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MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 2100 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations (CCR) Sections 15000 et seq.), the City of Los Alamitos has completed this Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the project described below based on the assessment presented in the attached Initial Study.

LEAD AGENCY: City of Los Alamitos

PROJECT TITLE: Sausalito Street Condominiums

PROJECT LOCATION: The project site is in the City of Los Alamitos, which is in the northwestern boundary of Orange County. The project site, which has an address of 3311 Sausalito Street (APN 242-222-13), is generally bounded by Cerritos Avenue to the north; Sausalito Street to the south; Chestnut Street to the east; and Coyote Creek Channel to the west.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Project development includes demolition of the existing church building and associated parking lot and hardscape improvements, as well as removal of all landscape improvements. Upon clearing, the 2.44-acre project site would be redeveloped from its existing church use to a residential use. Specifically, project development includes 50 residential condominiums in 11 three-story buildings; vehicular and pedestrian circulation improvements; parking and utility improvements; common landscape/open space areas; and various hardscape and landscape improvements. Project development requires City approval of a tentative tract map and site plan review.

EXISTING CONDITIONS: The project site is currently developed with the Cottonwood Church and its associated improvements. The site contains a two-story building that is used for church functions, a surface parking lot and associated drive aisles, and various hardscape (i.e., walkways, cement curbs and planters) and landscape (i.e., parking lot planters with trees and shrubs) improvements.

DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY: The MND and supporting Initial Study for the proposed project are available for public review at the following locations:

- City of Los Alamitos, 3191 Katella Avenue, Los Alamitos, CA 90720
- Los Alamitos/Rossmoor Library, 12700 Montecito, Seal Beach, CA 90740
- Online at: http://cityoflosalamitos.org/your-government/planning/planning-division/

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: The attached Initial Study was prepared to identify the potential effects on the environment from development and operation of the proposed project and to evaluate the significance of those effects. Based on the environmental analysis, the proposed project would have no impacts or less-than-significant impacts related to the following environmental issues:

- Aesthetics
- Cultural Resources
- Mineral Resources
- Recreation
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Population and Housing
- Transportation and Traffic
- Air Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Public Services
- Tribal Cultural Resources
The environmental assessment presented in the Initial Study identifies potentially significant environmental impacts related to biological resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, and noise. However, compliance with the mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study would reduce potentially significant impacts related to these environmental issues to less than significant levels.

**Findings.** It is hereby determined that, based on the information contained in the attached Initial Study, the proposed project would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment. Mitigation measures necessary to avoid the potentially significant effects on the environment are included in the attached Initial Study, which is hereby incorporated and fully made part of this MND. The City of Los Alamitos has hereby agreed to implement each of the identified mitigation measures, which will be adopted as part of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
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1. Introduction

The proposed project includes redevelopment of the 2.44-acre project site from its existing church use to a residential use. The project includes demolition of the existing two-story church building and construction of 50 residential condominiums in 11 three-story buildings. Other project components include vehicular and pedestrian circulation improvements; parking and utility improvements; common landscape/open space areas; and various hardscape and landscape improvements. In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City of Los Alamitos, as lead agency, is preparing the environmental documentation for the proposed project to determine if approval of the discretionary actions requested and subsequent development would have a significant impact on the environment. As defined by Section 15063 of the CEQA Guidelines, an Initial Study is prepared primarily to provide the lead agency with information to use as the basis for determining whether an environmental impact report, negative declaration, or mitigated negative declaration (MND) would provide the necessary environmental documentation and clearance for the proposed project. This Initial Study has been prepared to support the adoption of an MND.

1.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The Project Site is in the City of Los Alamitos (City), which is in the northwestern boundary of Orange County and is surrounded by five jurisdictions. To the east are the cities of Cypress and Garden Grove. The City of Seal Beach and the unincorporated community of Rossmoor, which is within the City’s Sphere of Influence are adjacent to the southern and southwestern borders, respectively. To the west, across the county line, is the City of Long Beach in Los Angeles County (see Figure 1, Regional Location). Interstate and regional access to the City are provided predominantly by Interstate 405 (I-45) and I-605.

The Project Site, which has an address of 3311 Sausalito Street (APN 242-222-13), is generally bounded by Cerritos Avenue to the north; Sausalito Street to the south; Chestnut Street to the east; and Coyote Creek Channel to the west (see Figures 2, Local Vicinity, and 3, Aerial Photograph).

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

1.2.1 Existing Land Use

The 2.44-acre Project Site is currently developed with the Cottonwood Church and its associated improvements. The site contains a two-story building (27,401 square feet in size) that is used for church functions, a surface parking lot and associated drive aisles, and various hardscape (i.e., walkways, cement curbs and planters) and landscape (i.e., parking lot planters with trees and shrubs) improvements. Other site improvements include parking lot light poles; a block wall that runs along the western, northern, and eastern site boundaries; and a monument sign (see Figures 3 and 4, Site Photographs). Vehicular access to the project site is via two access drives along Sausalito Street, with pedestrian access provided via the existing public sidewalk along Sausalito Street.
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1.2.2 Surrounding Land Use

As shown in Figure 3, Aerial Photograph, the Project Site is surrounded by residential uses to the south, across Sausalito Street; residential uses to the west; Coyote Creek Channel to the north and northwest; commercial and office uses to the northeast, across Cerritos Avenue; and commercial and office uses to the east. A vacant, rectangular-shaped lot also abuts the southeastern portion of the Project Site.

1.2.3 General Plan and Zoning

The Los Alamitos General Plan land use designation for the Project Site is Multi Family Residential, permitting residential development at densities of 20 to 30 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). The zoning district of the Project Site is Multiple Family Residential (R-3). The R-3 zoning district identifies areas designed to provide multi-family housing, with a maximum permitted density of up to 30 du/ac. The R-3 zoning district is consistent with the Multi Family Residential land use designation of the general plan.

1.2.4 Environmental Resources

The Project Site and its immediate surroundings are fully developed, and there are no biological resources onsite or within the surrounding area. The Project Site contains no historic buildings, housing, scenic resources, mineral resources, notable trees, or water bodies. Additional information regarding environmental resources on the Project Site and its surroundings—or the lack of such resources—can be found in Section 3, Environmental Analysis, of this Initial Study under each respective environmental topic.

1.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Development of the Proposed Project includes demolition of the existing church building and associated parking lot and hardscape improvements. Project development also requires removal of a number of trees and other landscape improvements associated with the site (site features to be demolished and removed are shown in Figures 3, Aerial Photograph, and 4, Site Photographs). Upon clearing, the 2.44-acre Project Site would be developed with a new residential condominium development; vehicular and pedestrian circulation improvements; parking and utility improvements; common landscape/open space areas; and various hardscape and landscape improvements. Project development requires City approval of a tentative tract map and site plan review.

Following is a detailed description of the Proposed Project’s overall site plan and character and the various development components and improvements that would be implemented under the project. Project phasing and construction details are discussed below in Section 1.3.7, Project Phasing and Construction.
Figure 1 - Regional Location

Note: Unincorporated county areas are shown in white.

Source: ESRI, USGS, NOAA, 2017
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Figure 2 - Local Vicinity

Source: ESRI, USGS, NOAA, 2017

Note: Unincorporated county areas are shown in white.

Source: ESRI, USGS, NOAA, 2017
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Figure 3 - Aerial Photograph

Source: Google Earth Pro, 2017
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Figure 4 - Site Photographs

3. Looking north across project site.

4. Looking south across project site.

5. Looking west across project site.


7. Looking north across project site from Sausalito Street.

8. Looking north across project site.

9. Looking southwest across project site.
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1.3.1 Site Plan and Character

After clearing the Project Site, the Developer (Olson Company) would construct 50 residential condominiums in 11 three-story buildings (up to 35 feet in height). The 50 condominiums would be provided at a density of approximately 20.5 dwelling units per acre (50 units divided by 2.44 acres). Table 1 provides a breakdown of the residential plan types that would be offered. As shown in the table, the square footage of the plan types would range between 1,339 and 2,153 square feet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Type</th>
<th>Unit Area in Square Feet</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Percentage Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan 1 – 2 bedrooms/2.5 baths</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 2 – 3 bedrooms/2.5 baths</td>
<td>1,522</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 3 – 2 bedrooms/2.5 baths</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 4 – 3 bedrooms/3.5 baths</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 5 – 3 bedrooms/3 baths</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 6 – 3 bedrooms/2.5 baths</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 7 – 3 bedrooms/2.5 baths</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>—</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5, Conceptual Site and Landscape Plan, illustrates the overall site and landscape design and layout of the Proposed Project. As shown in Figure 5, the 11 residential buildings (consisting of a mix of four-, five- and six-plex building layouts) would be divided on both sides of the proposed private street, with four provided on the west side and seven on the east side. The buildings would be separated from one another by drive aisles or courtyards. Each residence would feature a private yard or patio, as well as a two-car garage (interior dimensions: 20 by 20 feet).

Figures 6a and 6b, Conceptual Street Scene, and Figures 7a and 7b, Conceptual Building Elevation and Section, illustrate the conceptual building elevations and architectural style and elements/features of the proposed condominiums. As shown in these figures, the proposed architectural style would be Spanish, and the proposed buildings include design elements (e.g., roof style, window fenestration and details, wall material) that reflect this architectural style. For example, the design elements/features would include stucco walls; box bay windows; shaped truss tails; shutters; tubular steel rails; and cement S-tile roofs. Building pop-outs and offsets, variations in building heights and materials, and balconies would be added to offset the building’s massing, provide human scale, and provide relief to and variation in the building form and style. The final design and architectural style of the buildings are subject to review and approval by the City.

Other project elements—such as parking, vehicular access and circulation improvements, pedestrian access and circulation, infrastructure improvements, and other hardscape and landscape improvements—are discussed in detail below.
1.3.2 Landscaping, Walls, and Lighting

As shown in Figure 5, Conceptual Site and Landscape Plan, the Proposed Project's landscape plan would include a variety of new trees, shrubs, and groundcover along the building perimeters, within the courtyards and common areas, and along the perimeter of the site. Proposed tree types would include but not be limited to cypress, olive, and Brisbane box trees. All setbacks and other common areas not occupied by buildings or hardscape improvements (e.g., drive aisles, pedestrian walkways) would be landscaped. As noted above, project development requires the removal of a number of trees and other landscape improvements. Although project development would include the removal of all existing trees within the Project Site (approximately 20 trees), it would provide a greater number of trees (approximately 155 new trees) than currently exist. All common areas and landscaping would be maintained by the established homeowner's association (HOA).

Various walls, fences and gates would be provided throughout the Project Site—these would include stucco over CMU walls to enclose patios and along the northern perimeter; wood fences for side yards; and wood and metal gates for patios and side yards. Wall and fence heights would range from three to six feet, with pilasters reaching up to six feet six inches.

Site lighting would consist of building-mounted light fixtures; lighting for pedestrian walkways, courtyards, and common areas; decorative lighting for landscape features; lighting along the internal drive aisles and for the surface parking areas; security lighting; and interior lighting for the residential units.

1.3.3 Resident Amenities and Open Space Areas

Future project residents would have access to community amenities and open space areas (both common and private). As shown in Figure 5, Conceptual Site and Landscape Plan, a central community open space area would be provided in the northern end of the Project Site. The community open space would feature a curved seat wall and specimen tree for shade, bench seating, and a community dog bag station for pet owners. Also, each residence would feature a private yard or patio with a minimum area of 100 square feet (dimensions: 10 by 10 feet). Most homes would also feature a private deck on the second floor.

1.3.4 Access, Circulation, and Parking

As shown in Figure 5, Conceptual Site and Landscape Plan, vehicular access for the Project Site would be provided via a single access drive off Sausalito Street, which would connect to an internal, north-south private street. Vehicular access to the individual garages of each residence would be provided via short east-west drive aisles that connect to the private street. As also shown in Figure 5, the main access drive into the site would feature decorative pavers at the driveway entrance.

Pedestrian access to the Project Site would be provided via the existing public sidewalk along Sausalito Street. Internal pedestrian circulation would include a five-foot wide pedestrian esplanade along the eastern site boundary; four-foot wide community concrete walks along the courtyards and the east side of the private street; and three-foot wide unit entry walks (see Figure 5). As shown in Figure 5, the five-foot wide pedestrian esplanade and four-foot wide community concrete walk would connect to the public sidewalk along Sausalito Street.
Figure 5 - Conceptual Site and Landscape Plan

LEGEND

1. Central community open space area with curved seat wall, specimen tree for shade with bench seating for small social events and group gatherings.
2. Four community cluster mailboxes, per USPS review and approval.
3. Proposed wall, planter, gate or fence, per Wall & Fence Plan.
4. Enhanced paving at main project entry.
5. Proposed tree, per Planting Plan.
6. 5' wide pedestrian esplanade, natural colored concrete, with medium top-cast finish and saw-cut joints.
7. 4' wide community natural colored concrete walk, with light top-cast finish and saw-cut joints.
8. 3' wide unit entry natural colored concrete walk & stoop, with light top-cast finish and saw-cut joints.
9. Accessible parking stall and striping, per Civil plans.
10. EV charging station, to be coordinated with Electrical Engineer's plans.
11. Guest parking stall.
12. Natural colored concrete driveway, with light broom finish and tooled joints.
13. Private patio/yard area, homeowner maintained.
14. Common area landscape, builder installed and HOA maintained.
15. Community dog bag station (black in color), for pet owners.
16. Property line.
17. Public street R.O.W.
18. Existing public street sidewalk & parkway, per Civil plans.
19. Intermediate tree pockets with seat-walls at pedestrian nodes.
20. Short term bike parking (4 bike racks to accommodate 8 bike stalls).
21. Retention storm area with modular device (per Civil plans); with riparian planting.
22. Existing poles to remain, per Civil plans.
23. Common area landscape, builder installed and HOA maintained.
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Figure 6a - Conceptual Street Scene

Building 200: 5 Plex - Street Elevation
Building 100: 4 Plex - Street Elevation

Streetscene Along Sausalito Street

Source: Studio Pad, 2017
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Figure 6b - Conceptual Street Scene

Building 100: 4 Plex - Paseo Elevation

Source: Google Earth Pro, 2017
1. Introduction

This page intentionally left blank.
Figure 7a - Conceptual Building Elevation and Section

Note: Artist's conception; colors, materials and application may vary.

Source: Studio Pad, 2017
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Figure 7b - Conceptual Building Elevation and Section

Existing SFD

Building 300: 6 Plex

Street View - B

Source: Studio Pad, 2017
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Each condominium would be provided with a two-car garage (interior dimensions: 20 by 20 feet), which would be accessed via a drive aisle. As shown in Figure 5, 11 uncovered parking spaces would be provided at the northern end of the Project Site, including a handicap parking space and a space for an electric vehicle charging station.

1.3.5 Infrastructure Improvements

1.3.5.1 WATER

Golden State Water District provides potable water service to the existing church use on the Project Site and would continue to do so for the residential uses under the Proposed Project. Under existing conditions, potable water delivery to the site is provided via internal water lines that connect to the existing water main along Sausalito Street.

