on the Project Site. Thus, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.</p> <p>There are no known archaeological resources within the Project Site and the Native American Heritage Commission’s Sacred Lands File Search was negative for the Project Site. However, the excavation for the two subterranean parking levels has the potential to affect unknown archaeological resources. In addition, the Kizh Nation of the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians requested consultation per AB 52, based on their belief that the Project Site is in an area where their ancestral villages were located. The City engaged in consultation with the tribal representatives via a phone call on September 26, 2016, and a second consultation phone call was held between the City and tribal representatives on October 20, 2016. During these consultation phone calls, members of the Kizh Nation explained that trading routes and villages, including the village of Suangna, were located in this general region. Maps were also provided to show the general location of the ancestral villages and trading routes. None of the information provided specifically identifies the Project Site and the tribal representatives failed to respond in writing with more specific information. Implementation of Mitigation Measures A-1 and A-2 is therefore required to ensure that impacts with respect to archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources are less than significant.</p> <p>There are no known paleontological resources within the Project Site. However, the excavation for the subterranean parking levels has the potential to affect unknown paleontological resources. Implementation of Mitigation Measure A-3 would ensure that impacts are less significant.</p> <p>The likelihood of encountering human remains on the Project Site is minimal. However, during the construction and excavation of the Project Site, there is a</p> | <p><b>A-1</b>    If any archaeological materials are encountered during the course of Project development, all further development activity shall be halted in the area of the discovery and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The services of an archaeologist shall then be secured by contacting the South Central Coastal Information Center located at California State University Fullerton, or a member of the Society of Professional Archaeologists (SOPA), or a SOPA-qualified archaeologist, who shall assess the discovered material(s) and prepare a survey, study, or report evaluating the impact.</li> <li>b. The archaeologist’s survey, study, or report shall contain a recommendation(s), if necessary, for the preservation, conservation, or relocation of the resource.</li> <li>c. The applicant shall comply with the recommendations of the evaluating archaeologist, as contained in the survey, study, or report.</li> <li>d. Project development activities may resume once copies of the archaeological survey, study, or report are submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University Fullerton.</li> </ul> | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |

| Environmental Impact  | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|
| <p>possibility that human remains could be encountered. Implementation of Mitigation Measures A-1 and A-2 would be required to ensure that impacts with respect to human remains are less than significant.</p> | <p>e. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit a letter to the case file indicating what, if any, archaeological reports have been submitted, or a statement indicating that no material was discovered.</p> <p>f. A covenant and agreement binding the applicant to this condition shall be recorded prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p> <p><b>A-2</b> At least 30 days prior to beginning Project construction, the Project Developer shall contact the appropriate local Tribe or Band (such as the Kizh Nation of the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians) to notify them of grading and excavation activities, and to coordinate with the City and the Tribe or Band to develop a Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement (“Agreement”). The Agreement shall address the treatment and final disposition of any tribal cultural resources, sacred sites, and human remains that are discovered during Project grading and excavation.</p> <p>Should any tribal cultural resources be encountered during the course of Project development, all further development activity shall be halted in the area of discovery and the Project Developer shall notify the local Band or Tribe and the City, in accordance with the Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement. Any newly discovered cultural resource deposits shall be subject to a cultural resources evaluation in consultation with the local</p> |  |

| Environmental Impact | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|----------------------|--|--|
|                      | <p>Tribe or Band, in accordance with the terms of the Agreement.</p> <p>If any tribal cultural resources are discovered during Project development, Native American Tribal or Band monitors shall then be permitted to monitor the remaining on-site grading and excavation activities. Terms of compensation for on-site monitoring shall be included in the Agreement.</p> <p>The landowner shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts that are found in the Project area to the appropriate local Tribe or Band for proper treatment and disposition.</p> <p><b>A-3</b> If any paleontological materials are encountered during the course of Project development, all further development activities shall be halted in the area of the discovery and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The services of a paleontologist shall then be secured by contacting the Center for Public Paleontology – USC, UCLA, California State University Los Angeles, California State University Long Beach, or the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum – who shall assess the discovered material(s) and prepare a survey, study, or report evaluating the impact.</li> <li>b. The paleontologist’s survey, study, or report shall</li> </ul> |  |

| Environmental Impact  | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|--|
|   | <p>contain a recommendation(s), if necessary, for the preservation, conservation, or relocation of the resource.</p> <p>c. The applicant shall comply with the recommendations of the evaluating paleontologist, as contained in the survey, study, or report.</p> <p>d. Project development activities may resume once copies of the paleontological survey, study, or report are submitted to the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum.</p> <p>e. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit a letter to the case file indicating what, if any, paleontological reports have been submitted, or a statement indicating that no material was discovered.</p> <p>f. A covenant and agreement binding the applicant to this condition shall be recorded prior to the issuance of a grading permit.</p> |  |
| <p>Mineral Resources – The Project Site is located in an urbanized part of the City. While the Conoco Phillips Tank Petroleum Storage is located west of the Project Site across Crenshaw Boulevard, the Project Site is not located within an oil field or oil drilling area, and is currently zoned for Light Industrial and General Commercial land uses. Thus, the Project would not 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. In addition, the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a</p> | <p>None required.</p>  | <p>No impact.</p>                      |

| Environmental Impact  | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|
| locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.   |   |  |
| <b>B. Aesthetics</b>  |   |  |
| <p>Visual Character During Construction - Temporary fencing would be installed around the Project Site during construction, which would partially shield views of construction activities and equipment. Though construction activities under the Project would be visible from adjacent public and private vantage points, changes to the appearance of the Project Site would be temporary in nature, and would not rise to the level of a change that would substantially degrade the existing visual character.</p>   | None required.                                | Less than significant.                 |
| <p>Visual Character - The modern architectural style concept for the Project would introduce a new visual element to the vicinity that would replace the existing equipment storage use at the Site. The Project would utilize a stepped massing back from the Crenshaw Boulevard frontage, steadily increasing in height in stair step fashion toward the eastern edge of the Site. The use of different materials, including concrete, wood, metal, and glass, along with the use of structural indentation, along the Crenshaw Boulevard frontage would provide visual variation consistent with the street edge along this corridor. The use of exterior materials has also been carefully selected to reinforce the modern architectural concept. Portions of the Project that would be closest to existing off-site residences to the north and northeast would feature a simplified exterior color palette and exterior treatment in order to provide a more gradual visual transition. Landscaping, including trees along the northern, eastern, and southern (adjacent to the Shell station) edges of the Project, would also soften the transition to the adjacent land uses and provide some degree of visual relief.</p> <p>Given the profusion of diverse land uses in the Project area, the replacement of the existing industrial equipment storage complex with a five-story multi-family</p> | None required.                                | Less than significant.                 |