As a part of the Proposed Project, the onsite potable water lines that serve the existing church use would be removed and replaced with a series of new potable water lines that would connect to the existing water main along Sausalito Street. Proposed potable water infrastructure improvements would entail demolition of existing lines onsite, trenching and installing new lines, and connection to the existing main line. No offsite water line construction or upsizing would be required to accommodate the Proposed Project. However, some construction may occur within the public right-of-way of Sausalito Street in order to make the necessary infrastructure connections to the existing water main.

Additionally, fire hydrants would be installed at key locations within the Project Site, as required by the Orange County Fire Authority to meet hose-pull requirements and provide adequate fire access.

1.3.5.2 WASTEWATER

The Rossmoor/Los Alamitos Sewer District (Sewer District) provides wastewater collection service to the existing church use onsite and would continue to do so for the residential uses under the Proposed Project. Wastewater collection service to the site is provided via the existing Orange County Sanitation District (OCSD) sewer trunk along Sausalito Street. Wastewater collected by the Sewer District flows through a system of regional trunk lines to Reclamation Plant No. 1 (in the City of Fountain Valley) and Treatment Plant No. 2 (in the City of Huntington Beach) for treatment; both plants are owned and operated by OCSD.

Wastewater service for the Proposed Project would be provided via new internal sewer lines that connect to the Sewer District’s existing eight-inch sewer trunk in Walnut Street. Proposed wastewater infrastructure improvements would entail demolition of existing lines onsite, trenching and installing new lines, and connection to the existing trunk line in Walnut Street. A small portion of the offsite sewer line would be required to connect to the Sewer District’s sewer trunk to accommodate the Proposed Project. Therefore, some construction would occur within the public right-of-way of Walnut Street in order to make the necessary infrastructure connections to the existing sewer trunk.
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1.3.5.3 DRAINAGE

Under existing conditions, the Project Site is relatively flat and site drainage is an overland flow traveling in a southerly direction towards Sausalito Street. Approximately 87 percent of the Project Site consists of impervious areas (e.g., buildings, paving), and the remainder is pervious (e.g., landscaping). Approximately half of the Project Site runoff drains into an existing catch basin at the southeasterly corner of the site, which connects to an existing 24-inch reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) via an 18-inch RCP lateral within Sausalito Street. The other half of the Project Site runoff drains into the street via an existing Parkway culvert at the southwesterly corner of the site, which then travels easterly towards the aforementioned catch basin. Under existing conditions there are no water quality devices/features onsite to provide any treatment for the “first flush” generated onsite.¹

Under proposed conditions, stormwater runoff from the Project Site would be conveyed similar to existing conditions, continuing to flow southerly via new onsite drainage collection and treatment systems. Upon project completion, approximately 81 percent of the Project Site would consist of impervious areas and the remainder would be pervious. As shown in Figure 8, WQMP Schematic Plan, site drainage improvements needed to accommodate the Proposed Project would include new storm drain pipes, catch basins, and a water quality feature (a modular wetlands linear filtration device). Once runoff enters the catch basins, it would be conveyed via storm drain pipes to the modular wetlands linear filtration device in the southwesterly corner of the Project Site (see Figure 8), where runoff would be treated before being discharged into the existing 24-inch RCP main line within Sausalito Street via a proposed 18-inch RCP. The proposed onsite drainage system would be maintained by the established HOA.

1.3.5.4 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Plans for utilities that would serve the residential uses under the Proposed Project would include provision of electricity (Southern California Edison), natural gas (Southern California Gas Company), telecommunications facilities (Frontier, previously Verizon), cable service (Time Warner), and solid waste (Republic Services, Inc.). Bins for both solid waste and recycling would be provided in a designated location within the parking garage of each condominium. All new utility infrastructure for electricity, natural gas, telecommunications, and cable service would be installed underground or placed in enclosed spaces (e.g., utility closets).

¹ First flush is the initial surface runoff of a rainstorm. During this phase, water pollution entering storm drains in areas with high proportions of impervious surfaces is typically more concentrated compared to the remainder of the storm.
Figure 8 - WQMP Schematic Plan

Site Area = 2.44 AC
Design Flow Rate = 0.41 cfs
8' x 16' Modular Wetlands Linear Bio Filtration Device. Maximum Design Treatment Rate = 0.46 cfs

Source: Alan R. Short, 2017
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1.3.6 Tentative Tract Map

"Tentative map" refers to a map made for the purpose of showing the design and improvement of a proposed subdivision and the existing conditions in and around it. The tentative map facilitates the division of land and provides a clear transfer of ownership of any lots and/or condominiums that are created; it is the subdivision map prepared prior to a final map, the official legally-recorded document for a property. The subdivision design and necessary improvements related to roads, curb, gutter, sewer, water, and drainage are addressed during the processing of a tentative map. Development of the Proposed Project requires City approval of a tentative tract map (TTM No. 18086) to subdivide the Project Site for condominium purposes (see Figure 9, Tentative Tract Map No. 18086).

1.3.7 Green Building and Sustainability

Development under the Proposed Project is required to be designed using green building practices, including those of the most current California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen [Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 11]; incorporated by reference in Chapter 15.04 [Building Codes] of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code). Some of the green building practices/features that would be incorporated into the Proposed Project are tankless water heaters; low-flow faucets and toilets; drip irrigation; Energy Star appliances; LED lighting; waste diversion from construction (construction waste recycling); recycling of the asphalt and building demolition, where feasible; onsite stormwater retention; an electric-vehicle charging station; and bicycle racks. Other green building practices/features would be considered by the City as the Proposed Project is refined during the design and construction phase.

1.3.8 Project Phasing and Construction

Upon approval of the Proposed Project by the City, project development is anticipated to be completed in four phases—demolition and site clearing, earthwork and soil remediation, grading, and construction. Overall construction (including soil remediation) is estimated to take approximately 18 to 24 months, starting in fall of 2017. Approximately 3,450 cubic yards of soil export and 1,950 cubic yards of soils import would be required to balance the site. Project development would also require the hauling of demolition debris.

1.4 CITY ACTION REQUESTED

1.4.1 Lead Agency

This Initial Study is intended to serve as the primary environmental document for all future actions associated with the Proposed Project, including all discretionary approvals requested or required to implement the Proposed Project. The City of Los Alamitos is the lead agency under CEQA and has the principal approval authority over the Proposed Project. As part of the Proposed Project, the following discretionary actions and approvals are required by the City:

- Adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for CEQA clearance
- Approval of a Tentative Tract Map (TTM No. 18086) for residential subdivision purposes
- Approval of a Site Plan Review
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1.4.2 Responsible Agency

A responsible agency is a public agency other than the lead agency that has responsibility for carrying out or approving a project (CEQA Guidelines § 15381 and Public Resources Code § 21069). As part of the Proposed Project, the following approvals from responsible agencies are required:

- **Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board:** Compliance with the Construction General Permit issued under Order No. 2009-009-DWQ and its subsequent revisions under Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ.

1.5 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

The information in this Initial Study is based, in part, on the following documents that include the Project Site or provide information addressing the general project area or use:

- **City of Los Alamitos General Plan.** The City of Los Alamitos General Plan is a policy document designed to give long-range guidance for decisions affecting the future character of Los Alamitos. It represents the official statement of the community’s physical development as well as its economic, social, and environmental goals. The Los Alamitos General Plan was used throughout this Initial Study as the fundamental planning document governing development on the Project Site.

- **City of Los Alamitos Municipal Code.** The Los Alamitos Municipal Code, which includes the City’s Subdivision Ordinance (Title 16) and Zoning Code (Title 17), establishes the basic regulations under which land in the City is developed and utilized. This includes but is not limited to regulations and controls for the design and improvement of subdivisions; allowable uses, building setback and height requirements, and other development standards. The basic intent of the code is to promote and protect the public health, safety, convenience, and welfare of present and future citizens of Los Alamitos.

- **Environmental Impact Report for the City of Los Alamitos General Plan Update (2015).** An environmental impact report (SCH No. 2013121055) was prepared for the City of Los Alamitos General Plan Update, which were certified by the Los Alamitos City Council in March 2015 (2015 Certified EIR). The 2015 Certified EIR evaluated the potential individual and cumulative environmental effects associated with buildout of the General Plan Update, including direct (primary) and indirect (secondary) impacts that might occur as a result of buildout. Subsequent development projects under the General Plan Update are to be evaluated in light of the analysis provided in the 2015 Certified EIR to determine if additional environmental documentation is required (State CEQA Guidelines §§ 15168[b] and [c]). In cases where further environmental review is required, the environmental analysis for the individual development project can tier from the 2015 Certified EIR consistent with Public Resources Code Section 21093(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c). Where applicable, this Initial Study tiers off of the 2015 Certified EIR. The tiered analysis incorporates by reference analysis, background information, and mitigation measures, where applicable, and concentrates on issues specific to the Proposed Project (Public Resources Code § 21094; State CEQA Guidelines §§ 15168[c], 15385).
Figure 9 - Tentative Tract Map No. 18086

Source: Alan R. Short, P.E., 2017
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2. Environmental Checklist

2.1 BACKGROUND

1. **Project Title:** 3311 Sausalito Street Condominiums

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**
   City of Los Alamitos
   Development Services Department, Planning Division
   3191 Katella Avenue
   Los Alamitos, California 90720

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:**
   Steven A. Mendoza, Development Services Director
   562.431.3538 ext. 300

4. **Project Location:**
   The 2.44-acre Project Site is at 3311 Sausalito Street near the western boundary of the City of Los Alamitos in west Orange County. The Coyote Creek Channel passes near the northwest site boundary. The site is approximately 740 feet west of the intersection of Los Alamitos Boulevard and Cerritos Avenue.

5. **Project Sponsor’s Name and Address:**
   Steve Armanino
   The Olson Company
   3010 Old Ranch Pkwy, Suite 100
   Seal Beach, CA 90740

6. **General Plan Designation:** Multi Family Residential

7. **Zoning:** Multiple Family Residential (R-3)

8. **Description of Project:**
   The Proposed Project involves redevelopment of the 2.44-acre project site from its existing church use to a residential use. The project includes demolition of the existing two-story church building and construction of 50 residential condominiums in 11 three-story buildings. A more detailed description of the Proposed Project is provided in Section 1.3, *Project Description.*
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9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:
The Project Site is surrounded by residential uses to the south, across Sausalito Street; residential uses to the west; Coyote Creek Channel to the north and northwest; commercial and office uses to the northeast, across Cerritos Avenue; and commercial and office uses to the east. A vacant, rectangular-shaped lot also abuts the southeastern portion of the Project Site.

10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required:
- Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

2.3 DETERMINATION (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE LEAD AGENCY)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: ____________________________ Date: 8/01/2017

Printed Name: Shan Mendora
City of Los Alamitos: ____________________

August 2017
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2.4 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors, as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a) Earlier Analyses Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:

a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:**

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

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

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

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

**II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

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

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

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

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

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?  
   - X
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XII. NOISE. Would the project result in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### XV. RECREATION.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.
Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.</strong> Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</strong> Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed waste water treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or waste water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a)</strong> Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b)</strong> Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c)</strong> Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section 2.4 provided a checklist of environmental impacts. This section provides an evaluation of the impact categories and questions contained in the checklist and identifies mitigation measures, if applicable.

3.1 AESTHETICS

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

No Impact. A scenic vista, as defined by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), is a viewpoint that provides expansive views of a highly-valued landscape for the benefit of the general public. The City’s physical setting in the Santa Ana River Basin region and relatively flat topography afford distant scenic views of the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains from certain vantage points throughout the City. However, project development would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista of these scenic resources, as there are no scenic vistas afforded from the project site or its surroundings. Therefore, no impact to scenic vistas would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

No Impact. The Project Site is in a highly-urbanized area of the City and is not on or near a state-designated scenic highway, as designated on the California Scenic Highway Mapping System of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans 2017). Additionally, the Project Site is not visible from the nearest state-designated scenic highway (State Route 91), which is approximately 15 miles to the east (Caltrans 2017). There are several mature ornamental landscape trees throughout the Project Site; however, such trees are not considered scenic resources. Furthermore, there are no rock outcroppings or historic buildings onsite. Therefore, no impact to scenic resources within a state scenic highway would occur due to project development and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The assessment of aesthetic impacts is subjective by nature. Aesthetics generally refers to the identification of visual resources and their quality, as well as an overall visual perception of the environment. A project is generally considered to have a significant aesthetic impact if it substantially changes the character or quality of the Project Site such that the site becomes visually incompatible or visually unexpected with its surroundings.

Following is a discussion of the potential aesthetic and visual effects resulting from the Proposed Project’s construction and operational phases.
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**Visual Character – Project Construction Phase**

Project implementation would result in construction activities that would temporarily change the visual character of the Project Site and its surroundings. Construction activities would involve demolition, site clearing, grading, building, and site improvements. Construction staging areas, including earth stockpiling, storage of equipment and supplies, and related activities would contribute to a generally “disturbed site,” which may be perceived by some as a visual impact.

However, these effects would be typical of any site in the City that undergoes development or redevelopment. These activities may be unsightly during the site preparation and construction phases, but they are not considered significant because they are temporary. Construction fencing that would be erected along the site perimeter would help shield the construction areas and would also be temporary. Therefore, project-related construction activities would not have a significant effect on the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Visual Character – Project Operation Phase**

The Project Site is in a highly-urbanized area of the City and is surrounded by a mix of residential, commercial, and office uses, as well as the Coyote Creek Channel (see Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*). Buildings immediately adjacent to and surrounding the Project Site include two-story residences (both attached and detached) to the west and south and single-story commercial/office uses to the east and northeast. A vacant, rectangular-shaped lot also abuts the southeastern boundary of the Project Site.

Development of the Proposed Project includes demolition of an existing church building and its associated parking areas and landscape improvements, as well as the removal of all existing trees and landscape improvements onsite (site features to be demolished and removed are shown in Figures 3 and 4, *Site Photographs*). After clearing the Project Site, the Developer would construct 50 residential condominiums in 11 three-story buildings (up to 35 feet in height). Other project components include vehicular and pedestrian circulation improvements; parking and utility improvements; common landscape/open space areas; and various hardscape and landscape improvements. Figure 5, *Conceptual Site and Landscape Plan*, illustrates how each of the project components fit into the overall layout of the Project Site.

Figures 6a, 6b, 7a, and 7b illustrate the conceptual building elevations of the proposed residential buildings; these figures also illustrate the proposed architectural style (Spanish) and elements/features of the buildings. The proposed buildings include design elements (e.g., roof style, window fenestration and details, wall material) that reflect the Spanish architectural style. For example, the design elements/features would include stucco walls; box bay windows; shaped truss tails; shutters; tubular steel rails; and cement S-tile roofs. The final design and architectural style of the buildings are subject to review and approval by the City.

The proposed architectural style would be complementary to and not detract from the visual character or quality of the surrounding area or uses. As shown in Figures 6a, 6b, 7a, and 7b, building masses, elevations, and rooflines would be modulated to promote visual interest and articulation of the proposed buildings. Building pop-outs and offsets and variations in building heights, materials and color schemes would be added to offset building massing, provide human scale, and provide relief to and variation in the building form and
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style. The complementary nature of the proposed architectural style is best demonstrated in Figure 7a, *Conceptual Building Elevation and Section*. As shown in this figure, the color scheme and design elements/features of the proposed residential buildings would be complimentary to those of the existing two-story single-family residences to the west.

Additionally, project implementation would provide similar and compatible uses to the existing residential uses adjacent to and surrounding the Project Site. For example, the proposed residential buildings (including building massing and heights; see Figures 6a, 6b, 7a, and 7b) would be compatible with the residential uses to the west and south, which include two-story buildings that are similar to the massing of the buildings of the Proposed Project. Also, as shown in Figures 7a and 7b, *Conceptual Building Elevation and Section*, development on the Project Site would occur at approximately two feet below the grade level of the adjacent residential community, but would be at grade with Sausalito Street. Thereby, reducing the overall height of the proposed residential buildings by two feet, as seen from the adjacent residential community.

The provisions of the City’s Zoning Code (Title 17 [Zoning] of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code) and the City’s development review process would also help ensure that the Proposed Project is designed and implemented in a manner that would not be detrimental to the Project Site or its surroundings. For example, the Proposed Project would be required to be designed in accordance with the standards outlined in Section 17.16.040 (Architectural Design), including those related to screening mechanical equipment, integrated sign design, compatible and harmonious development, and compatible scale and character. Compliance with the City’s development standards would be ensured through the City’s development review process.

Furthermore, as shown in Figures 5, 6a, 6b, 7a, and 7b, the proposed landscape plan would enhance the visual character of the Project Site and surrounding area. The landscape plan includes a variety of new trees, shrubs, and groundcover around the proposed buildings; along the street frontage and internal drive aisles; and within the common areas. All landscaping would be designed and provided in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 17.20 (Landscaping) of the City’s Zoning Code. The Proposed Project’s landscape elements would help to visually soften the height and massing of the proposed buildings when viewed from public areas, as well as help provide visual interest and relief.

Finally, the future HOA (along with a governing tool in the form of Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions [CC&Rs]) would be in charge of maintaining common areas of the Proposed Project (e.g., landscaped parkways, sidewalks, open space areas) and would set forth rules and regulations for individual homeowners (e.g., yard maintenance, house appearance) via the CC&Rs. Enforcement of the CC&Rs by the HOA would ensure that the visual character and quality of the Proposed Project would be maintained.

Overall, development of the Proposed Project would enhance and strengthen the visual character of the Project Site and its surroundings through new architecture, landscaping, hardscape, and other improvements onsite and along the Sausalito Street site frontage. The proposed architectural and landscape elements and design would ensure that development of the Proposed Project is not detrimental to the visual character or quality of the surrounding area or uses. The building masses, landscaping, and various hardscape and landscape improvements proposed throughout the Project Site would not only be designed to create a sense of uniqueness, but also a sense of cohesiveness on- and offsite and along the Project Site boundaries.
Although newer than that of the surrounding area and uses, the proposed architecture and landscaping would complement and not detract from the visual character of the site or surrounding area.

Based on the preceding, development of the Proposed Project would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Nighttime illumination and glare impacts are the effects of a project’s exterior lighting upon adjoining uses and areas. Glare can also be generated by light reflecting off passing cars and large expanses of glazing (i.e., glass windows) or other reflective surfaces. Excessive light and/or glare can impair vision, cause annoyance, affect sleep patterns, and generate safety hazards when experienced by drivers. Following is a discussion of the potential day and nighttime light and glare impacts in the project area as a result of development of the Proposed Project.

**Architectural Treatments and Building Materials**

Urban glare is largely a daytime phenomenon occurring when sunlight is reflected off the surfaces of buildings or objects. Excessive glare not only impedes visibility, but also increases the ambient heat reflectivity in a given area. The building materials and architectural treatments of the proposed residential structures (e.g., stucco walls, wood trimming, roofing) would not be reflective and would therefore not create day or nighttime glare. They are similar to building materials used on other similar residential developments in the surrounding area.

Additionally, as shown in the conceptual building elevations provided in Figures 6a and 6b, Conceptual Street Scene, and Figures 7a and 7b, Conceptual Building Elevation and Section, the proposed residential structures would not include large expanses of glazing (i.e., glass windows). However, the windows of the building could potentially increase sources of glare, because they would reflect sunlight during certain times of the day. In addition, vehicles parked onsite would increase the potential for reflected sunlight during certain times of the day. However, glare from these sources is typical of the surrounding area and would not increase beyond what is expected for an urban area.

Therefore, daytime glare impacts from project-related architectural treatments and building materials would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Nighttime Lighting**

Lighting for the Proposed Project would consist of building-mounted light fixtures; lighting for pedestrian walkways and common areas; interior lighting for the buildings; and security lighting where necessary. Nighttime lighting and glare from the Project Site would be visible to the surrounding land uses from various vantage points, and from surrounding roadways.
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Although development of the Project Site would introduce new light sources to the area, the Proposed Project’s light sources would be similar to the light sources of the surrounding residential uses. Considering the existing sources of lighting in surrounding areas, including street and parking lot lights and lighting from the existing uses onsite and the surrounding uses, the amount and intensity of nighttime lighting proposed onsite would not be substantially greater or different than existing lighting in the surrounding area.

Additionally, among other considerations related to outdoor illumination, Chapter 8.48 (Lighting Performance Standards) of Title 8 (Health and Safety) of the City’s Municipal Code addresses the visual impacts of exterior lighting on adjacent property owners and neighborhoods. The chapter outlines guidelines for the design, scale, location, and illumination level of lighting fixtures. The guidelines aim to reduce light trespass and prevent glare. Section 17.14.040 (Light and Glare) of Title 17 (Zoning) also outlines standards for shielding of light sources. As outlined in Section 17.14.040, where the light source is visible from outside the project boundary, shielding is required to reduce glare so that neither the light source nor its image from a reflective surface shall be directly visible from a point of five feet or more beyond the property line. All exterior lighting sources of the Proposed Project would be designed, arranged, installed, directed, shielded, and maintained in such a manner as to contain direct illumination onsite and prevent light and glare impacts offsite in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 8.48 and Section 17.14.040, thereby preventing excess illumination and light spillover onto adjoining land uses and/or roadways.

Additionally, project development would be required to comply with California’s Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations, which outlines mandatory provisions for lighting control devices and luminaires. For example, the Proposed Project’s lighting sources would be required to be installed in accordance with the provisions of Section 110.9 (Mandatory Requirements for Lighting Control Devices and Systems, Ballasts, and Luminaires). Compliance with the provisions of the City’s Municipal Code and California Building Energy Efficiency Standards would be ensured through the City’s development review process.

Therefore, no significant nighttime light and glare impacts would occur as a result of development of the Proposed Project and no mitigation measures are necessary.

3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.
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a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

**No Impact.** The Project Site is mapped as Urban and Built-Up Land on the California Important Farmland Finder maintained by the Division of Land Resource Protection (DLRP 2017). The site is developed as a church; is not in agricultural use; and is in a built-out urban area of the City. Therefore, project development would not convert mapped farmland to nonagricultural use. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**No Impact.** The Project Site is not zoned for agricultural use, and no active Williamson Act contract\(^1\) applies to the Project Site or any areas surrounding the site. The zoning district of the Project Site is Multiple Family Residential (R-3), which does not permit agricultural uses. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act contract. Accordingly, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**No Impact.** The Project Site is zoned R-3 and is not zoned for forest land, timberland, or timberland production use. The site is developed with a church; trees onsite are ornamental landscape trees and are not cultivated for forest resources. Therefore, development of the Proposed Project would have no impact on forest land or resources and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**No Impact.** See response to Section 3.2(c), above. As substantiated in this section, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**No Impact.** See responses to Section’s 3.2(a), (b), and (c), above. As substantiated in these sections, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

---

\(^1\) Williamson Act contracts restrict the use of privately-owned land to agriculture and compatible open-space uses under contract with local governments; in exchange, the land is taxed based on actual use rather than potential market value.
3.3 AIR QUALITY

The analysis in this section is based partly on the following technical study, which is included as Appendix A to this Initial Study:


This section addresses the impacts of the Proposed Project on ambient air quality and the exposure of people, especially sensitive individuals, to unhealthful pollutant concentrations. A background discussion on the air quality regulatory setting, meteorological conditions, existing ambient air quality in the vicinity of the Project Site, and air quality modeling data can be found in Appendix A.

The primary air pollutants of concern for which ambient air quality standards (AAQS) have been established are ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), coarse inhalable particulate matter (PM₁₀), fine inhalable particulate matter (PM₂.₅), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and lead (Pb). Areas are classified under the federal and California Clean Air acts as either in attainment or nonattainment for each criteria pollutant based on whether the AAQS have been achieved. The South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB), which is managed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), is designated nonattainment for O₃, and PM₂.₅ under the California and National AAQS, nonattainment for PM₁₀ under the California AAQS, and nonattainment for lead (Los Angeles County only) under the National AAQS (CARB 2016).

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A consistency determination plays an important role in local agency project review by linking local planning and individual projects to the air quality management plan (AQMP). It fulfills the CEQA goal of informing decision makers of the environmental efforts of the project under consideration at an early enough stage to ensure that air quality concerns are fully addressed. It also provides the local agency with ongoing information as to whether they are contributing to clean air goals in the AQMP. The most recent adopted comprehensive plan is the 2016 AQMP, adopted on March 3, 2017 (see Appendix A for a description of the 2016 AQMP).

Regional growth projections are used by SCAQMD to forecast future emission levels in the SoCAB. For southern California, these regional growth projections are provided by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and are partially based on land use designations in city/county general plans. Typically, only large, regionally significant projects have the potential to affect the regional growth projections. The Proposed Project involves the demolition of a church, surface parking, and landscaping and the construction of a 50-unit residential development. The Proposed Project is not a project of statewide, regional, or areawide significance that would require intergovernmental review by SCAG under Section 15206 of the CEQA Guidelines as it would result in less than 500 dwelling units. Additionally, the average household size in the City of Los Alamitos estimated by the California Department of Finance for 2017 is 2.66 persons (CDF 2017). At full occupancy, the 50 units proposed under the project would result in an increase of
approximately 133 residents. The population of the City of Los Alamitos is forecast to increase from 11,806 people in 2015 to 12,051 in 2040 (CDR 2016), a net increase of 245 people. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not exceed regional growth projections.

Furthermore, the proposed residential land use is consistent with the City of Los Alamitos’s underlying General Plan land use designation of the Project Site, Multi-Family Residential. The project-related regional operation-phase emissions would also not exceed the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds for operation (see Table 2, Projected Peak Day Operational Emissions and Daily Criteria Values (pounds/day)).

In summary, the Proposed Project would not conflict with or interfere with implementation of the AQMP. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The following describes impacts from short-term construction activities and long-term operation of the Proposed Project.

Short-Term Construction Air Quality Impacts

Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would include demolition of the existing church and construction of 50 condominiums. Construction activities would result in the generation of air pollutants. These emissions would primarily be 1) exhaust emissions from off-road diesel-powered construction equipment; 2) dust generated by demolition, grading, earthmoving, and other construction activities; 3) exhaust emissions from on-road vehicles and 4) off-gas emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from application of asphalt, paints, and coatings.

Construction is estimated to take approximately 18 to 24 months to complete, starting in fall of 2017. Construction emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2016.3.1, based on the project’s preliminary construction information, construction schedule, and CalEEMod default assumptions. As shown in Table 1, the daily construction emissions projected for the Proposed Project would not exceed SCAQMD’s regional construction significance thresholds for construction. Therefore, air quality impacts from project-related construction phase activities would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are necessary.
Table 1  Comparison of Projected Construction Emissions and Daily Criteria Values (pounds/day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Road Diesel</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>26.76</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Road Diesel</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Trips</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>33.65</td>
<td>17.72</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Road Diesel</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Trips</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Road Diesel</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>26.16</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Trips</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>26.20</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Road Diesel</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>23.03</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor Trips</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Trips</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>18.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Road Diesel</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Trips</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Gas</td>
<td>50.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Road Diesel</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Trips</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>51.15</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Threshold (Any Phase)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Threshold?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Synectecology 2017.
Note: The CalEEMod model projects summer and winter emissions and the higher of the two values is included in the table.

Long-Term Operational Air Quality Impacts

Long-term air pollutant emissions of the Proposed Project would be generated by area sources (e.g., landscape fuel use, aerosols, and architectural coatings), mobile sources from vehicle trips, and energy use (natural gas). In accordance with the traffic projections provided in the Traffic Impact Study prepared for the Proposed Project (see Appendix I), the project is estimated to generate approximately 291 ADT (average daily trips) on a weekday. Applying the weekend trip generation rates of the Institute of Transportation Engineers...
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(ITE) Trip Generation, 9th Edition, the 50 condominiums would generate approximately 284 ADT on a Saturday and 242 ADT on a Sunday. Similarly, and applying the weekday and weekend ITE trip generation rates for church uses, the existing church is estimated to generate approximately 250 ADT on a weekday, 316 ADT on a Saturday, and 1,004 ADT on a Sunday.

Criteria air pollutant emissions for the existing and proposed conditions were modeled using CalEEMod, and are summarized in Table 2. As shown in the table, the net-increase in project-related air pollutant emissions would not exceed SCAQMD’s regional emissions thresholds for operational activities. Therefore, air quality impacts from project operation would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Table 2  Projected Peak Day Operational Emissions and Daily Criteria Values (pounds/day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Maintenance</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Products</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearth</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>25.43</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Maintenance</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Maximum Daily Emissions</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>37.05</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Existing Maximum Emissions</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Increase</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>&lt;2.40&gt;</td>
<td>19.91</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Synectecology 2017.
Note: The CalEEMod model projects summer and winter emissions and the higher of the two values is included in the table.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The SoCAB is designated nonattainment for O₃ and PM₂.₅ under the California and National AAQS, nonattainment for PM₁₀ under the California AAQS, and nonattainment for lead under the National AAQS (CARB 2016). According to SCAQMD methodology, any project that does not exceed or can be mitigated to less than the daily threshold values would not add significantly to a cumulative impact (SCAQMD 1993). Construction and operational activities associated with the Proposed Project would not result in emissions in excess of SCAQMD’s significant thresholds. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria pollutants and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are necessary.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project could expose sensitive receptors to elevated pollutant concentrations if it would cause or contribute significantly to elevated pollutant concentration levels. Localized concentrations refer to the amount of pollutant in a volume of air (ppm or µg/m³) and can be
correlated to potential health effects. The nearest sensitive land uses to the Project Site are the single-family residences along the western perimeter of the site (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph).