| Environmental Impact  | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|
| <p>residential development cannot be considered to represent a significant alteration of an established visual theme within the neighborhood, nor can it be concluded to substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings. Indeed, some may view the loss of the equipment storage yard and its replacement with a modern, articulated structure as a net benefit with respect to visual interest and character. Furthermore, the Project will not have any effect on significant visual or historical natural resources on the site because none are present. Because the Project Site vicinity has no single predominant land use and associated visual character, development of the Project would result in a less than significant impact with respect to architectural design and visual character compatibility.</p>   |   |  |
| <p>Nighttime Light - Due to its scale in relation to existing development in the Project vicinity, light generated from the interior of the proposed building could potentially be seen from substantial distances from the Project Site. However, the increase in light that would be generated would not be out-of-character with the existing light sources in the urbanized Project vicinity. Furthermore, it is anticipated that the light generated from the Project would not be bright enough to affect the nearby residences. The residences located north and northeast of the Project Site would be the most affected, but the amount of light spillover from interior Project sources at these off-site locations would not be substantial. The utilization of low-intensity, downward focused light fixtures for exterior Project lighting would minimize the amount of additional light at these locations. In general, glow from existing street lighting would continue to represent the dominant nighttime lighting source as perceived from both adjacent residences and the street. As such, nighttime views in the Project vicinity would not be adversely impacted by the Project, and impacts would be less than significant.</p> | <p>None required.</p>                         | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |

| Environmental Impact   | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Daytime Glare - The Project’s architectural features and facades would not be constructed of highly reflective materials. The exterior of the proposed building would be constructed of materials such as wood, concrete, and metal, which would not be expected to affect daytime views by creating substantial sources of glare. The glass in the building’s exterior would be largely limited to windows within the residential units. Windows would utilize high-performance and/or non-reflective tinted glass (no mirror-like tints or films), and the lower levels of the Project would be partially shielded and softened by street trees and other landscaping. Therefore, the Project’s potential sources of glare would not result in hazardous conditions to motorists or result in substantial glare due to the building materials selected to minimize glare-related impacts, and impacts would be less than significant.</p> | <p>None required.</p>  | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |
| <p><b>C. Air Quality</b></p>   |  |  |
| <p>AQMP Consistency - Because the AQMP is built on local General Plan land use designations, the City’s current designation for the Site as Commercial/Industrial does not accommodate population growth in this area. As such, the RTP/SCS’ assumptions about growth in the City likely do not accommodate housing and population growth on this Site. As such, the Project conflicts with the growth assumptions in the regional air plan, which is a potentially significant impact. Therefore, Mitigation Measure C-1 has been provided, and requires the City of Lomita to coordinate with SCAG and the SCAQMD to ensure that the 2016 AQMP accommodates the population and households at the Project Site, which would reduce this potential impact to less than significant.</p>  | <p><b>C-1</b> The City of Lomita shall coordinate with SCAG and the SCAQMD to ensure that the 2016 AQMP accommodates the population and households at this Site.</p>                   | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |
| <p>Construction Regional Impacts - The construction of the Project would produce NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, SO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions that would not exceed the SCAQMD’s regional thresholds. However, VOC emissions could exceed the SCAQMD’s daily thresholds during the application of architectural coatings. With implementation of Mitigation Measure C-4, regional air quality impacts during construction would be</p>  | <p><b>C-4</b> Ensure the architectural coatings are applied over a period of at least four months to ensure that daily VOC emissions do not exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds.</p> | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |

| Environmental Impact   | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|
| less than significant.   |   |  |
| <p>Construction Localized Impacts - The Project would produce emissions that do not exceed the SCAQMD’s recommended localized standards of significance for NO<sub>2</sub> and CO during the construction phase. However, construction activities could produce PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions that exceed localized thresholds recommended by the SCAQMD, primarily from vehicle exhaust and fugitive dust emissions from off-road construction vehicles during the grading phase. With implementation of Mitigation Measures C-2 through C-4, requiring the Project to use updated construction emissions standards, this impact would be less than significant.</p> | <p><b>C-2</b> All off-road construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet U.S. EPA Tier 4 emission standards, where available, to reduce NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions at the Project Site. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with Best Available Control Technology devices certified by CARB. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations. At the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment, a copy of each unit’s certified tier specification, BACT documentation, and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit shall be provided.</p> <p><b>C-3</b> Require the use of 2010 and newer diesel haul trucks (e.g., material delivery trucks and soil import/export) and if the Lead Agency determines that 2010 model year or newer diesel trucks cannot be obtained, the Lead Agency shall require trucks that meet U.S. EPA 2007 model year NO<sub>x</sub> emissions requirements.</p> | Less than significant.                 |
| <p>Operational Regional Impacts - Net operational emissions would not exceed SCAQMD’s regional significance thresholds for VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, SO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions. Therefore, Project impacts related to regional operational emissions would be less than significant.</p>   | None required.  | Less than significant.                 |
| <p>Operational Localized Impacts - Localized emissions would not approach the SCAQMD’s localized significance thresholds (LST) which signal when there could</p>   | None required.  | Less than significant.                 |

| Environmental Impact  | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|
| <p>be human health impacts at nearby sensitive receptors during long-term operations. Therefore, Project impacts related to localized operational emissions would be less than significant.</p>   |   |  |
| <p>Operational Toxic Air Contaminants - The Project is not anticipated to generate a substantial number of truck trips, thus the Project would not be a source of diesel emissions. Based on the limited activity of TAC emissions sources, the Project would not warrant the need for a health risk assessment associated with on-site activities, and any minimal TAC impacts would be less than significant.</p>   | <p>None required.</p>                         | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |
| <p>Health Risk Assessment – A Health Risk Assessment was prepared to evaluate the impacts of potential toxic air contaminants from an existing gas station at 2477 Lomita Boulevard on the future residents of the Project. It was concluded that future residences would be given adequate health-based separation from the existing gas station and any impacts to human health would be considered less than significant.</p>  | <p>None required.</p>                         | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |
| <p><b>D. Geology and Soils</b></p>  |   |  |
| <p>Surface Rupture – According to the preparers of the geotechnical report, no active or potentially active faults underlie the Project Site. Compliance with the existing state and local regulations, including the Uniform Building Code, as well as the City of Lomita’s adoption of the Los Angeles County Building Code by reference, would ensure the Project complies with existing seismic safety regulations. Therefore, the Project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects associated with fault rupture, resulting in a less than significant impact.</p> | <p>None required.</p>                         | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |
| <p>Strong Seismic Ground Shaking – The Project Site is susceptible to ground motion as a result of potential movement along faults in the region. However, the Project would be required to be designed and constructed in conformance to the most recently adopted California Building Code (CBC) design parameters. Adherence to current building codes and engineering practices would ensure that the Project</p>   | <p>None required</p>                          | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |

| Environmental Impact   | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|
| <p>would not expose people, property, or infrastructure to seismically induced ground shaking hazards that are greater than the average risk associated with locations in the southern California region and would minimize the potential to expose people or structures to substantial risk, loss, or injury, and impacts would be less than significant.</p>   |   |  |
| <p>Liquefaction – The Project Site is not located within a State of California liquefaction hazard zone. Although the Project Site is underlain by potentially liquefiable sediments, groundwater was not encountered during Site exploration (up to 50 feet). Therefore, it is the opinion of the geotechnical report that the potential for liquefaction to occur is remote and impacts would be less than significant.</p>  | None required.  | Less than significant.                 |
| <p>Soil Erosion - The Project’s developer would be required to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), in accordance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity and Land Disturbance Activities.</p> <p>During the Project’s operational phase, the potential for soil erosion would be relatively low due to the urban nature of the Project area and the level topography of the Project Site. The Project would develop the entire Site with a new building, paving, and surface treatments, including landscaping. Therefore, impacts from soil erosion would be less than significant.</p> | None required.  | Less than significant.                 |
| <p>Soil Stability – Construction activities must comply with the City of Lomita Municipal Code, which is designed to assure safe construction, including building foundation requirements appropriate to Site conditions. No indications of seeps, springs, or slope instability, such as tension crack in the exposed soils, distorted buildings, or surficial and deep seated failure were noted during preparation of the geotechnical report. The Project would also comply with the regulatory measures for seismic safety listed in the CBC standards as approved by the Los Angeles County, DPW, Building and Safety. With compliance of the recommendations in</p>   | <p><b>D-1</b> The Project Applicant shall comply with the recommendations found in Section 3.0 of the <u>Due Diligence Study</u>, Kling Consulting Group, Inc., July 24, 2015, to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County, DPW, Building and Safety.</p> | Less than significant.                 |

| Environmental Impact   | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|
| the geotechnical report (formally provided as Mitigation Measure D-1), the Project is considered feasible from a geotechnical engineering standpoint and impacts would be less than significant.   |   |  |
| Expansive Soils - Based on a review of the potential Project Site uses, the flatness of the overall Project Site and lack of anticipated changes in grades, and historic high groundwater, the potential for settlement due to increased loads is likely limited to normal settlement associated with the anticipated structures and improvements once remedial grading is completed. A thorough evaluation of the potential impacts to the Project Site from settlement should be evaluated in a geotechnical investigation during building permit approval. As a result, expansive soils are not expected to be encountered during construction activities and impacts would be less than significant. | See Mitigation Measure D-1, above.            | Less than significant.                 |
| <b>E. Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>   |   |  |
| Construction - Construction emissions of CO <sub>2</sub> would peak in 2019, when up to 11,821 pounds of CO <sub>2</sub> e per day are anticipated following implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-3. These emissions are further incorporated in the assessment of long-term operational impacts by amortizing them over a 30-year period, pursuant to guidance from the State and SCAQMD.  | None required.                                | Less than significant.                 |
| Operation – The emissions for the Project and its associated CARB 2020 NAT scenario are estimated to be 8,731 and 13,276 MTCO <sub>2</sub> e per year, respectively, which shows the Project would reduce emissions by 34 percent from the CARB 2020 NAT scenario. The proposed emissions would represent a net 8,291 metric ton increase in annual emissions when accounting for existing emissions from current development. Based on these results, the Project is consistent with the reduction target as a numeric threshold (15.3 percent) set forth in the 2014 Revised AB 32 Scoping Plan. In addition, the Project would be consistent with numerous  | None required.                                | Less than significant.                 |

| Environmental Impact   | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|
| <p>plans and policies including Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-30-15, SCAG’s Sustainable Communities Strategy, the City of Lomita General Plan, and the City of Lomita EECAP. As a result, the Project’s contribution to global climate change is not cumulatively considerable and impacts would be less than significant.</p>   |   |  |
| <p><b>F. Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b></p>   |   |  |
| <p>Transport of Hazardous Materials – Construction of the Project would involve the temporary transport, use, or disposal of potentially hazardous materials, including paints, adhesives, surface coatings, cleaning agents, fuels, and oils. All of these materials would be used in a short-term nature during construction activities. Construction of the Project would comply with applicable regulations and would not expose persons to substantial risks resulting from the release of hazardous materials or exposure to health hazards in excess of regulatory standards.</p> <p>Operation of the residential uses would involve the use and storage of small quantities of potentially hazardous materials in the form of cleaning solvents, paints, and pesticides for landscaping. With implementation of hazardous waste reduction efforts on-site, as well as the proper treatment and disposal of such wastes at licensed resource recovery facilities, the Project would not generate significant amounts of hazardous wastes. Finally, implementation of the Project could incrementally decrease the transport of hazardous materials and wastes to/from the Project Site when compared to existing conditions. Overall, based on compliance with federal, state, and local regulations, the transport of hazardous materials and wastes during Project construction and operation would not create a hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, impacts related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant.</p> | <p>None required.</p>                           | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |
| <p>Release of Hazardous Materials – Due to the age of the Site buildings, there is a potential that ACM and LBP are present. Provided that abatement rules and</p>   | <p><b>F-1 Asbestos-Containing Materials</b></p> | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |

| Environmental Impact  | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|
| <p>regulations are followed as necessary, provided in Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2, respectively, hazardous materials impacts relative to exposure of workers and others to ACM and LBP would be less than significant.</p> <p>A 2,000-gallon above-ground diesel tank, one 500-gallon above-ground gasoline tank, two above-ground propane tanks, and above-ground storage tanks for waste oil, lube oil, motor oil, transmission oil, and hydraulic oil were observed at the Project Site. Additionally, an underground storage tank with an unknown location was also divulged in the Phase I ESA. Environmental impacts may result from the potential soil and/or groundwater contamination from any ASTs or USTs. The Project would be required to comply with existing EPA regulations related to the safe removal of ASTs and USTs. Specifically, the ASTs and USTs shall be decommissioned or removed as determined by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Health and Hazardous Materials Division. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure that impacts related to ASTs and USTs are less than significant.</p> <p>While the results of the Phase II ESA indicate that none of the soil gas or soil samples exceeded their respective health risk based screening levels, EMS recommends that a Soil Management Plan (SMP) be developed for the Site and used during Site demolition and grading (as listed in Mitigation Measure F-3). The SMP should specify the process for identifying, segregating, profiling and disposing of any stained/strong odor soil. The SMP should also specify the process for removal and cleanup of the clarifier. Based on the soil gas and soil results, EMS recommends that the clarifier, waste oil, and diesel tanks be removed according to local regulations and any soil that appears to be stained or has a strong odor to be segregated for proper profiling and disposal. A representative sample of the stained/strong odor soil should be collected and analyzed to confirm it is not hazardous and should be disposed in a proper manner. This is also recommended for the soil beneath the concrete pad in the southeast portion of the property. With</p> | <p>Prior to the issuance of any permit for the demolition of the existing structures, the Applicant shall provide a letter to the Los Angeles County Department of Building and Safety from a qualified asbestos abatement consultant indicating that no ACMs are present in the structures. If ACMs are found to be present, they will need to be abated in compliance with the SCAQMD's Rule 1403, as well as other applicable state and federal rules and regulations.</p> <p><b>F-2 Lead-Based Paint</b></p> <p>Prior to the issuance of any permit for the demolition of the existing structures, a lead-based paint survey shall be performed to the written satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Department of Building and Safety. Should lead-based paint materials be identified, standard handling and disposal practices shall be implemented pursuant to OSHA regulations.</p> <p><b>F-3 Soil Management Plan</b></p> <p>A Soil Management Plan (SMP) shall be developed for the Site and used during Site demolition and grading. The SMP should specify the process for identifying, segregating, profiling and disposing of any stained/strong odor soil. A technician shall be present on the Project Site during the demolition, excavation, and grading phases to sample and screen any residual contaminants, should they be encountered. Testing to characterize the material shall occur either on-site in a mobile laboratory or off-site in a</p> |  |