**Construction Impacts**

In addition to the mass daily threshold standards discussed above in Section 3.3(b), project construction has the potential to raise localized ambient pollutant concentrations. Bordering sensitive land uses include the single-family residences along the western perimeter of the Project Site. Table 3 shows the maximum daily emissions (pounds per day) generated by project-related construction activities compared with SCAQMD’s screening-level construction localized significance thresholds (LST). As shown in the table, the maximum daily NO\textsubscript{X}, CO, PM\textsubscript{10} and PM\textsubscript{2.5} emissions generated from construction-related activities would be less than their respective SCAQMD screening-level construction LSTs. Therefore, project-related construction activities would not have the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and localized construction-related impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Pollutants (lbs/day)</th>
<th>NO\textsubscript{X}</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{10}</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Onsite Emissions</td>
<td>26.76</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD 1-acre LST</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds LST?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Synectecology 2017.
Notes: LSTs are based on residential receptors within 82 feet (25 meters) in SRA 17.
In accordance with SCAQMD methodology, only on-site stationary sources and on-site mobile equipment are included in the analysis.

**Operational Impacts**

**LSTs**

Operation of the Proposed Project would not generate substantial emissions from onsite, stationary sources. The project involves the construction of 50 condominiums, and would generate minimal criteria air pollutant emissions associated with their operation. Additionally, land uses that have the potential to generate substantial stationary-source emissions would require a permit from SCAQMD—these include industrial land uses such as chemical processing and warehousing operations where substantial truck idling could occur on-site. The Proposed Project does not fall within this category of uses. Furthermore, the primary source of emissions from project operations would be due to the addition of vehicles on the roadway network. These emissions would be spread over a wide area and would not result in localized concentrations close to the Project Site. LSTs only apply to emissions, at a fixed location, including idling emissions, during both project construction and operations and are not applicable to mobile sources traveling over roadways.

In summary, it is anticipated that operation of the Proposed Project would not exceed the SCAQMD LSTs and would not have the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
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Therefore, localized impacts from operation of the Proposed Project would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Carbon Monoxide Hotspots**

Because carbon monoxide (CO) is the criteria pollutant that is produced in greatest quantities from vehicle combustion and does not readily disperse into the atmosphere, historically, long-term adherence to AAQS was typically demonstrated through an analysis of localized CO concentrations. In the past, areas of vehicle congestion had the potential to create “pockets” of CO called “hot spots.” However, the SoCAB has now been designated as an attainment area of both the state and federal CO standards, and no hot spots have been reported in the project region in more than the last five years. CO is no longer a localized pollutant of concern near roadways; therefore, CO hot spot analysis is no longer necessary.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The type of facilities that are considered to have objectionable odors include wastewater treatments plants, compost facilities, landfills, solid waste transfer stations, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, paint/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), dairy farms, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing, and food manufacturing facilities. The Proposed Project is a residential development and would not result in the types of odors generated by the aforementioned land uses.

Project construction would involve the use of heavy equipment creating exhaust pollutants from onsite earth movement and from equipment bringing concrete and other building materials to the site. With regards to nuisance odors, any air quality impacts will be confined to the immediate vicinity of the equipment itself. By the time such emissions reach any sensitive receptor sites away from the Project Site, they will be diluted to well below any level of air quality concern. An occasional “whiff” of diesel exhaust from passing equipment and trucks accessing the site from public roadways may result. Additionally, some odor would be produced from the application of asphalt, paints, and coatings. However, these odors would be low in concentration, temporary, and are not expected to affect a substantial number of people.

Therefore, odor impacts from construction and operation of the Proposed Project would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

3.4 **BIological RESOURCES**

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

**No Impact.** Sensitive biological resources are habitats or species that have been recognized by federal, state, and/or local agencies as being endangered, threatened, rare, or in decline throughout all or part of their historical distribution. The Project Site is developed with a church, surface parking, and small landscaped areas in and on the perimeter of the site. Landscape vegetation consists of trees, grass, shrubs, and forbs
(nonwoody flowering plants). Based on views of the Project Site and surrounding area from Google Earth maps and a site visit conducted by PlaceWorks personnel, there is no suitable habitat for sensitive species onsite, and no natural biological resources or communities exist on, adjacent to, or near the Project Site. Coyote Creek Channel, which passes next to the northwestern site boundary, consists of concrete bed and banks and does not support wildlife habitat. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

No Impact. Sensitive natural communities are communities that are considered rare in the region by regulatory agencies; known to provide habitat for sensitive animal or plant species; or known to be important wildlife corridors. Riparian habitats are those occurring along the banks of rivers and streams. As shown in Figure 3, Aerial Photograph, the entire Project Site is developed with a church use and no sensitive natural community is present onsite. Coyote Creek Channel, which passes next to the northwestern site boundary, consists of concrete bed and banks and thus does not support riparian habitat. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in an impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

No Impact. Wetlands are defined under the federal Clean Water Act as land that is flooded or saturated by surface water or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that normally does support, a prevalence of vegetation adapted to life in saturated soils. Wetlands include areas such as streams, swamps, marshes, and bogs. Coyote Creek Channel, which passes next to the northwestern site boundary, is mapped on the National Wetlands Mapper as riverine wetland (USFWS 2017). However, the channel consists of concrete bed and banks and therefore, does not support wetland resources such as saturated soil or wetland vegetation. Project development would not impact wetlands directly or indirectly. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. There are no corridors valuable for overland wildlife movement or migration in the City. Coyote Creek Channel (which passes next to the northwestern site boundary) and Carbon Creek pass through the City—Carbon Creek discharges into Coyote Creek Channel approximately 0.4 miles northeast of the Project Site. However, Coyote Creek Channel and Carbon Creek both consist of concrete bed and banks and do not contain valuable wildlife habitat.
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Additionally, the Project Site and surroundings are built out with urban uses and are not available for overland wildlife movement.

The Project Site does, however, include a number of ornamental trees (see Figures 3, *Aerial Photograph*, and 4, *Site Photographs*) which would be removed under the Proposed Project. Although ornamental, these trees may provide suitable habitat, including nesting habitat, for migratory birds\(^1\) under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and Section 3513 et seq, of the California Fish and Game Code. Section 3513 provides protection to the birds listed under the MBTA, essentially all native birds. Additionally, Section 3503 of the code makes it unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird. The MBTA implements the United States’ commitment to four treaties with Canada, Japan, Mexico, and Russia for the protection of shared migratory bird resources. The MBTA governs the taking, killing, possession, transportation, and importation of migratory birds, their eggs, parts, and nests. USFWS administers permits to take migratory birds in accordance with the MBTA.

The Developer would be required to comply with the MBTA by either avoiding site clearing, demolition, or grading activities during the breeding/nesting season (February 1 to September 1) or conducting a site survey for nesting birds prior to commencing such activities during the nesting season, as outlined in Mitigation Measure BIO-1. Adherence to the MBTA regulations and Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would ensure that if construction occurs during the breeding season, appropriate measures would be taken to avoid impacts to nesting birds, if any are found. Compliance with the MBTA requirements and Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would be ensured through the City’s development review process. With adherence to the MBTA requirements and Mitigation Measure BIO-1, impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

**BIO-1** Prior to the commencement of any proposed actions (e.g., site clearing, demolition, grading) during the breeding/nesting season (February 1 to August 31, as defined by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife), the monitoring biologist contracted by the project applicant shall conduct a preconstruction survey(s) to identify any active nests in and near the project area no more than three days prior to initiation of the action. If the biologist does not find any active nests that would be potentially impacted, the proposed action may proceed. However, if the biologist finds an active nest within or adjacent to the action area and determines that the nest may be impacted, the biologist shall delineate an appropriate buffer zone around the nest using temporary plastic fencing or other suitable materials, such as barricade tape and traffic cones. The buffer zone shall range from a 300- to 500-foot radius at the discretion of the biologist and in coordination with the construction contractor. Only specified activities (if any) approved by the qualified biologist in coordination with the construction contractor shall take place within the buffer zone until the nest is vacated. Activities that may be prohibited within the buffer zone by the biologist may include but not be limited to grading and tree clearing. Once the nest is no longer active and upon final

---

\(^1\) Migratory birds include all native birds in the United States, as listed in the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 50, Section 10.13 (List of Migratory Birds).
determination by the biologist, the proposed action may proceed within the buffer zone. Any active nests observed during the survey shall be mapped on a recent aerial photograph, including documentation of GPS coordinates.

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

**No Impact.** The Project Site includes a number of ornamental trees along the site boundaries and internal to the site (see Figures 3 and 4), all of which would be removed under the Proposed Project. Chapter 12.24 (City Parkway Trees) of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code protects trees in City parkways. The trees onsite are on private property and not on or within a City parkway. Additionally, although project development would include the removal of all existing trees within the Project Site (approximately 20 trees), it would provide a greater number of trees (approximately 155 new trees) than currently exist. Therefore, project development would not conflict with the City’s tree ordinance and no significant impacts would occur. No mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**No Impact.** The Project Site is in the plan area of the OCTA [Orange County Transportation Authority] M2 Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP), which encompasses all of Orange County. The NCCP/HCP, finalized by the OCTA Board of Directors in November 2016, involves acquisition and conservation and/or enhancement of natural habitat as mitigation for impacts to biological resources from freeway construction and widening projects (OCTA 2017; OCTA 2014). The Project Site (as well as its surroundings) is not natural habitat and is therefore not a candidate area for conservation and/or enhancement under the NCCP/HCP. Therefore, project development would not conflict with the NCCP/HCP. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### 3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

**No Impact.** Section 15064.5 defines historic resources as resources listed or determined to be eligible for listing by the State Historical Resources Commission, a local register of historical resources, or the lead agency. Generally, a resource is considered “historically significant” if it meets one of the following criteria:

i) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;

ii) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

iii) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values;
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iv) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

As shown in Figures 3, *Aerial Photograph*, and 4, *Site Photographs*, the Project Site is currently developed with the Cottonwood Church. The site contains a two-story building that is used for church functions, as well as various hardscape and landscape improvements. Project development would involve demolition of the church building and associated hardscape improvements. The church building was built between 1983 and 1989, based on historic aerial photographs (Stantec 2017). Buildings less than 45 years old are typically not evaluated for historical significance in cultural resources investigations. The state-recommended threshold under which buildings may be considered historic resources is a construction age of 50 years (California Code of Regulations, §4852.d.2). Additionally, the existing church building does not exhibit any unique architectural style or features; it is a common building design found throughout southern California. Furthermore, the Project Site and existing church are not identified on any federal, state, or local historic registers—National Register of Historic Places; California State Historical Landmarks and Points of Historical Interest; and City of Los Alamitos local historic resources. Therefore, no impact to historical resources would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As shown in Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*, the Project Site is developed with a church and its associated improvements. Prior to the church use, the site was occupied with industrial uses. The Project Site is in a highly-urbanized area of the City and is surrounded by a mix of residential, commercial, and office uses. Given the highly-disturbed condition of the Project Site and its surroundings, the potential for development of the Proposed Project to impact an unidentified archeological or paleontological resource is considered extremely low. Additionally, the Project Site has already been subject to similar construction and ground-disturbing activities that would occur under the Proposed Project. No archaeological or paleontological resources were identified during prior development of the Project Site, and it is unlikely that any such resources would be uncovered or affected during project-related grading and construction activities. Furthermore, the Project Site and immediate surroundings are not recognized as an area of having the potential for subsurface archeological or paleontological resources. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** See response to Section 3.5(b), above. Additionally, the Project Site is generally flat—there are no unique geological features onsite or adjacent to or surrounding the Project Site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** There are no known human remains or cemeteries on or near the Project Site. The Project Site is in a highly-urbanized area of the City; has already been disturbed and is developed with a church use; and has already been subject to similar construction and ground-disturbing activities.
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associated with the Proposed Project. Therefore, the likelihood that human remains may be discovered during site clearing and grading activities is considered extremely low. However, development of the Proposed Project would involve ground-disturbing activities that could have the potential to disturb previously undiscovered subsurface human remains, if any exist. For example, the Proposed Project could involve deeper excavation than previously performed in certain areas of the Project Site.

In the unlikely event that human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that disturbance of the site shall remain halted until the Los Angeles Coroner has conducted an investigation into the circumstances, manner, and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. The coroner is required to make a determination within two working days of notification of the discovery of the human remains. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority or has reason to believe the human remains to be those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission.

Compliance with existing law regarding the discovery of human remains would reduce potential impacts to human remains to less than significant levels. No mitigation measures are necessary.

3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The analysis in this section is based partly on the following technical studies, which are included as Appendices B and F to this Initial Study:

- Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan, Alan Short, November 15, 2016. (Appendix F)

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

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

No Impact. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act was passed in 1972 to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting to structures for human occupancy. Surface rupture is the most easily avoided seismic hazard. Fault rupture generally occurs within 50 feet of an active fault line and is limited to the immediate area of the fault zone where the fault breaks along the surface (CGS 2007). The main purpose of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act is to prevent construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface of active faults, in order to minimize the hazard of surface rupture of a fault to people and habitable buildings. Before cities and counties can permit development within Alquist-Priolo
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Earthquake Fault Zones, geologic investigations are required to show that the proposed development site is not threatened by surface rupture from future earthquakes.

There are no mapped active faults or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones on or within proximity of the Project Site. The nearest active faults to the site are three fault traces in the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone at approximately 3.8 miles to the southwest; and two segments of the Puente Hills Fault at approximately 6 and 7.3 miles to the north/northwest, respectively. Active earthquake faults are faults where surface rupture has occurred within the last 11,000 years. The nearest Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone to the Project Site is approximately 3.7 miles to the southwest along the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone. Due to the distance to these faults, the potential for surface rupture of a fault onsite is considered very low. Therefore, project development would not subject people or structures to hazards arising from surface rupture of a known active fault. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. The most significant geologic hazard to the design life of the Proposed Project is the potential for moderate to strong ground shaking resulting from earthquakes generated on the faults in seismically active southern California. As with other areas in southern California, it is anticipated that the Project Site will likely be subject to strong ground shaking due to earthquakes on nearby faults. The estimated peak ground acceleration onsite with a two percent chance of exceedance in 50 years – that is, an average return period of 2,475 years – is 0.566g, where g is the acceleration of gravity. An earthquake affecting the Project Site with a probability of exceedance of two percent in 50 years has a magnitude of 6.58 and an average distance of 8.4 miles from the site.

Ground acceleration of 0.566g correlates with intensity VIII on the Modified Mercalli Intensity (MMI) Scale (Wald et. al. 1999), a subjective scale of how earthquakes are felt by people and the effects of earthquakes on buildings. The MMI Scale is a 12-point scale where Intensity I earthquakes are generally not felt by people; in Intensity XII earthquakes damage is total, and objects are thrown into the air. In an intensity VIII earthquake, damage is slight in specially-designed structures; considerable damage occurs in ordinary=substantial buildings with partial collapse; and damage is great in poorly=built structures. Chimneys, factory stacks, columns, monuments, and walls fall, and heavy furniture is overturned (USGS 2017).

However, the Project Site is not at a greater risk of seismic activity or impacts than other sites in southern California. Seismic shaking is a risk throughout southern California. Additionally, the state regulates development in California through a variety of tools that reduce hazards from earthquakes and other geologic hazards. The California Building Code (CBC; California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2), adopted by reference in Chapter 15.04 (California Building Code) of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code, contains provisions to safeguard against major structural failures or loss of life caused by earthquakes or other geologic hazards. The CBC contains provisions for earthquake safety based on factors including occupancy type, the types of soil and rock onsite, and the strength of ground motion with specified
probability of occurring at the site. Project development would be required to adhere to the provisions of the CBC, which are imposed on project developments by the City’s Development Services Department during the building plan check and development review process.

Furthermore, even when CEQA review is not required, the City requires preparation of geotechnical reports for construction projects prior to issuing development permits and imposes the recommended design parameters of the report as conditions of approval. In this case, the Geotechnical Report prepared for the Proposed Project (see Appendix B) includes seismic design parameters pursuant to the CBC (as well as other design parameters), which will be included as conditions of approval. Design parameters outlined in the Geotechnical Report include but are not limited to (a complete and detailed list of the recommended design parameters is included in Section 6 [Recommendations] of the Geotechnical Report):

- **Pre-Grade Meeting and Geotechnical Observation.** Recommends that a geotechnical consultant be retained to provide soil engineering and engineering geologic services during site grading and foundation construction.

- **Ground Preparation.** Recommends that all existing artificial fill soils be removed below the proposed residential buildings, retaining walls, and pavement and replaced as engineered fill.

- **Seismic Design Parameters.** Outlines the seismic design parameters from the 2016 CBC that project development will be required to implement.

- **Foundation System for Habitable Structures.** Outlines a number of design parameters to assist the project’s structural engineer to design post-tensioned slab foundation system to support the proposed residential structures at the site.

Incorporation of the design parameters provided in the Geotechnical Report would reduce hazards from strong seismic ground shaking. Project compliance with the design parameters of the Geotechnical Report would be ensured through the City’s building plan check and development review process.

In summary, implementation of the design parameters outlined in the Geotechnical Report, as required by Mitigation Measures GEO-1, and compliance with the provisions of the CBC would reduce seismic-related ground failure impacts to less than significant levels.

**Mitigation Measure**

GEO-1 Prior to the issuance of grading and/or building permits, the project applicant shall demonstrate to the City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department that all design parameters (including those listed as “recommended”) provided in the project’s Geotechnical Report prepared by Albus-Keefe & Associates and dated May 19, 2017 (incorporated herein by this reference), have been incorporated into the project design and grading plans. During grading and construction activities, the City’s Development Services Department staff shall
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verify that all such activities are implemented in accordance with the design parameters of the Geotechnical Report.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** Liquefaction refers to loose, saturated sand or silt deposits that behave as a liquid and lose their load supporting capability when strongly shaken. Loose granular soils and silts that are saturated by relatively shallow groundwater are susceptible to liquefaction.

The Geotechnical Report prepared for the Proposed Project (see Appendix B) included a liquefaction analysis using a peak ground acceleration of 0.566g, the same identified above in Section 3.6(a)(ii). As noted in the Geotechnical Report, the maximum liquefaction-induced settlement onsite is estimated at 4.5 to 4.6 inches. Differential seismic settlement would likely not exceed half of the total settlement or approximately 2.3 inches over 30 feet. Potential lateral spreading onsite, that is, downslope movement of surface sediment due to liquefaction in a subsurface layer, is estimated at 0.3 to 0.4 feet.

The Geotechnical Report includes design parameters for foundation design to withstand the estimated total and differential seismic settlements onsite (4.6 and 2.3 inches, respectively), and lateral spreading (0.4 feet) estimated to occur onsite. Project site grading, design, and construction would conform with the design parameters of the Geotechnical Report—compliance with the design parameters would be ensured through the City’s building plan check and development review process.

Therefore, implementation of the design parameters outlined in the Geotechnical Report, as required by Mitigation Measures GEO-1, would reduce seismic-related ground failure impacts to less than significant levels.

iv) Landslides?

**No Impact.** Landslides are the downslope movement of geologic materials. Slope failures in the form of landslides are common during strong seismic shaking in areas of steep hills. Landslides are not expected to occur at the Project Site, since the site is relatively flat and not within a landslide hazard area as identified by the California Geologic Survey, which are areas having potential for seismic slope instability. Therefore, geologic hazards associated with landsliding are not anticipated at the site. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Erosion is the movement of rock and soil from place to place, and is a natural process. Common agents of erosion in the project region include wind and flowing water. Significant erosion typically occurs on steep slopes where stormwater and high winds can carry topsoil down hillsides. Erosion can be increased greatly by earth-moving activities if erosion control measures are not used.

Following is a discussion of the potential erosion impacts resulting from the Proposed Project’s construction and operational phases.
3. Environmental Analysis

Construction Phase

Project development would involve excavation, grading, and construction activities that would disturb soil and leave exposed soil on the ground surface. Common means of soil erosion from construction sites include water, wind, and being tracked offsite by vehicles. These activities could result in soil erosion. However, development of the Project Site is subject to local and state codes and requirements for erosion control and grading during construction. For example, project development is required to comply with standard regulations, including South Coast Air Quality Management District Rules 402 and 403, which would reduce construction erosion impacts. Rule 403 requires that fugitive dust be controlled with best available control measures so that the presence of such dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emissions source. Rule 402 requires dust suppression techniques be implemented to prevent dust and soil erosion from creating a nuisance offsite. For example, as outlined in Table 1 (Best Available Control Measures) of Rule 403, control measures to reduce erosion during grading and construction activities include stabilizing backfilling materials when not actively handling, stabilizing soils during clearing and grubbing activities, and stabilizing soils during and after cut-and-fill activities.

Additionally, the Construction General Permit (CGP) issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), effective July 17, 2012, regulates construction activities to minimize water pollution, including sediment risk from construction activities to receiving waters. The proposed improvements at the Project Site would be subject to the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting regulations, including the development and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which is further discussed in Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality. The Proposed Project’s construction contractor would be required to prepare and implement a SWPPP and associated best management practices (BMPs) in compliance with the CGP during grading and construction. For example, as outlined in Section 3.9, types of BMPs that are incorporated in SWPPPs and would help minimize impacts from soil erosion include:

- **Erosion controls:** cover and/or bind soil surface, to prevent soil particles from being detached and transported by water or wind. Erosion control BMPs include mulch, soil binders, and mats.

- **Sediment controls:** Filter out soil particles that have been detached and transported in water. Sediment control BMPs include barriers, and cleaning measures such as street sweeping.

- **Tracking controls:** Tracking control BMPs minimize the tracking of soil offsite by vehicles; for instance, stabilizing construction roadways and entrances/exits.

Adherence to the BMPs in the SWPPP and adherence with local and state codes and requirements for erosion control and grading during construction would reduce, prevent, or minimize soil erosion from project-related grading and construction activities. Therefore, soil erosion impacts from project-related grading and construction activities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Operation Phase

The Project Site is in a highly-urbanized area of the City and is flat. After project completion, the Project Site would be developed with residential uses, access and circulation improvements, and landscape improvements.
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and would not contain exposed or bare soil. In addition, a drip irrigation system would be implemented and designed to minimize the potential for soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Upon project completion, the potential for soil erosion or the loss of topsoil would be expected to be extremely low.

In accordance with the Orange County Drainage Area Master Plan and the City’s local implementation plans, a Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) was prepared for the Proposed Project (see Appendix F). The Preliminary WQMP identified sediment as one of the Pollutants of Concern for the project. BMPs specified for the project in the WQMP, which would minimize sediment pollution of stormwater, include a proprietary vegetated biotreatment system; common area landscape management; and use of efficient irrigation systems and landscape design, water conservation, and smart controllers. BMPs are discussed further in Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality. Implementation of the BMPs would help ensure that soil erosion would not occur under the operation phase of the Proposed Project—BMP implementation would be ensured through the City’s building plan check and development review process.

Therefore, soil erosion impacts from the Proposed Project’s operation phase would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. Hazards from liquefaction and lateral spreading are addressed above in Section 3.6(a)(iii), and landslide hazards are addressed above in Section 3.6(a)(iv). As concluded in these sections, no significant landslide impact would occur; and no impacts from liquefaction, seismic settlement, and lateral spreading would be less than significant after implementation of the recommended design parameters in the Geotechnical Report prepared for the Proposed Project (see Appendix B), as required by Mitigation Measures GEO-1.

Subsurface Site Soils

The Geotechnical Report included two exploratory borings to depths of about 21.5 and 51.5 feet below ground surface (bgs). The Project Site was found to be underlain by artificial fill – consisting of silty sand that is damp, loose to medium dense and contains scattered gravel with silts – to depths of approximately 3.5 to 5.5 feet bgs. The artificial fill is underlain by alluvium consisting of fine-grained soils (clayey silt and silty clay) to depths of approximately 27 to 31.5 feet bgs. These materials were typically moist to very moist and soft to medium stiff. Below this fine-grained unit are interbedded fine- and coarse-grained soils consisting of sands, silty sands, sandy silts, silt and silty clay to the maximum depth of exploration (51.5 feet). Groundwater was found at approximately 20 feet bgs.

Subsidence

The major cause of ground subsidence is the excessive withdrawal of groundwater. The Project Site is over the Main Orange County Groundwater Basin (Basin). The Orange County Water District manages groundwater levels in the Basin within a specified operating range pursuant to state law. Ground water elevations over the Basin rise and fall within a range of a few inches, correlated with groundwater levels and
3. Environmental Analysis

changes in Basin groundwater storage. Subsidence due to changes in groundwater conditions in the Basin is variable within a small range and does not show a pattern of widespread irreversible permanent lowering of the ground surface (OCWD 2015).

Additionally, project development would be implemented in accordance with the design parameters of the Geotechnical Report, which includes removal of all existing artificial fill soils and replacing the removed soil with engineered fill. With implementation of the design parameters of the Geotechnical Report, which would be ensured through the City’s building plan check and development review process, project development would not subject people or structures to substantial hazards arising from ground subsidence. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the design parameters in the Geotechnical Report, as required by Mitigation Measures GEO-1.

Collapsible Soils
Collapsible soils shrink upon being wetted and/or being subject to a load. The Geotechnical Report concluded that artificial fill soils onsite are unsuitable for supporting the proposed structures. As noted above, project development would be implemented in accordance with the design parameters of Geotechnical Report, which includes removal of all existing artificial fill soils and replacing the removed soil with engineered fill. With implementation of the design parameters of the Geotechnical Report, which would be ensured through the City’s building plan check and development review process, project development would not expose people or structures to substantial hazards arising from collapsible soils. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the design parameters in the Geotechnical Report, as required by Mitigation Measures GEO-1.

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

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. Expansive soils shrink or swell as the moisture content decreases or increases; the shrinking or swelling can shift, crack, or break structures built on such soils. Site soils are expected to have very low to medium expansion potential. Adverse effects of expansive soils can readily be mitigated using post-tension slab foundations and properly detailed flatwork. The Geotechnical Report prepared for the Proposed Project (see Appendix B) contains appropriate design parameters for foundation and flatwork design. Project design and construction would be implemented in accordance with the recommended design parameters of the Geotechnical Report; therefore, project development would not expose people or structures to substantial hazards from expansive soils. Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the design parameters in the Geotechnical Report, as required by Mitigation Measures GEO-1.

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

No Impact. The Proposed Project would require connection to existing sewers main lines and service lines, which are currently available along Sausalito Street. The project would not involve the use of septic tanks or
other alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### 3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The analysis in this section is based partly on the following technical study, which is included as Appendix A to this Initial Study:


Scientists have concluded that human activities are contributing to global climate change by adding large amounts of heat-trapping gases, known as greenhouse gases (GHGs), into the atmosphere. The primary source of these GHG is fossil fuel use. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has identified four major GHGs—water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO$_2$), methane (CH$_4$), and ozone (O$_3$)—that are the likely cause of an increase in global average temperatures observed within the 20th and 21st centuries. Other GHG identified by the IPCC that contribute to global warming to a lesser extent include nitrous oxide (N$_2$O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF$_6$), hydro fluorocarbons, per fluorocarbons, and chlorofluorocarbons.$^{1,2}$

This section analyzes the Proposed Project’s contribution to global climate change impacts in California through an analysis of project-related GHG emissions. Information on manufacture of cement, steel, and other “life cycle” emissions that would occur as a result of the project are not applicable and are not included in the analysis.$^3$

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

---

$^1$ Water vapor (H$_2$O) is the strongest GHG and the most variable in its phases (vapor, cloud droplets, ice crystals). However, water vapor is not considered a pollutant, but part of the feedback loop rather than a primary cause of change.

$^2$ Black carbon contributes to climate change both directly, by absorbing sunlight, and indirectly, by depositing on snow (making it melt faster) and by interacting with clouds and affecting cloud formation. Black carbon is the most strongly light-absorbing component of PM emitted from burning fuels. Reducing black carbon emissions globally can have immediate economic, climate, and public health benefits. California has been an international leader in reducing emissions of black carbon, with close to 95 percent control expected by 2020 due to existing programs that target reducing PM from diesel engines and burning activities (CARB 2017a). However, state and national GHG inventories do not yet include black carbon due to ongoing work resolving the precise global warming potential of black carbon. Guidance for CEQA documents does not yet include black carbon.

$^3$ Life cycle emissions include indirect emissions associated with materials manufacture. However, these indirect emissions involve numerous parties, each of which is responsible for GHG emissions of their particular activity. The California Resources Agency, in adopting the CEQA Guidelines Amendments on GHG emissions found that life cycle analysis was not warranted for project-specific CEQA analysis in most situations, for a variety of reasons, including lack of control over some sources, and the possibility of double-counting emissions (see Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action, December 2009). Because the amount of materials consumed during the operation or construction of the Proposed Project is not known, the origin of the raw materials purchased is not known, and manufacturing information for those raw materials is also not known, calculation of life cycle emissions would be speculative. A life-cycle analysis is not warranted (OPR 2008).
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Global climate change is not confined to a particular project area and is generally accepted as the consequence of global industrialization over the last 200 years. A typical project, even a very large one, does not generate enough greenhouse gas emissions on its own to influence global climate change significantly; hence, the issue of global climate change is, by definition, a cumulative environmental impact.

The Proposed Project would generate GHG emissions from vehicle trips generated by the project, energy use (indirectly from purchased electricity use and directly through fuel consumed for building heating), area sources (e.g., equipment used onsite, consumer products, coatings), water/wastewater generation, and waste disposal. Annual GHG emissions were calculated for construction and operation of the Proposed Project. Annual average construction emissions were amortized over 30 years and included in the emissions inventory to account for GHG emissions from the construction phase of the Proposed Project. Project-related operational emissions (including construction emissions amortized over 30 years) are shown in Table 4. As shown in the table, the Proposed Project at buildout would result in a net-increase of 83.73 metric tons of carbon dioxide-equivalent (MTCO<sub>2</sub>e) emissions per year. The total increase of GHG emissions from the Proposed Project would not exceed the SCAQMD’s proposed bright-line screening threshold of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e, and the Proposed Project’s cumulative contribution to GHG emissions is less than significant. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4 Yearly Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions (MTCO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;e/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Land Use Sub-Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Amortization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yearly Emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Yearly Emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Proposed Screening Threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Threshold?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Synectecology 2017.