| Environmental Impact   | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--|--|
| <p>implementation of Mitigation Measure F-3, impacts with respect to potentially contaminated soil would be less than significant.</p>   | <p>remote laboratory. Materials shall be identified, segregated, and tracked as to their extent on the Project Site.</p> <p>Any soils containing contaminants at levels of concern shall be either remediated on-site prior to reuse or removed and disposed of in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations, including those promulgated by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). All necessary approvals shall be obtained from the lead enforcement agency including, but not limited to, the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Health and Hazardous Materials Division.</p> <p>The SMP should also specify the process for removal and cleanup of the clarifier.</p> |  |
| <p>Hazards within ¼ mile of a school – There are two schools located on the St. Mark’s Church property (the First Lutheran Early Childhood Center and the Volunteers of America Head Start preschool), which would be located within one-quarter mile of the Project Site. In addition, Lomita Elementary School is the nearest public school and is located approximately 0.5-mile from the Project Site. The Project would not require the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous that would pose a significant hazard to the public or environment. In addition, as discussed above, there is the potential to encounter ACM, LBP, and soils in need of management during demolition and construction. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures F-1 through F-3 would ensure that these impacts are less than significant. Thus, the Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter</p> | <p>See Mitigation Measures F-1 through F-3, above.</p>   | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |

| Environmental Impact   | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|
| <p>mile of an existing or proposed school, and impacts would be less than significant.</p>   |   |  |
| <p>Listed Hazardous Materials Site – The Project Site was identified on a number of databases owing to the past use of the Site. However, the environmental concerns that resulted in listing on various environmental databases have been discussed above, and with implementation of Mitigation Measure F-3, impacts would be less than significant.</p>   | <p>See Mitigation Measure F-3, above.</p>   | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |
| <p>Airport Hazards - Although the Project Site is located approximately 0.5-mile from the Torrance Airport, there are intervening land uses and infrastructure, including the Crossroads Shopping Center and Lomita Boulevard, between the Project Site and the Torrance Airport. In addition, according to the Safety Element of the General Plan, the Torrance Airport has designated clear zones around the runways to prevent hazards associated with aircraft accidents during landing and take-off. This area does not extend into the City of Lomita. Finally, the Project would comply with the FAA height restriction of 200 feet, based on the Site’s location within three miles of an airport. As such, no impact with respect to airport hazards would occur as a result of the Project.</p>  | <p>None required.</p>   | <p>No impact.</p>                      |
| <p>Emergency Response or Evacuation Plan - Narbonne Avenue, Lomita Boulevard, and Crenshaw Boulevard are designated as emergency evacuation routes within the City of Lomita. While construction of the Project would occur within the property boundaries of the Project Site, temporary pedestrian or vehicular public right-of-way closures along Crenshaw Boulevard or Lomita Boulevard may be necessary during the construction phase for construction staging, equipment access, and pedestrian safety. However, partial lane closures would not significantly affect emergency vehicles, the drivers of which normally have a variety of options for dealing with traffic, such as using their sirens to clear a path of travel or driving in the lanes of opposing traffic. The implementation of Mitigation Measure L-1 (in Section 4.L, Traffic) requiring the creation of a Construction Traffic Management</p> | <p><b>F-4 Emergency Response Plan</b></p> <p>Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall develop an emergency response plan in consultation with the Fire Department. The emergency response plan shall include but not be limited to the following: mapping of emergency exits, evacuation routes for vehicles and pedestrians, location of nearest hospitals, and fire departments.</p> | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |

| Environmental Impact   | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Plan would ensure that impacts related to emergency response and evacuation routes during Project construction are less than significant. In addition, the Project would create an emergency response plan to ensure that there are emergency exits and evacuation routes for vehicles and pedestrians (provided as Mitigation Measure F-4). Finally, as described in Section 4.L, Traffic, the Project would not result in any significant traffic impacts and therefore would not interfere with roadway operations used in conjunction with an emergency response plan or evacuation plan. As such, impacts would be less than significant.</p>  |   |  |
| <b>G. Hydrology and Water Quality</b>  |   |  |
| <p>Water Quality - In order to prevent both short-term (construction) and long-term (operational) impacts to water quality, the Project would be designed and constructed to comply with the requirements of the NPDES Permit No. CAS004001, the Construction General Permit Water Quality (LARWQCB Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ). As part of the permit compliance process, a SWPPP to address the management of potential stormwater pollutants throughout the construction process would be prepared, implemented, and enforced as mandatory regulatory compliance, which would ensure that impacts are less than significant.</p>   | None required.                                | Less than significant.                 |
| <p>Groundwater - Construction of the Project is not anticipated to require temporary dewatering for the approximately 25-foot deep excavations that would be required for the below-grade parking levels. Groundwater levels in the vicinity are noted to be approximately 100 feet below ground surface, and no groundwater was encountered at the 50-foot deep borings installed at the site; thus, excavations for the Project would not be expected to encounter groundwater. However, if unanticipated groundwater is encountered during Project excavation work, the Project Applicant would be required to comply with the terms of Order No. R4-2013-0095, NPDES No. CAG994004 governing construction-related dewatering discharges (the General Dewatering Permit). Compliance with the General Dewatering Permit would reduce any potential Project impacts to a less than</p> | None required.                                | Less than significant.                 |

| Environmental Impact  | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|
| <p>significant level. In addition, the Project would be served by the municipal water and sewer system and no production wells for a source of water would be installed. Therefore, the Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, yields, or flow directions. Therefore, no impacts to groundwater would occur.</p>  |   |  |
| <p>Drainage - The Project would alter the on-site drainage patterns due to the development of the buildings, podiums, and open space areas that would modify the elevations of the Project Site, thus altering the stormwater runoff pattern. However, this alteration would not result in on-site erosion or siltation because all runoff would be directed to areas of BMPs and/or other storm drain infrastructure. The current drainage pattern from the Project Site includes the discharge of stormwater runoff from the paved areas directly to the sidewalk and street via surface flow. The Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the surrounding area in a manner that would result in substantial flooding on- or off-site. Therefore, no impacts related to drainage would occur.</p>                                  | None required.                                | Less than significant.                 |
| <p>Runoff – During construction, the Project is required to comply with LID BMPs, which are determined on a case-by-case basis by the Public Works Department. Approval for development project and building/grading permits would not be granted or issued until appropriate and applicable stormwater BMPs are incorporated into the Project design plans and the performance standards required in the City LID Ordinance are met.</p> <p>Activities associated with operation of the Project would generate substances that could degrade the quality of water runoff. The deposition of certain chemicals by cars in the parking area could have the potential to contribute metals, oil and grease, solvents, phosphates, hydrocarbons, and suspended solids to the storm drain system. However, impacts to water quality would be reduced as compared to</p> | None required.                                | Less than significant.                 |