<sup>1</sup> Because different gases have different conversion factors, totals may not equal.
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

No Impact. Applicable plans adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions include the California Air Resources Board’s (CARB) Scoping Plan and the Southern California Association of Governments’ (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). A consistency analysis of the Proposed Project with these plans is presented below.

**CARB Scoping Plan**

The California Air Resources Board’s (CARB’s) Scoping Plan is California’s GHG reduction strategy to achieve the state’s GHG emissions reduction target. In accordance with AB 32, CARB developed the 2008 Scoping Plan to outline the state’s strategy to achieve 1990 level emissions by year 2020. The CARB Scoping Plan is applicable to state agencies and is not directly applicable to cities/counties and individual projects. Nonetheless, the Scoping Plan has been the primary tool that is used to develop performance-based and efficiency-based CEQA criteria and GHG reduction targets for climate action planning efforts. On January 20, 2017, CARB released the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan to address the new interim GHG emissions target under Senate Bill 32, which requires the state to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 (CARB 2017b). The 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan provides the strategies for the state to meet the 2030 GHG reduction target as established under SB 32.

Statewide strategies to reduce GHG emissions in the 2017 Scoping Plan include implementing Senate Bill 350, which expands the Renewables Portfolio Standard to 50 percent by 2030 and doubles energy efficiency savings; expanding the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to 18 percent by 2030; implementing the Mobile Source Strategy to deploy zero-electric vehicle buses and trucks; implementation of the Sustainable Freight Action Plan; implementation of the Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Reduction Strategy, which reduces methane and hydrofluorocarbons 40 percent below 2013 levels by 2030 and black carbon emissions 50 percent below 2013 levels by 2030; continuing to implement Senate Bill 375; creation of a post-2020 Cap-and-Trade Program; establishing a new regulation to reduce GHG emissions from the refinery sector by 20 percent; and development of an Integrated Natural and Working Lands Action Plan to secure California’s land base as a net carbon sink (CARB 2017b).

The Proposed Project’s GHG emissions would be reduced from compliance with statewide measures that have been adopted since AB 32. As an example, new buildings, like those constructed as a part of the proposed project, are required to comply with the 2016 Building Energy Efficiency Standards and 2016 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). Additionally, as noted in Section 1.3.8, Green Building and Sustainability, some of the green building practices/features that would be incorporated into the Proposed Project are tankless water heaters; low flow faucets and toilets; drip irrigation; Energy Star appliances; LED lighting; waste diversion from construction (construction waste recycling); recycling of the asphalt and building demolition, where feasible; onsite stormwater retention; an electric-vehicle charging station; and bicycle racks. Other green building practices/features would be considered by the City as the Proposed Project is refined during the design and construction phase. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not
interfere or conflict with implementation of CARB’s Scoping Plan. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**SCAG’s Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy**

In addition to AB 32, the California legislature passed Senate Bill (SB) 375 to connect regional transportation planning to land use decisions made at a local level. SB 375 requires the metropolitan planning organizations to prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in their regional transportation plans to achieve the per capita GHG reduction targets. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) adopted the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) in April 2016 pursuant to the requirements of SB 375. The overarching strategy in the 2016 RTP/SCS is to provide a plan that allows the southern California region to grow in more compact communities in existing urban areas; provide neighborhoods with efficient and plentiful public transit and abundant and safe opportunities to walk, bike, and pursue other forms of active transportation; and preserve more of the region’s remaining natural lands (SCAG 2016). The SCS does not require that local general plans, specific plans, or zoning be consistent with the 2016 RTP/SCS, but provides incentives for consistency for governments and developers.

The Proposed Project is consistent with the underlying General Plan land use designation of the Project Site, which permits residential development. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with SCAG’s regional goals of providing infill housing and integrating land uses near major transportation corridors and adding residential land uses to an area surrounded by commercial development. The RTP/SCS designates High-Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs), that is, areas within 0.5 mile of rail transit service or bus service where lines have peak headways of less than 15 minutes. In 2014 there were over 30,700 jobs in an approximately 16-square mile area (four miles on a side) centered on the Project Site (USCB 2017). The Project Site is at the junction of two High Quality Transit Areas for planned year 2040 – one extending east-west between central Orange County and the City of Long Beach on Katella Avenue and Willow Street; and one extending two miles north from Katella Avenue on Los Alamitos Boulevard and Norwalk Boulevard to Lincoln Avenue, and then east on Lincoln Avenue to north-central Orange County (SCAG 2017).

In addition, the Proposed Project would develop housing in a jobs-rich area; the jobs-housing ratio in the City of Los Alamitos is forecast to increase from a jobs-rich 3.22 in 2013 to an even more jobs-rich 3.78 in 2035 (City of Los Alamitos 2014a). Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with and would not interfere with SCAG’s ability to implement the regional goals and strategies outlined in the 2016 RTP/SCS. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

The information in this section is based partly on the following technical reports, which are included as Appendices C, D, and E to this Initial Study:

- *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment*, Stantec Consulting Services, Inc., May 5, 2017. (Appendix C)
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- Approval of Draft Final Response Plan, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, April 24, 2017. (Appendix E)

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Following is a discussion of the potential hazards impacts that could arise from the Proposed Project's construction and operational phases.

**Project Operation**

Operation of the proposed residences would involve the use of small amounts of hazardous materials, such as cleansers, paints, fertilizers, and pesticides for cleaning and maintenance purposes. However, residential uses are not associated with uses that use, generate, store, or transport large quantities of hazardous materials; such uses generally include manufacturing, industrial, medical (e.g., hospital), and other similar uses. Additionally, the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials would be governed by existing regulations of several agencies, including the US Environmental Protection Agency, US Department of Transportation, California Division of Occupational Safety and Health, Orange County Environmental Health, and Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA).¹ Compliance with applicable laws and regulations governing the use, storage, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials would ensure that all potentially hazardous materials are used and handled in an appropriate manner and would minimize the potential for safety impacts.

The Proposed Project would also be constructed and operated with strict adherence to all emergency response plan requirements set forth by the Orange County Environmental Health and OCFA. Furthermore, residents of Los Alamitos (including those of the Proposed Project) have access to the City's Household Hazardous Waste Collection curbside service. Residents simply contact the City’s household hazardous waste specialists (Consolidated Disposal Service) to schedule the pickup of household hazardous waste (e.g., electronics, paint, cleaners, aerosol cans, motor oil, antifreeze, batteries, pesticides, fluorescent light bulbs).

Therefore, substantial hazards to the public or the environment arising from the routine use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials during long-term operation of the Proposed Project would not occur. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Project Construction**

Project-related construction activities would involve the use of larger amounts of hazardous materials than would project operation. Construction activities would include the use of materials such as fuels, lubricants, and greases in construction equipment and coatings used in construction. However, the materials used would not be in such quantities or stored in such a manner as to pose a significant safety hazard. These activities

---

¹ OC Environmental Health is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for most of Orange County including the City of Los Alamitos; the Certified Unified Program coordinates and makes consistent enforcement of several state and federal regulations governing hazardous materials.
would also be short term or one time in nature, and would cease upon completion of the Proposed Project's construction phase. Project construction workers would also be trained in safe handling and hazardous materials use.

Additionally, as with project operation, the use, storage, transport, and disposal of construction-related hazardous materials would be required to conform to existing laws and regulations. Compliance with applicable laws and regulations governing the use, storage, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials would ensure that all potentially hazardous materials are used and handled in an appropriate manner and would minimize the potential for safety impacts. For example, all spills or leakage of petroleum products during construction activities are required to be immediately contained, the hazardous material identified, and the material remediated in compliance with applicable state and local regulations for the cleanup and disposal of that contaminant. All contaminated waste would be required to be collected and disposed of at an appropriately licensed disposal or treatment facility.

Furthermore, strict adherence to all emergency response plan requirements set forth by OC Environmental Health and OCFA would be required through the duration of the project construction phase. Therefore, hazards to the public or the environment arising from the routine use of hazardous materials during project construction would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** Following is a discussion of the potential hazards impacts that could arise through the accidental release of hazardous materials from the Proposed Project’s construction and operational phases, as well from existing site materials onsite.

**Hazardous Materials Associated with Project Construction and Operation**

See response to Section 3.8(a), above. As concluded in this section, hazards to the public or the environment arising from the routine use of hazardous materials during project operation and construction phases would less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary. Additionally, the Proposed Project consists of the development of residential uses, which would not generate air toxics requiring an SCAMQD permit.

**Hazardous Materials Onsite**

As shown in Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*, and 4, *Aerial Photograph*, the Project Site is developed with a two-story building and various hardscape improvements associated with existing church use. Development of the Proposed Project includes demolition of the buildings and hardscape improvements (site features to be demolished and removed are shown in Figure 3 and Figures 4a and 4b, *Site Photographs*). Neither the building or related site improvements to be demolished are associated with or contain hazardous materials. Additionally, any site materials demolished (e.g., asphalt, concrete) would either be reused onsite for development of the Proposed Project’s site improvements (e.g., drive aisles, walkways), or hauled offsite to
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the appropriate disposal or recycling facility and in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations associated with the transport and disposal of hazardous and nonhazardous materials.

However, soil, soil vapor, and groundwater contamination – all above regulatory action levels for residential land use – were detected under the Project Site during various site assessments that were conducted for the site (see Appendix C). In response to the findings of the site assessments, Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. (Stantec) prepared a Draft Final Response Plan (Response Plan; see Appendix D), which was submitted to the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWQCB) for review and approval. Upon review, SARWQCB approved the Response Plan for remediation on April 24, 2017 (see Appendix E for approval letter from SARWQCB). The Response Plan requires excavation of contaminated soil; further assessment, and remediation as needed of groundwater; and installation of soil vapor barriers under specific site structures. The Response Plan would be carried out under SARWQCB oversight; the Developer is also required to inform SARWQCB prior to the commencement of any site activities (see Appendix E). Site assessments conducted for the Project Site and the Response Plan are discussed further in Section 3.8.d, below. As concluded in 3.8.d, impacts would be less than significant after implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-4.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Two schools are within one-quarter mile of the Project Site: Los Alamitos High School at approximately 900 feet to the east, and Oak Middle School at approximately 800 feet to the south. As noted in Section 3.8(a), above, project operation would not emit hazardous substances or hazardous wastes in quantities posing substantial hazards to the public or the environment. Additionally, the use of hazardous materials during the project's construction phase would not be in such quantities or stored in such a manner as to pose a significant safety hazard. These activities would also be short term or one time in nature, and would cease upon completion of the Proposed Project's construction phase. The use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials would also be required to conform to existing laws and regulations.

Furthermore, the transport of any construction-related hazardous materials would generally occur along selected roadways, including Los Alamitos Boulevard, Cerritos Avenue, and Katella Avenue, all of which are designated truck routes in Figure 5 (Truck Routes) of the Mobility and Circulation Element of the City’s General Plan. Sausalito Street, which forms the southern Project Site boundary and provides direct access to the site, would also be used for transporting construction materials. The transport of such materials would not occur along or around the streets that abut or surround the school sites.

Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no migration measures are necessary.
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d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. Per the database search conducted as a part of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prepared by Stantec for the Project Site (see Appendix C), the site is listed on the California Geotracker Spills Leaks, Investigation, and Cleanups (SLIC) database, and on the No Further Remedial Action Planned Site of the Federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS NFRAP). As described in the Phase I ESA, various site investigations and assessments were conducted for the Project Site by Stantec from 2014 to 2016. Following is a discussion of the site assessments and the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of these assessments.

Previous Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (2014)

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was completed by Stantec in 2014 (see Appendix C). Per the Phase I ESA, Velsicol Chemical Company (Velsicol) occupied the Project Site and the adjacent property to the east (3342 Cerritos Avenue) from the late 1940’s up to the 1960’s. Velsicol reportedly manufactured pesticides and, based on the historic aerial photographs, the business facility had numerous above ground storage tanks (ASTs) and operation buildings onsite. The majority of the Velsicol operations took place on the adjacent property to the east.

Upon Velsicol vacating the Project Site in the 1960s, California Batching Equipment (CBE) occupied the site from the 1960s to 1980s, as well as the property to the east. Per the Phase I ESA, CBE manufactured conveyor belt systems and other heavy equipment. Both operations reportedly used and stored chemical and petroleum hydrocarbons. Stantec identified these facilities as recognized environmental conditions (RECs) and recommended further assessment to evaluate potential impacts that could affect residential development onsite, as well as uses surrounding the Project Site.

Phase II Subsurface Investigation (2014)

To address the identified RECs in the Phase I ESA, borings were drilled in November 2014 and soil, soil vapor, and groundwater samples were obtained. The samples were tested for total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), pesticides, and methane. Following is a discussion of the results of the Phase II Subsurface Investigation.

Soil Testing Results

TPH in the gasoline range (TPHg), diesel range (TPHd), and oil range (TPHo) were present in soil samples taken along the eastern portion of the Project Site. The detected concentrations of TPHd and TPHo were at levels exceeding typical regulatory action levels for residential use imposed by Orange County Environmental Health of 100 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) and 500 mg/kg, respectively. In addition, the detected concentrations of TPHd and TPHo were above maximum soil screening levels above drinking water aquifers (<20 feet) designated by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. No volatile organic compounds (VOCs) were detected in soil associated with these TPH detections.
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**Soil Vapor Testing Results**

The results of soil vapor sampling indicated concentrations of TPHg, benzene, and ethylbenzene at maximum concentrations of 16,000 micrograms per liter (µg/L), 20 µg/L, and 40 µg/L, respectively. The detected concentrations of benzene and ethylbenzene along the eastern property line exceed their respective California Human Health Screening Levels (CHHSLs) and United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) regional screening levels (RSLs) for residential uses. Methane was detected at concentrations ranging from 1,300 parts per million by volume (ppmV) to a maximum concentration of 120,000 ppmV in the northeastern portion of the site. The peak levels of methane are in excess of levels of concern to residential development published by OCFA.

**Groundwater Testing Results**

Limited groundwater sampling was performed at two locations onsite. TPHg was detected in one sample at 0.38 µg/L concentration, which is well below the California Maximum Contaminant Levels (CA MCL) for drinking water set at 100 µg/L. No VOCs or pesticides were reported in these two groundwater samples.

**Additional Phase II Subsurface Investigation (2015)**

Subsequent to the Phase II Subsurface Investigation conducted in 2014, further investigation of the detected impacts to soil, soil vapor, and groundwater was conducted in 2015. The assessment involved the drilling and sampling of 12 additional soil borings and 3 soil vapor probes onsite in June of 2015. Following is a discussion of the results of the additional Phase II Subsurface Investigation.

**Soil Testing Results**

The assessment characterized impact to soil in three specific locations on the Project Site. TPHd and TPHo were detected at levels above assumed regulatory cleanup levels to depths less than 5 feet below ground surface (bgs). TPHg was also detected and extends to groundwater at a depth of approximately 12 feet bgs. Low concentrations of VOCs also appear to exist with this detected TPH impact, indicating a relatively old and degraded source of contamination.

**Soil Vapor Testing Results**

Soil vapor samples collected below the church building indicated no VOCs at concentrations above the USEPA’s RSLs or CHHSLs for residential uses. In addition, no methane was detected below the church building. To date, VOCs at levels above the RSLs and CHHSLs have been detected only along the eastern property line in in certain areas of the site. Elevated levels of methane were also detected in association with elevated TPH in the northern and southeast portions of the Project Site.

**Groundwater Testing Results**

A groundwater sample from the northeastern portion of the Project Site showed elevated levels of VOCs, particularly benzene, naphthalene, and ethylbenzene. TPHg was also reported at elevated levels. The detected concentrations of groundwater impact are above current regulatory action levels. Due to the elevated levels of TPH in soil, along with significant soil staining, principally along the eastern and northern
portions of the site, in conjunction with the elevated levels of TPH and VOCs in groundwater, Stantec recommended that SARWQCB be engaged to oversee remediation.

**Additional Phase II Subsurface Investigation (2016)**

Based on the recommendations of the additional Phase II Subsurface Investigation conducted in 2015, SARWQCB was engaged to oversee site assessment and cleanup. A scope of work was developed to address outstanding data gaps in the previous assessment data. A work plan was submitted in February 2017 to SARWQCB, which approved the plan in April 2017 (see Appendices D and E). Under the additional Phase II Subsurface Investigation conducted in 2016, wells for sampling soil and soil vapor were installed at six locations onsite. In addition, four groundwater monitoring wells were installed in the northern portion of the site where contaminated groundwater had been found.

Based on the previous Phase II Subsurface Investigations and the SARWQCB-directed assessment, Stantec concluded that there was sufficient data to characterize the lateral and vertical limits of impacted soil onsite. In addition, the data showed that groundwater flows in a westerly direction beneath the Project Site. The groundwater monitoring data showed that concentrations decline across the site from east to west, demonstrating that the groundwater contamination emanates offsite from the east.

**Draft Final Response Plan**

Based on the SARWQCB-directed assessment results, Stantec prepared the Draft Final Response Plan (Response Plan; see Appendix D) for remediating soil contamination to levels sufficient for residential development on the Project Site, for both the construction and post-construction phases. The construction remediation phase includes excavation of impacted soil and removal of the soil to an approved offsite facility. To address post-construction remediation for vapor intrusion, the Response Plan calls for the installation of soil vapor barriers with passive vent systems. These barriers would be placed below specific site structures identified as potentially affected by VOC and/or methane vapor intrusion, to protect future residents. A deed restriction is also called for in the Response Plan, which would be recorded to provide notification to future owners and residents of the vapor barriers.

Additionally, the Response Plan recommends additional groundwater monitoring and lateral assessment to confirm the limits of impact to groundwater. Such monitoring would include re-installation of monitoring wells onsite after site grading for the proposed development. The Response Plan calls for groundwater monitoring to occur for at least three years. Furthermore, the Response Plan recommends that SARWQCB assess the groundwater impact to evaluate if remediation is needed.

**Conclusion**

SARWQCB approved the Response Plan in April of 2017; the approval letter is included as Appendix E of this Initial Study. Assessment and mitigation actions outlined in the Response Plan will be completed to obtain written regulatory closure from SARWQCB in order to facilitate residential development on the Project Site. Assessment and mitigation actions of the Response Plan will be conducted under SARWQCB oversight. As SARWQB is requesting monitoring of at least three years prior to issuing a closure letter,
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Project development will be allowed to proceed prior to such closure letter being obtained. However, in order to ensure that impacts are reduced to a level of less than significant and that all requirements set forth in the Response Plan are implemented, mitigation would be necessary. With implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-4, impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

HAZ -1 The project applicant/developer shall comply with all requirements set forth in the Final Draft Response Plan prepared by Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. and dated February 13, 2017 (incorporated herein by this reference), which was approved by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board on April 24, 2017. The City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department staff shall ensure that all requirements of the plan have been implemented accordingly. This does not include any monitoring by the Regional Water Quality Control Board that may be required under the plan.

HAZ-2 No grading permit or other building permits shall be issued until the City of Los Alamitos receives clearance from the appropriate County of Orange agency that the necessary remediation work has been completed in accordance with the Final Draft Response Plan prepared by Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. and dated February 13, 2017 (incorporated herein by this reference), which was approved by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board on April 24, 2017. This shall not prevent the City from issuing any permits that may be required for purposes of soil remediation work.

HAZ-3 The Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs) established for the new residential development shall include a provision that requires the established Homeowner’s Association (HOA) to continue monitoring the wells installed onsite and taking any other/further remedial action that may be required by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWQCB) or other regulatory agency until such time as SARWQCB issues a regulatory closure letter. Upon issuance of the closure letter by SARWQCB, the project applicant/developer or HOA shall furnish the City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department with a copy of the letter.

HAZ-4 The project applicant/developer shall be required to record a separate notice to provide notification of the presence of vapor barriers (where such building features are installed) to future project owners and residents. The notice is in addition to any other provisions that may be included in the established Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs). The project applicant/developer shall furnish the City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department with proof of the notice provided to future owners or residents.
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles or a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project Site is approximately 0.9 miles northwest of Joint Forces Training Base Los Alamitos (JFTBLA), from which both fixed-wing aircraft and helicopters operate. Two areas are designated in the Airport Environ Land Use Plan for JFTBLA where land uses are regulated to minimize hazards from aircraft crashes to persons on the ground: Clear Zones within approximately 0.5 mile of each end of the main runway; both Clear Zones are within the JFTBLA. The Project Site is outside of the Clear Zones. The approach and departure routes for fixed-wing aircraft to and from JFTBLA do not pass over the Project Site; approach routes are from the northeast, passing east of the site, while the departure route is to the southwest over the City of Seal Beach (OCALUC 2016). Therefore, project development would not result in an airport-related hazard for residents or workers on or near the Project Site. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** There are no private airstrips in proximity of the Project Site. However, helicopters operate from JFTBLA, which as noted above, is approximately 0.9 miles southeast of the Project Site. Over congested areas, helicopters are required to maintain an altitude of at least 1,000 feet above the highest obstacle within 2,000 feet of the aircraft, except as needed for takeoff and landing (Code of Federal Regulations, Title 14 § 91.119). Takeoffs and landings at JFTBLA are infrequent and are at a sufficient distance from the Project Site that they would not pose a safety hazard to residents or workers on or near the Project Site. Therefore, impacts associated with helipads would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Los Alamitos is a participant in PrepareOC, the County of Orange Incident Preparedness, Response & Recovery Program. The goal of PrepareOC is to develop a coordinated approach to preparedness planning for county government, local governments and organizations, and the county’s constituents. Development of the Proposed Project would have no adverse impact on implementation of PrepareOC, and the project is not considered a critical facility as defined by the Essential Services Building Seismic Safety Act for buildings that provide essential services after a disaster.

Additionally, during the construction and operation phases, the Proposed Project would not interfere with any of the daily operations of the Orange County Sheriff’s Department Emergency Management Division, which supports emergency planning and response efforts of incorporated cities in Orange County and operates the County's emergency operations center (Sherriff 2017). All construction activities would be required to be performed per the City’s and OCFA’s standards and regulations. The Proposed Project would be required to provide the necessary on- and offsite access and circulation for emergency vehicles and services during the construction and operation phases.
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The Proposed Project would also be required to go through the City’s development review and permitting process and would be required to incorporate all applicable design and safety standards and regulations in the CBC and Los Alamitos Municipal Code (including those of Chapter 15.08 [City of Los Alamitos Fire Code]) to ensure that project development does not interfere with the provision of local emergency services (provision of adequate access roads to accommodate emergency response vehicles, adequate numbers/locations of fire hydrants, etc.).

Based on the preceding, implementation of the Proposed Project (both the construction and operational phases) would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the adopted PrepareOC or any other emergency response plan. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

No Impact. A wildland fire hazard area is typically characterized by areas with limited access, rugged terrain, limited water supply, and combustible vegetation. As shown in Figure 3, Aerial Photograph, the Project Site is in a highly-urbanized area of the City and is surrounded by a mix of residential, commercial, and office uses. The Project Site is developed, has good access, and is served by adequate water infrastructure. There is no combustible wildland vegetation on or near the site. The site is also not in or next to a Fire Hazard Severity Zone mapped by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Prevention; the nearest such Zone to the Project Site is a Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone within the JFTBLA, approximately 1.1 miles to the southeast (CALFIRE 2011). Therefore, project development would not introduce people or structures to substantial hazards from wildland fires. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The information in this section is based partly on the following technical reports, which are included as Appendices F and G of this Initial Study:

- Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan, Alan Short, P.E., November 15, 2016. (Appendix F)
- Hydrology Study, Alan Short, P.E., November 15, 2016. (Appendix G)

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

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. Water quality within the City of Los Alamitos is regulated by SARWQCB and its Water Quality Control Plan for the Santa Ana River Basin (Basin Plan), which contains water quality standards and identifies beneficial uses for receiving waters (wildlife habitat, agricultural supply, fishing, etc.) along with water quality criteria necessary to support these uses consistent with federal and state water quality laws, regulations, and standards.
The nearest storm drain inlet to the Project Site is on the north side of Sausalito Street near the southeast corner of the Project Site. The nearest drainage facilities to the Project Site, as mapped on the Base Map of Drainage Facilities in Orange County issued by the Orange County Public Works Flood Division in 2008, are the Los Alamitos Channel next to the northwestern site boundary; Coyote Creek Channel next to the northwestern site boundary; a storm drain in Cerritos Avenue that passes north of the site and discharges into Los Alamitos Channel; and a storm drain in Catalina Street approximately 680 feet south of the site, which in turn discharges into Los Alamitos Channel. The Los Alamitos Channel extends southwest and south, near the east bank of Coyote Creek Channel, until it discharges into the Los Alamitos Retarding Basin approximately 3.8 miles south of the site (OCFCD 2008).

Following is a discussion of the potential water quality impacts resulting from the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Project.

**Construction Phase**

Construction-related runoff pollutants are typically generated from waste and hazardous materials handling or storage areas, outdoor work areas, material storage areas, and general maintenance areas (e.g., vehicle or equipment fueling and maintenance, including washing). The Proposed Project's construction phase may cause deterioration in the quality of downstream receiving waters if construction-related sediments or pollutants wash into the existing storm drain system and facilities in the area.

Additionally, the Construction General Permit (CGP) issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), effective July 17, 2012, regulates construction activities to minimize water pollution, including sediment risk from construction activities to receiving waters.

Construction projects of one acre or more are regulated under the CGP (2009-0009-DWQ) and its subsequent revisions (2012-0006-DWQ), issued by SWRCB. The CGP regulates construction activities to minimize water pollution, including sediment risk from construction activities to receiving waters. Projects obtain coverage by developing and implementing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), estimating sediment risk from construction activities to receiving waters, and specifying BMPs that would be implemented as a part of the project's construction phase to minimize pollution of stormwater prior to and during grading and construction. Types of BMPs that are incorporated in SWPPPs and would minimize impacts from soil erosion and sediment include those listed in Table 5.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5 Construction BMPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion Controls and Wind Erosion Controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sediment Controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking Controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-storm Water Management Controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management and Controls (i.e., good housekeeping practices)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Proposed Project’s construction contractor would be required to prepare and implement an SWPPP and associated BMPs in compliance with the CGP during grading and construction. The SWPPP would specify BMPs, such as those outlined in Table 5, that the construction contractor would implement to protect water quality by eliminating and/or minimizing stormwater pollution prior to and during grading and construction and show the placement of those BMPs. Additional construction BMPs that would be incorporated into the Proposed Project’s SWPPP and implemented during the construction phase include but are not limited to:

- Perimeter control with silt fences and perimeter sandbags and/or gravel bags.
- Stabilized construction exit with rumble strip(s)/plate(s).
- Installation of storm drain inlet protection on affected onsite drains and within roadways.
- Installation of silt fences around stockpile and covering of stockpiles.
- Use of secondary containment around barrels, containers and storage materials that may impact water quality.
- Stabilization of disturbed areas where construction ceases for a determined period of time (e.g., one week) with erosion controls.
- Installation of temporary sanitary facilities and dumpsters.
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Adherence to the BMPs in the SWPPP would reduce, prevent, minimize, and/or treat pollutants and prevent degradation of downstream receiving waters. BMPs identified in the SWPPP would reduce or avoid contamination of stormwater with sediment and other pollutants such as trash and debris; oil, grease, fuels, and other toxic chemicals; paint, concrete, asphalt, bituminous materials, etc.; and nutrients.

Furthermore, in response to the findings of the site assessments conducted for the Project Site (refer to Section 3.8[d], above, for a description of the site assessments), Stantec prepared a Draft Final Response Plan for site remediation (Response Plan; see Appendix D), which was approved by SARWQCB on April 24, 2017 (see Appendix E for approval letter from SARWQCB). The Response Plan requires excavation of contaminated soil and further assessment, and remediation as needed of groundwater. Implementation of the requirements set forth in the Response Plan would be ensured through implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 and the City's development review process. Additionally, Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 requires that the City receive clearance from the appropriate County of Orange agency that the necessary remediation work has been completed in accordance with the Response Plan. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure HAZ-3 requires the established CC&Rs to include a provision that the HOA continue monitoring the wells installed onsite and take any further remedial action that may be required by SARWQCB until such time as the project applicant/developer furnish the City with a copy of the closure letter issued by SARWQCB. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-3, no significant water quality and waste-discharge impacts from project-related construction activities are anticipated to occur.

Operation Phase

The Project Site is in the Coyote Creek Watershed, which covers 165 square miles in north Orange County and in Los Angeles County (OCPW 2010). Coyote Creek Channel, which abuts the Project Site's northwestern boundary (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph), flows into the San Gabriel River just above the river's mouth. Under existing conditions, runoff from the Project Site drains into an existing catch basin at the southeasterly corner of the site. There are currently no water quality devices/features onsite to provide any treatment for the “first flush” generated onsite.2

Coyote Creek Channel is listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List of Water-Quality Limited Segments for bacteria and diazinon (pesticide). Expected pollutants from the Proposed Project include sediment, nutrients, pathogens, pesticides, oil and grease, and trash. Therefore, the project's primary pollutants of concern are pathogens and pesticides, due to impairments to Coyote Creek (Short 2016a). Mitigation of these pollutants of concern is accomplished through the implementation of postdevelopment (operation phase) BMPs, as discussed below.

In May 2009, SARWQCB reissued the North Orange County Municipal Separate Stormwater (MS4) Storm Water Permit as WDR Order R8-2009-0030 (NPDES Permit No. CAS618030) to the County of Orange, incorporated cities of the county, and Orange County Public Works Flood Division, all of which are within

---

1 Bituminous = resembling or containing bitumen; bitumen = any of various viscous or solid impure mixtures of hydrocarbons that occur naturally in asphalt, tar, mineral waxes, etc.; used as a road surfacing and roofing material.
2 First flush is the initial surface runoff of a rainstorm. During this phase, water pollution entering storm drains in areas with high proportions of impervious surfaces is typically more concentrated compared to the remainder of the storm.
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the Santa Ana Region. Pursuant to this “Fourth-Term” MS4 Permit, the co-permitees were required to
develop and implement drainage area management plans (DAMP) for their jurisdictions, as well as local
implementation plans (LIPs), which describe the co-permitees’ urban runoff management programs for their
local jurisdictions, such as the City of Los Alamitos.