| Environmental Impact  | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|
| <p>current site conditions as the Project must comply with the LID Ordinance requirements to install stormwater source and treatment control BMPs prior to the approval of Project design plans. These design criteria would minimize the conveyance of polluted stormwater runoff off-site. Compliance with these existing regulations would ensure that the Project’s potential water quality impacts would be less than significant.</p>   |   |  |
| <b>H. Land Use and Planning</b>   |   |  |
| <p>Consistency Analysis - The Project would be consistent with all applicable policies of the 2008 RCP, 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, General Plan Land Use Element, and General Plan Housing Element.</p>   | <p>None required.</p>   | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |
| <p>Zoning - With approval of the zoning (change) map amendment to create a specific plan for the overall Project, the Project would conform to the Zoning Code provisions applicable to the Project.</p>  | <p>None required.</p>   | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |
| <b>I. Noise</b>   |   |  |
| <p>Construction Noise - Construction activities for the Project would generate noise from a variety of on- and off-site activities and would include the use of on-site heavy equipment such as excavators and loaders, as well as smaller equipment such as hand-held pneumatic tools. Secondary noise could also be generated by construction worker vehicles and vendor deliveries. Section 4-4.11 of the Lomita Municipal Code would limit the allowable noise levels of Project construction equipment and tools to 35 dBA or below at the receiving property lines of any nearby properties. Comparable in noise level to a soft whisper or the interior of a library, an intrusive 35 dBA noise level would not even be audible over the existing ambient noise levels at all Project receptors. This noise level would be an impossible standard to achieve, as noise reduction to this degree would go beyond the capabilities of even the most state-of-the-art mitigation methods and could only</p> | <p><b>I-1</b> All powered construction equipment shall be equipped with exhaust mufflers or other suitable noise reduction devices capable of achieving a sound attenuation of at least 3 dBA at 50 feet of distance.</p> <p><b>I-2</b> All construction areas for staging and warming-up equipment shall be located as far as feasible from noise-sensitive land uses.</p> <p><b>I-3</b> Portable noise sheds for smaller, noisy equipment, such as air compressors, dewatering pumps, and generators shall be provided as feasible.</p> | <p>Significant and unavoidable.</p>    |

| Environmental Impact  | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|
| <p>be achieved by great Project-to-receptor distances. But, these distances rarely exist in urban and suburban environments. Put simply, Section 4-4.11 sets forth an unattainable standard for construction projects. Nevertheless, Mitigation Measures I-1 through I-4 are recommended to reduce the Project’s construction noise impacts to the maximum extent feasible, but noise impacts during construction would be considered significant and unavoidable.</p>  | <p><b>I-4</b> Temporary sound barriers capable of achieving a sound attenuation of at least 15 dBA shall be erected for the ground level of the Project Site to obstruct line-of-sight noise travel from the Project Site to 239<sup>th</sup> Street Residences, St. Mark’s Presbyterian Church, Pennsylvania Avenue Residences, and Lomita Boulevard Residences—North.</p> |  |
| <p>Operational Noise - The Project would produce both direct noise from residential-related activities, as well as indirect noise impacts from vehicles traveling on local streets to access the Site. The direct sources would generate noise on a seasonal, irregular, or infrequent basis and would not individually or collectively elevate ambient noise levels substantially at nearby sensitive receptors. In addition, vehicles traveling to and from the Site would only generate nominal noise increases. Therefore, impacts related to operational noise would be less than significant.</p> | <p>None required.</p>   | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |
| <p>Construction Vibration – No receptors would experience ground-borne vibration levels in excess of their respective thresholds for building damage, and therefore these specific vibration impacts would be considered less than significant. In addition, the Project’s vibration impacts relating to land use disruption would be considered less than significant at all receptors.</p>  | <p>See Mitigation Measures I-1 through I-4, above.</p>  | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |
| <p>Operational Vibration – During operation of the Project, there would be no significant stationary sources of ground-borne vibration, such as heavy equipment or industrial operations. Operational ground-borne vibration in the Project vicinity would be generated by vehicular travel on local roadways. However, passenger vehicles rarely create enough ground-borne vibration to be perceptible to humans unless road surfaces are poorly maintained and have potholes or bumps. Project-related traffic would expose nearby land uses and other sensitive receptors to</p>                    | <p>None required.</p>   | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |

| Environmental Impact  | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|
| vibration levels far below those associated with land use disruption, let alone human perceptibility, and would as a result be considered less than significant.  |   |  |
| Airport Noise – The Torrance Airport is located approximately 0.5-mile from the Project Site, just west of Crenshaw Boulevard. However, according to the City’s Noise Element, the Project Site is not located within any noise impact areas of the Torrance Airport. As a result, the occupants and workers at the Project Site would not be exposed to excessive noise levels from aircrafts, and impacts would be less than significant.   | None required.                                | Less than significant.                 |
| <b>J. Population and Housing</b>  |   |  |
| Construction - The construction of the Project would result in increased employment opportunities in the construction field, which could potentially result in increased permanent population and demand for housing in the vicinity of the Project Site. However, the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California are such that it is not likely that they would relocate their households due to the construction employment associated with the Project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. | None required.                                | Less than significant.                 |
| Operation Infrastructure – The Project would not introduce unplanned infrastructure or accelerate development in an undeveloped area that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment. The Project Site is currently developed with several buildings and is located within an urbanized area in the City. Thus, the construction of a potential growth-inducing roadway or other infrastructure extensions would not be required, and no impact would occur.   | None required.                                | No impact.                             |
| Population and Employee Generation - It is estimated that the Project would generate approximately 535 residents, using the City’s rate of 2.40 persons per unit. It is estimated that the Project would generate approximately 11 employees (net increase after the removal of the existing uses). The Project’s population growth   | None required.                                | Less than significant.                 |

| Environmental Impact   | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|--|--|
| <p>would be within the estimates provided by SCAG, but the number of proposed housing units would exceed the growth forecast and RHNA. Thus, the Project does not represent a substantial or significant growth of population that would exceed forecasts, and impacts with respect to population would be less than significant. It is assumed that the City of Lomita would work with SCAG to revise the housing estimates for the City of Lomita to ensure that accurate growth forecasts are included in the next RTP/SCS. Therefore, Project impacts with respect to housing growth would also be less than significant.</p>  |  |  |
| <p><b>K.1 Public Services: Fire Protection</b></p>   |  |  |
| <p>Construction - Construction of the Project would be subject to applicable existing regulations related to the maintenance of mechanical equipment, handling and storage of flammable materials, and cleanup flammable material spills. Therefore, compliance with State and local regulations and the presence of fire suppression equipment and trained personnel on the Project Site would reduce the need for fire and emergency services during construction of the Project. Due to the limited duration of construction activities and compliance with applicable codes, Project construction would not be expected to adversely impact firefighting and emergency services to the extent that there would be a need for new or expanded fire facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives of the LACFD, and impacts would be less than significant.</p> | <p><b>Project Design Features</b></p> <p><b>K.1-1</b> Construction contractors and work crews shall properly maintain the mechanical equipment according to best practices and the manufacturers' procedures, ensure proper storage of flammable materials, and cleanup of flammable liquid.</p> <p><b>K.1-2</b> If there are partial closures to streets surrounding the Project Site, flagmen shall be used to facilitate the traffic flow until the street closure around the construction is complete.</p> <p><b>K.1-3</b> During demolition and construction, LACFD access from major roadways shall remain clear and unobstructed.</p> <p><b>K.1-4</b> The design of the Project Site shall provide adequate access for LACFD equipment and personnel to the structures.</p> | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |
| <p>Operation – While the Project could result in an increased need for fire protection</p>   | <p>None required.</p>  | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |

| Environmental Impact   | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|
| <p>and emergency medical services at the Project Site, the Project’s operational impacts to fire protection services, including response distance and time, fire flow, emergency access, and plan consistency would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically-altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically-altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause a significant impact. As such, impacts would be less than significant.</p> |   |  |
| <p><b>K.2 Public Services: Police Protection</b></p>   |   |  |
| <p>Construction - Construction of the Project would not be expected to affect the LACSD’s ability to respond to emergencies to the extent that there would be a need for any additional new or expanded police facilities, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives of the LACSD, and impacts would be less than significant.</p>   | <p><b>Project Design Feature</b></p> <p><b>K.2-1</b> Emergency access shall be maintained to the Project Site during construction through marked emergency access points approved by the LACSD.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measures</b></p> <p><b>K.2-3</b> Temporary construction fencing shall be placed along the periphery of the active construction areas to screen as much of the construction activity from view at the local street level and to keep unpermitted persons from entering the construction area.</p> <p>The perimeter fence shall have gates installed to facilitate the ingress and egress of equipment and the work force. The bottom of the fence, where necessary, shall have filter fabric to prevent silt run off. Straw hay bales shall be utilized around catch basins when located within the construction zone. The perimeter and silt fence shall be maintained while in place. Where applicable, the</p> | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |

| Environmental Impact  | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p>construction fence shall incorporate a pedestrian walkway. Temporary lighting shall be installed and maintained at the pedestrian walkway. Should sections of the site fence have to be removed to facilitate work in progress, barriers and or K – rail shall be utilized to isolate and protect the public from unsafe conditions.</p> <p><b>K.2-4</b> The Project Applicant shall provide for the deployment of a private security guard to monitor and patrol the Site, appropriate to the phase of construction throughout the construction period. The patrol shall be deployed at times that are typical within the local-area construction industry for a Project of this size.</p> <p><b>K.2-5</b> The plans shall incorporate the design guidelines relative to security, semi-public and private spaces, which may include but not be limited to access control to buildings, secured parking facilities, walls/fences with key systems, well-illuminated public and semi-public space designed with a minimum of dead space to eliminate areas of concealment, location of toilet facilities or building entrances in high-foot traffic areas, and provision of security guard patrol throughout the Project Site if needed.</p> |  |
| <p>Operation - The addition of one officer to maintain the existing ratio would not require the expansion, consolidation, or relocation of the Lomita Sheriff’s Station.</p> <p>The approximately 546 persons generated onsite (residents + employees) would equate to an increase of 12 crimes, or 2.7 percent increase, compared to the 446</p> | <p><b>Project Design Feature</b></p> <p><b>K.2-2</b> The Project shall provide for on-site security measures and controlled access systems for residents to minimize the demand for police protection services. These measures include, but are not limited to, the following:</p>  | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |

| Environmental Impact   | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|
| <p>crimes in Lomita (average of 2014 and 2015 calendar years).</p> <p>The Project’s direct minimal population increase and associated demand for police services, along with the provision of on-site security features, coordination with LACSD, incorporation of crime prevention features, would not require the provision of new or physically altered police stations in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for police protection, and impacts would be less than significant.</p>                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perimeter lighting to supplement the street lighting and to provide increased visibility and security;</li> <li>• Parking Structure Access Control; and</li> <li>• Residential Units Access Control.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation Measure</b></p> <p><b>K.2-6</b> The Project Applicant shall provide the LACSD with a diagram of each portion of the Project Site, showing access routes and additional access information as requested by the LACSD, to facilitate police response.</p> |  |
| <b>K.3 Public Services: Schools</b>  |   |  |
| <p>The Project would result in approximately 158 students (90 elementary students, 22 middle school students, and 45 high school students). The Project Applicant would be required to pay school facilities fees pursuant to SB 50, which would ensure that Project impacts related to schools are less than significant.</p>   | None required.  | Less than significant.                 |
| <b>K.4 Public Services: Parks</b>  |   |  |
| <p>Based on the City’s standard ratio of one acre of regional parkland per 2,500 residents, the Project would generate an additional demand for approximately 0.21 acres of parkland. The Project includes approximately 33,240 square feet of open space, which would serve to reduce the Project’s demands and use upon existing recreation and park facilities in the local area. The Project would comply with the LMC, including the payment of the applicable park and recreation facility tax, which would ensure that impacts are less than significant.</p> | None required.  | Less than significant.                 |

| Environmental Impact  | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|--|
| <b>K.5 Public Services: Libraries</b>   |  |  |
| <p>The Project would increase the demand for library services through its resident population, but it would not result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. The Lomita Branch Library is already undergoing expansion. Thus, the need for a new branch does not exist, and impacts to library services as a result of the Project would be less than significant.</p>  | <p>None required.</p>  | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |
| <b>L. Transportation/Traffic</b>  |  |  |
| <p>Construction – Construction-related trips associated with trucks and employees traveling to and from the Site in the morning and afternoon may result in some minor traffic delays; however, potential traffic interference caused by construction vehicles would create a temporary/short-term impact to vehicles using Crenshaw Boulevard and Lomita Boulevard in the morning and afternoon hours and the number of construction workers would vary depending on the specific construction activities over time.</p> <p>Traffic impacts to the adjacent roadway network would be minimal and not long-term. Further, since the construction-related trip generation potential of the Project (i.e. all four construction components) is less than that of the Project and the Project is not expected to significantly impact any of the 10 key study intersections, no significant impacts resulting from construction traffic are anticipated aside from the nuisance traffic that would occur as a result of construction-related traffic (e.g., construction materials, construction workers, etc.).</p> <p>Nevertheless, to reduce the impact of construction-related traffic (i.e., during the weekday and weekend), the implementation of a Construction Management Plan (Mitigation Measure L-1) is recommended to minimize traffic impacts upon the local circulation system in the area and would ensure that construction impacts are</p> | <p><b>L-1 Construction Traffic Management Plan</b></p> <p>To ensure that impacts to the surrounding street system are kept to a minimum during Project construction, the Project Applicant shall develop a Construction Traffic Management Plan in coordination with the City of Lomita. At a minimum, the Construction Traffic Management Plan shall address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic control for any street closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation.</li> <li>• Identify the routes that construction vehicles would utilize for the delivery of construction materials (i.e. lumber, tiles, piping, windows, etc.), to access the Site, traffic controls and detours, and proposed construction phasing plan for the Project.</li> <li>• Specify the hours during which transport activities can occur and methods to mitigate construction-related</li> </ul> | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |

| Environmental Impact   | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|------------------------|---|--|
| less than significant. | <p>impacts to adjacent streets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require the Applicant to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including but not limited to gravel and dirt as a result of its operations. The Applicant shall clean adjacent streets, as directed by the City Engineer (or representative of the City Engineer), of any material which may have been spilled, tracked, or blown onto adjacent streets or areas.</li> <li>• Hauling or transport of oversize loads would be allowed between the hours of 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM only, Monday through Friday, unless approved otherwise by the City Engineer. No hauling or transport would be allowed during nighttime hours, weekends, or federal holidays.</li> <li>• Use of local streets shall be prohibited.</li> <li>• Haul trucks entering or exiting public streets shall at all times yield to public traffic.</li> <li>• If hauling operations cause any damage to existing pavement, street, curb, and/or gutter along the haul route, the Applicant will be fully responsible for repairs. The repairs shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.</li> <li>• All construction-related parking and staging of vehicles would be kept out of the adjacent public</li> </ul> |  |

| Environmental Impact  | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p>roadways and would occur on-site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This Plan shall meet standards established in the current <i>California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Device (MUTCD)</i> as well as City of Lomita requirements. The traffic control plans (TCP) shall be prepared by the contractor and submitted to the City (the Office of City Engineer) for approval pertaining to off-site work, including sidewalk construction, building façade, underground utilities, driveway construction, and any work that would require temporary curb lane closures. The plan shall be according to the <i>CAMUTCD</i> (latest edition) guidelines, including signs, cone arrangements, flagmen to assist with pedestrians, and traffic. The plan shall include other pertaining requirements by the City of Lomita.</li> </ul> |  |
| <p>Existing Plus Project - During the Existing With Project scenario, no significant impacts would occur when the Project's traffic generation is added to existing traffic conditions (under both ICU and HCM methodologies) and impacts would be less than significant.</p>   | <p>None required.</p>   | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |
| <p>Future Plus Project - During the Future With Project scenario, no significant impacts would occur when the Project's traffic generation is added to future traffic conditions, which include an annual growth factor of 1% to year 2019 (3% total) and traffic from 15 related projects (under both ICU and HCM methodologies) and impacts would be less than significant.</p> | <p>None required.</p>   | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |
| <p>CMP – The closest CMP freeway monitoring location in the Project vicinity is the</p>   | <p>None required.</p>   | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |

| Environmental Impact   | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|
| <p>I-405 Freeway n/o Inglewood Avenue, at Compton Boulevard (CMP Station 1068 – Post Mile 18.63). Based on the Project’s trip generation potential and distribution pattern, the Project would not add more than 150 trips (in either direction) during either the weekday AM or PM peak hour at this CMP mainline freeway-monitoring location. Therefore, a CMP freeway traffic impact analysis is not required and impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>The closest CMP intersection monitoring location in the Project vicinity is Pacific Coast Highway at Crenshaw Boulevard (CMP Intersection 151). As stated above, the CMP guidelines require that arterial monitoring intersection locations must be examined if the Project would add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours (of adjacent street traffic) at CMP monitoring intersections. Based on the Project’s trip generation potential, trip distribution, and trip assignment, the Project would not add more than 50 trips at the identified CMP intersections during the weekday AM peak hour or PM peak hour. Therefore, a CMP intersection traffic impact analysis is not required and impacts would be less than significant.</p> |   |  |
| <p>Design Hazards – Both of the proposed driveways would be perpendicular to the roadway and would include standard curb-cuts and design, therefore affording good visibility to both drivers and pedestrians. In addition, the Project driveways would be designed in accordance with City of Lomita standards and approvals. Therefore, impacts related to hazards as a result of a design feature would be less than significant.</p>   | None required.                                | Less than significant.                 |
| <p>Access – Vehicular access to the Project would be provided via driveways located along Crenshaw Boulevard and Lomita Boulevard, specifically via one proposed driveway along Crenshaw Boulevard and one proposed driveway along Lomita Boulevard. One of the Project driveways is forecast to operate at an unacceptable</p>  | None required.                                | Less than significant.                 |

| Environmental Impact  | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|
| <p>level of service in the Year 2019 during the PM peak hour. In addition, based on the level of service calculations, the proposed on-site throat lengths at the Project driveways are sufficient for storing potential queuing vehicles. It should be noted that based on the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile queue within the southbound left-turn pocket on Crenshaw Boulevard at Lomita Boulevard, an alternative analysis was prepared as part of the Traffic Report for the Project to address the proposed inbound left turn restriction at the Project driveway on Crenshaw Boulevard.</p> <p><i>Alternative Site Access</i> - During the AM and PM peak hours, the southbound left-turn queue at the intersection of Crenshaw Boulevard at Lomita Boulevard would extend beyond the access for Project Driveway 1. As a result, the inbound left-turn access to the Project Site is recommended to be restricted during the AM and PM peak periods (i.e. 7-9 AM &amp; 4-6 PM weekdays). The two Project driveways are forecast to operate at acceptable levels of service in the Year 2019 during the AM and PM peak hours with the recommended peak period inbound left-turn restriction at Project Driveway 1.</p> |   |  |
| <p>Public Transit – Pursuant to the CMP guidelines, the Project is forecasted to generate five transit trips (one inbound and four outbound) during the AM peak hour and six transit trips (four inbound and two outbound) during the PM peak hour. Over a 24-hour period, the Project is forecasted to generate 62 daily weekday transit trips. It is estimated that the existing transit service in the Project area would be able to accommodate the Project generated transit trips. The Project would generate on average less than one new boarding per bus in the AM and PM peak hours. Therefore, given the number of transit trips generated by the Project and the existing transit routes in the Project vicinity, it is concluded that the public transit system would not be significantly impacted by the Project.</p>  | None required.                                | Less than significant.                 |
| <p>Pedestrian Circulation - Pedestrian circulation would be provided via existing</p>   | None required.                                | Less than significant.                 |

| Environmental Impact   | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|
| <p>public sidewalks along Crenshaw Boulevard and Lomita Boulevard within the vicinity of the Project frontage, which would connect to the Project’s internal walkway system. The Project would maintain the existing sidewalk along Project frontage and if necessary repair or reconstruct sidewalks along the Project frontage per the City’s request. The existing sidewalk system within the Project vicinity provides direct connectivity to the surrounding residential community, existing retail/commercial uses, and major thoroughfares. As such, Project impacts related to pedestrian circulation and connectivity would be less than significant.</p>   |   |  |
| <p><b>M.1 Utilities and Service Systems: Wastewater</b></p>  |   |  |
| <p>Construction - During construction, a negligible amount of wastewater would be generated by construction employees. Portable on-site sanitation facilities would be provided by a private company and the waste would be properly disposed of off-site. No new connections to the public sewer system would be required during construction of the Project. As such, wastewater generated during Project construction activities would not enter the local conveyance system and thus would not affect sewer line capacities in the area. Given the temporary and limited level of wastewater generation during construction, the Project wouldn’t exceed the capacity of any treatment plant. Construction related impacts to existing wastewater facilities would be less than significant.</p> | <p>None required.</p>                         | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |

| Environmental Impact   | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Operation – The Project Site is currently developed and served by an existing wastewater conveyance system. As part of the building permit process, the lead agency would confirm and ensure that there is sufficient capacity in the local and trunk lines to accommodate the Project’s projected wastewater flows. If the surrounding sewer lines’ capacity is determined to be insufficient, the Project Applicant would be required to build the necessary improvements to convey the wastewater to a point with sufficient capacity.</p> <p>It is estimated the Project would generate a net total of approximately 32,630 gallons per day (gpd) (or 0.032 mgd) of wastewater. There is adequate treatment capacity at the JWPCP to accommodate the Project, and thus, the increase in wastewater generation would not have a significant impact on treatment plant capacity. As the JWPCP complies with the State’s wastewater treatment requirements and the Project’s wastewater generation is well within the existing capacity, the Project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of LAWQCB, and impacts would be less than significant.</p> | <p>None required.</p>                         | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |
| <p><b>M.2 Utilities and Service Systems: Water</b></p>   |   |  |
| <p>Construction - Water consumption would be required to accommodate construction activities, such as soil watering (i.e. for fugitive dust control), clean up, masonry, painting, and other related activities. The construction activities requiring water would not create substantial water demand. Typically, fugitive dust watering is provided by private purveyors and not provided by on-site water sources. Reclaimed/recycled water can be used for dust control. If necessary, and as determined during the plan check process, potential water main and other infrastructure upgrades would not be expected to create a significant impact to the physical environment because: (1) any disruption of service would be of a short-term nature; (2) replacement of the water mains would be within public and private rights-of-way; and (3) the existing infrastructure would be replaced with larger infrastructure in areas that have already been significantly disturbed. As such,</p>  | <p>None required.</p>                         | <p>Less than significant.</p>          |

| Environmental Impact  | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|--|
| impacts would be less than significant.   |   |  |
| <p>Water Demand and Supply - The Project is estimated to consume a total of approximately 48,208 gallons per day (gpd) (or 0.15 acre-feet [AF] per day or 54.75 AF/year). The 2015 UWMP shows that the City expects a water supply of 2,300 AF from imported sources and 1,352 AF of ground sources. Additionally, given the incremental increase in water consumption for the Project, and compliance with applicable water conservation ordinances and regulations such as CCR, Title 20, Section 1604; CCR Title 22; the Project would not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities.</p>  | None required.                                | Less than significant.                 |
| <p>Fire flow - The Project design includes design features to increase the capacity of existing water infrastructure in accordance with standards, which take into account fire flow and pressure requirements. Hydrants, water lines, and water tanks would be installed per Fire Code requirements for the Project. In addition, the Project Applicant would be required to submit the proposed plot plans for the Project to the City for review for compliance with applicable Los Angeles County Fire Code, California Fire Code, and National Fire Protection Association standards, thereby ensuring that the Project would not create any undue fire hazard. The LWD should be able to provide the domestic needs of the Project from the existing water system. There are no known water service problems/deficiencies and fire flow for existing structures has been adequate. All infrastructure improvements would be built to the LWD and California Plumbing Code standards. As part of the building permit process, the lead agency would confirm that there is sufficient capacity in the water supply and infrastructure to accommodate the Project's water needs. If a deficiency or service problem is discovered during the permitting process that prevents the Project from an adequate level of service, the Project Applicant shall fund the required upgrades to adequately serve the Project. Compliance with these standard requirements would ensure that the Project's impacts to the water conveyance</p> | None required.                                | Less than significant.                 |

| Environmental Impact   | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features   | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|
| system would be less than significant.   |   |  |
| <b>M.3 Utilities and Service Systems: Solid Waste</b>  |   |  |
| <p>Construction - The Project is predicted to generate approximately 2.4 tons per day of construction waste. The demolition and construction debris associated with the Project would primarily be classified as inert waste and would be recycled in accordance with Ordinance 181,519 at one of the City certified construction and demolition waste processor facilities. Compliance with AB 939 would require a minimum of 50 percent of demolition and construction debris to be recycled. Through compliance with applicable City regulations and contracting with approved waste haulers, the Project would achieve, at a minimum, the required 50 percent source reduction and recycling rate. With implementation of Project Design Feature PDF-L.3-1, which require recycling of most of the solid waste generated by the construction of the Project, short-term construction impacts to landfills and solid waste services would be less than significant.</p>   | <p><b>Project Design Feature</b></p> <p><b>M.3-1</b> To the maximum extent feasible, demolition and construction debris including concrete, asphalt, wood, drywall, metals, and other miscellaneous and composite materials shall be recycled and salvaged.</p> | Less than significant.                 |
| <p>Operation - It is estimated the Project would generate a total of approximately 1.3 tpd of solid waste. The SERFF can accept 775 tons per day and could therefore accommodate the additional approximately 1.3 tons per day increase in solid waste resulting from the Project. Further, pursuant to AB 939, each city and county in the state must divert 50 percent of its solid waste from landfill disposal through source reduction, recycling, and composting. In recognition of the importance of recycling, the Project would incorporate design features targeted at reducing the Project's solid waste generation during construction as well as during operations. Implementation of the City's standard regulations related to recycling, as well as inclusion of Project Design Feature M.3-1, would ensure that solid waste is separated and disposed/recycled properly during construction and operation further mitigating any potential solid waste impact from Project operations. These measures would render the impact associated with solid waste during operation of</p> | None required.  | Less than significant.                 |

| Environmental Impact  | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features  | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|--|--|
| the Project to be less than significant.  |  |  |
| <b>M.4 Utilities and Service Systems: Energy Conservation</b>   |  |  |
| Construction Electricity - Electricity used to provide temporary power for lighting and electronic equipment (e.g., computers, etc.) inside temporary construction trailers, and for lighting when necessary for general construction and renovation activity would generally not result in a net increase in on-site electricity use over existing conditions, and impacts would be less than significant.   | None required.   | Less than significant.                 |
| Construction Natural Gas - Construction equipment fuels (diesel, gas, or natural gas) would be provided by local or regional suppliers and vendors and the amount of natural gas released would be minimal and is not expected to significantly impact natural gas supplies or infrastructure.  | None required.   | Less than significant.                 |
| Operation Electricity - The Project would demand approximately 1,148,520 kw-h/year of electricity. Electrical service would be provided in accordance with the SCE’s Rules Governing Electric Service. It should also be noted that the Project’s estimated electricity consumption is based on usage rates that do not account for the Project’s energy conservation features. This represents a conservative (worst-case scenario) approach. Therefore, actual electricity consumption from the Project would likely be lower than that forecasted. Based on the above analysis, no operational impacts associated with the consumption of electricity would occur. | <p><b>Project Design Feature</b></p> <p><b>M.4-1</b> The Project shall use Energy Star appliances where available.</p> | Less than significant.                 |
| Operation Natural Gas - The Project is estimated to demand approximately 870,785 cf/month (or 29,026 cf/day) of natural gas. The natural gas demand is based on natural gas usage rates from the SCAQMD and without taking credit for the Project’s energy conservation features, which would reduce natural gas usage. The approximate demand is based on the best available data and is intended to provide an analysis of the estimated demand in comparison to SCG’s overall supply. The SCG residential peak day demand in 2015 was estimated at 239 billion cf/day. The   | See Project Design Feature M.4-1, above.   | Less than significant.                 |

| Environmental Impact   | Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|--|---|--|
| Project's 0.029 million cf/day represents approximately 0.0001 percent of the demand. Thus, there is adequate supply capacity and no impacts would occur.  |   |  |
| Transportation Energy – Based on the Project's estimated VMT and assuming the Project's mix of vehicle types (automobiles, trucks, and motorcycles) have an average fuel economy of 22.711 mpgs, approximately 200,000 gallons of fuel would be required in a year. Thus, the Project would represent less than 0.001 percent of the statewide gasoline consumption. | None required.                                | Less than significant.                 |
| <i>Source: CAJA Environmental Services, October 2016.</i>  |   |  |