Under the City’s LIP, land development policies pertaining to hydromodification1 and low-impact-
development (LID) are regulated for new and significant redevelopment projects. LID BMPs are used in
project planning and design to preserve a site’s predevelopment hydrology by minimizing the loss of natural
hydrologic processes such as infiltration, evapotranspiration, and runoff detention. LID BMPs try to offset
these losses by introducing structural and nonstructural design components into the project’s land plan that
restore these water quality functions. These land development requirements are detailed in the countywide
Model Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) and Technical Guidance Document, approved in May 2011,
which cities have incorporated into their discretionary approval processes for new development and
redevelopment projects.

In accordance with the Orange County DAMP and the City’s LIP, a Preliminary WQMP was prepared for the
Proposed Project (see Appendix F). The Preliminary WQMP specifies BMPs that would be implemented
to minimize water pollution from the Project Site during the operation phase. As outlined in the Preliminary
WQMP, the Proposed Project would include LID BMPs, site design BMPs, nonstructural source control
BMPs, and structural source control BMPs. A detailed list of the BMPs and discussion of how they were
selected based on their effectiveness to address and mitigate the Proposed Project’s pollutants of concern are
provid ed in the Preliminary WQMP.

As shown in Figure 8, WQMP Schematic Plan, site drainage improvements needed to accommodate the
Proposed Project would include new storm drain pipes, catch basins, and a water quality feature (a modular
wetlands linear filtration device). Once runoff enters the catch basins, it would be conveyed via storm drain
pipes to the modular wetlands linear filtration device in the southwesterly corner of the Project Site
(considered a proprietary bioretention BMP), where runoff would be treated before being discharged into the
existing 24-inch RCP within Sausalito Street via a proposed 18-inch RCP. The final BMPs to be implemented
for the Proposed Project would be determined through the City’s review of the final WQMP, which would
occur during the City’s development review and building plan check process.

The information provided in the Preliminary WQMP provides sufficient detail to identify the major LID
BMPs and other anticipated water quality BMPs and features that would be implemented as a part of the
Proposed Project and would prevent impacts to the quality of receiving waters, which include Coyote Creek.
The combination of BMPs identified in the Preliminary WQMP addresses all identified pollutants of the
Proposed Project. Implementation of these BMPs would be ensured through the City’s development review
and building plan check process.

1 The term “hydromodification” refers to the changes in runoff characteristics from a watershed caused by changes in land use
condition. More specifically, hydromodification refers to “the change in the natural watershed hydrologic processes and runoff
characteristics (i.e., interception, infiltration, overland flow, interflow and groundwater flow) caused by urbanization or other land
use changes that result in increased stream flows and sediment transport.”
Therefore, no significant water quality and waste-discharge impacts from operation activities of the Proposed Project are anticipated to occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Mitigation Measures**

Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-3 apply here.

b) **Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Orange County Water District (OCWD) manages the Orange County Groundwater Basin (Basin), which covers approximately 350 square miles beneath the Tustin and Downey Plains. It is bounded by consolidated rocks exposed on the north in the Puente and Chino Hills, on the east in the Santa Ana Mountains, and on the south in the San Joaquin Hills.

Golden State Water Company (GSWC) provides water to the City of Los Alamitos, including the Project Site. Groundwater comprised approximately 99 percent of GSWC’s water supplies in 2015 and is forecast to decline to approximately 87 percent of water supplies by 2040, with the remainder forecast to be imported water and recycled water. GSWC forecasts that it will have sufficient water supplies to meet demands in its service area over the 2020-2040 period (Kennedy/Jenks 2016).

Additionally, the Project Site is not located in or near a groundwater recharge area/facility, nor does it represent a source of groundwater recharge. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not substantially interfere with groundwater supplies or recharge and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are necessary.

Impacts to groundwater supplies are further discussed in Section 3.18(d), below.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Erosion and siltation impacts potentially resulting from alteration of the drainage pattern due to the Proposed Project would, for the most part, occur during the project’s construction phase, which would include site preparation and grading activities. Erosion and siltation are not anticipated to occur during project operation.

**Project Construction**

As discussed above in Section 3.9(a), the project construction contractor would be required to prepare and implement a SWPPP pursuant to the CGP during grading and construction. The SWPPP would specify BMPs that the project construction contractor would implement prior to and during grading and construction to minimize erosion and siltation impacts on- and offsite. BMPs that would be implemented
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during the Proposed Project's construction phase are discussed in detail in Section 3.9(a), above. For example, BMPs would include but are not limited to: installation of perimeter silt fences, installation of silt fences around stockpile and covering of stockpiles, and stabilization of disturbed areas where construction ceases for a determined period of time (e.g., one week) with erosion controls. Adherence to the BMPs in the SWPPP would reduce, prevent, or minimize soil erosion from project-related grading and construction activities. Therefore, project-related construction activities would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite. Construction-related impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Project Operation

The Project Site is relatively flat and does not consist of bare or exposed soil. As shown in Figures 3, Aerial Photograph, and 4, Site Photographs, the Project Site is currently developed with a church use and its associated surface parking. Under the Proposed Project, there would be no bare or disturbed soil onsite at project completion that would be vulnerable to erosion or siltation. All areas would either be buildings, paved, or landscaped. Under proposed conditions, stormwater runoff would also be conveyed similar to existing conditions, continuing to flow generally south.

Additionally, project design and operation would include implementation of BMPs specified in the Preliminary WQMP (see Appendix F), which would minimize soil erosion into stormwater and thus minimize sedimentation downstream. Such BMPs include a proprietary vegetated biotreatment system; common area landscape management; and use of efficient irrigation systems and landscape design, water conservation, and smart controllers; see Section 3.9(a), above for further description.

Therefore, development of the Proposed Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite. Operation-related impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project Site is in the Coyote Creek Watershed, which covers 165 square miles in north Orange County and in Los Angeles County (OCPW 2010). Coyote Creek Channel, which abuts the Project Site’s northwestern boundary (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph), flows into the San Gabriel River just above the river’s mouth. Under existing conditions, runoff from the Project Site drains into an existing catch basin at the southeasterly corner of the Site. No offsite drainage runs onto the Project Site.

As shown in Figure 8, WQMP Schematic Plan, site drainage improvements needed to accommodate the Proposed Project would include new storm drain pipes, catch basins, and a water quality feature (a modular wetlands linear filtration device). Once runoff enters the catch basins, it would be conveyed via storm drain pipes to the modular wetlands linear filtration device in the southwesterly corner of the Project Site, where runoff would be treated before being discharged into the existing 24-inch RCP within Sausalito Street via a proposed 18-inch RCP.
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Peak stormwater discharges from the Project Site in the existing and proposed conditions for the 2-, 10-, 25-, and 100-year storm events are shown in Table 6. As shown in the table, project development would increase the peak discharge from a 10-year storm – for which the proposed onsite drainage system would be designed – by 0.1 cubic foot per second (cfs), or approximately two percent of the existing peak discharge. The net increases in peak discharges from the 25- and 100-year storm events would also be 0.1 cfs each, while no increase in discharge would result from a 2-year storm event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storm Event</th>
<th>Proposed Condition (in cubic feet per second)</th>
<th>Existing Condition (in cubic feet per second)</th>
<th>Net Change (in cubic feet per second)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-year storm</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-year storm</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-year storm</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-year storm</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Postdevelopment runoff from the Project Site would be adequately handled by the Proposed Project’s drainage system and would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the Project Site or area in a manner that would result in flooding on- or offsite. Therefore, project impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The following describes potential impacts related to storm drainage systems and runoff.

Capacity of Stormwater Drainage Systems

Project impacts on the capacity of storm drainage systems would be less than significant, as substantiated in Section 3.9(d), above. No mitigation measures are necessary.

Polluted Runoff

Project stormwater pollution impacts would be less than significant, as substantiated in Section 3.9(a), above. No mitigation measures are necessary.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. See response to Section 3.9(a), above. As substantiated in this section, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

No Impact. The Project Site is in the Shaded Zone X flood hazard zone as designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, indicating that the site is protected from 100-year floods by levees (FEMA 2017). Project development would not place housing or any other structures in a 100-year flood zone. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

No Impact. See response to Section 3.9(g), above. As substantiated in this section, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Loss of life and damage to structures, roads, and utilities may result from a dam or reservoir failure. Los Alamitos is within the dam inundation area of the Prado Dam, which is a flood control and water conservation project constructed and operated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Prado Dam is approximately 25 miles northeast of Los Alamitos in the City of Corona on the Santa Ana River. Areas downstream from this dam have high potential for inundation in the unlikely event of catastrophic dam failure.

According to the Los Alamitos General Plan, potential damage to the City from a failure of the Prado Dam is not an issue due to recent dam upgrades. Work is nearing completion on the Santa Ana River Mainstem Project (Mainstream Project), aimed at protecting parts of San Bernardino, Riverside, and Orange counties from flooding on the Santa Ana River. The Mainstem Project, underway since 1989, is being carried out by various agencies including, the flood control agencies of Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties and the US Army Corps of Engineers. The Mainstem Project includes construction of the Seven Oaks Dam on the Santa Ana River in Mentone, completed in 2000; increasing the height and spillway size of Prado Dam; and strengthening levees along the river. Work on the Santa Ana River in Orange County from Wier Canyon to the Pacific Ocean has been completed; work on the river between Weir Canyon and Prado Dam is scheduled for completion in 2021 (Corpuz 2017), and improvements on Prado Dam, which commenced in 2003, are slated for completion in 2020 (OCPW 2017). While the remaining flood protection improvements to be implemented for the Santa Ana River and Prado Dam are slated for completion between 2020 and 2021, respectfully, their timeline for completion does not pose a flood threat or place people or structures at greater danger. The ongoing flood protection improvements along the Santa Ana River and to the Prado Dam will help minimize or prevent flood hazards from failure of a dam or a levee.

Additionally, because dam failure can have severe consequences, the Federal Emergency Management Agency requires that all dam owners develop emergency action plans for warning, evacuation, and postflood actions. The responsibility for facilitation of emergency response is also the responsibility of the owner. As noted above, Prado Dam is operated and maintained by the Corps. As part of their Dam Safety Program, the Corps conducts routine inspections and operation of the dam and has developed an emergency action plan for
Prado Dam in coordination with local emergency management officials. The primary objective of the Corps Dam Safety Program is to maintain public safety by making sure the dams owned and operated by the Corps are safe and risks to the public are minimized (Corps 2016).

Furthermore, in the unlikely event of a Prado Dam failure, the Corps will contact the following agencies: Sheriff’s Department Control One; Orange County Public Works; Orange County Disaster Preparedness; and Governor’s Office of Emergency Services, Sacramento. Once contacted, these agencies notify all pertinent federal, state, county, and local agencies through the state’s National Warning System and all applicable Orange County communications systems.

Based on the preceding, development of the Proposed Project would not expose people or structures to significant impacts involving flooding as a result of a failure of a dam. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No Impact. The following describes potential impacts to people and structures from seiches, tsunamis, and mudflows.

Seiche

A seiche is a surface wave created when a body of water is shaken, usually by earthquake activity. Seiches are of concern relative to water storage facilities because inundation from a seiche can occur if the wave overflows a containment wall, such as the wall of a reservoir, water storage tank, dam, or other artificial body of water.

There are no water storage facilities or enclosed water bodies on or within the vicinity of the Project Site that could pose a flood hazard to the site due to a seiche or failure of an aboveground reservoir. The nearest substantial water bodies are artificial lakes in the Los Alamitos Racetrack, approximately 1.5 miles east of the Project Site. Therefore, impacts from a seiche would not occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Potential inundation impacts due to a dam failure are discussed in Section 3.9(i), above.

Tsunami

A tsunami is a sea wave caused by a sudden displacement of the ocean floor, most often due to earthquakes. The Project Site elevation is approximately 135 feet above mean sea level, and is approximately 5.1 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean. Additionally, the Project Site is not in tsunami inundation zones mapped by the California Geological Survey (CGS 2017). Therefore, project development would not place people or structures at risk of flooding due to a tsunami. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Mudflow

A mudflow is a landslide composed of saturated rock debris and soil with a consistency of wet cement. The Project Site and surrounding area are in an urbanized area and are relatively level. No major slopes or bluffs
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are on or adjacent to the Project Site. Therefore, impacts from a mudflow would not occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

3.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

a) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The Project Site is currently occupied by a religious institution (Cottonwood Church) and is surrounded by residential, commercial, and office uses (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph). Upon clearing, the Project Site would be developed with 50 residential condominiums in 11 three-story building (up to 35 feet in height). The Proposed Project would occur in a highly-urbanized area of the City and would be compatible with and complementary to the surrounding land uses.

Additionally, while there are established residential communities southeast and south of the Project Site (see Figure 3), development of the Proposed Project would not physically divide these communities in any way because the project would be developed within the confines of the Project Site and would not introduce roadways or other infrastructure improvements that would bisect or transect the residential communities. Access to the existing residential communities would also not be interrupted as a result of the project development, since residents of these communities do not have to cross the Project Site to access their community.

Therefore, the Proposed Project would not create any land use barriers or otherwise divide or disrupt the physical arrangement of the existing residential communities. No impact would occur and no mitigation measure are necessary.

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

No Impact. Adopted land use regulations applicable to the Project Site include the City’s General Plan and Zoning Code. Following is an analysis of the Proposed Project’s consistency with these land use regulations.

General Plan Consistency

The Los Alamitos General Plan land use designation for the Project Site is Multi Family Residential, permitting residential development at densities of 20 to 30 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). Consistent with the Multi Family Residential designation of the Project Site and the permitted density, the Proposed Project includes the development of 50 residential condominiums at a density of approximately 20.5 dwelling units per acre. Development of the Proposed Project does not include or require any amendments to the Los Alamitos General Plan.

The Proposed Project also helps implement and further a number of goals and policies of the Los Alamitos General Plan. For example, the Proposed Project would be consistent with and help implement Policy 4.4 (Scale and Character) of the Land Use Element, which calls for new development in residential
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neighborhoods to be compatible with the scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood. The Proposed Project would also be consistent with and help implement Policy 4.2 (Site design) of the Mobility and Circulation Element, which calls for new development projects to provide convenience and security to pedestrians and bicyclists. As shown in Figure 5, Conceptual Site and Landscape Plan, the Proposed Project includes a safe and convenient pedestrian walkway system that would connect to the existing public sidewalk along Sausalito Street. The project also includes the provision of bicycle racks in the northern end of the Project Site (see Figure 5), as well as safe and convenient access for bicyclists within the site and to Sausalito Street.

Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with the Los Alamitos General Plan. No land use impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Zoning Consistency

The City’s Zoning Code (Title 17 of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code) establishes the basic zoning regulations under which land is developed and utilized and by which the City’s General Plan is systematically implemented. It is the method the City uses to implement control of land uses, in accordance with the City’s General Plan goals and policies.

The zoning district of the Project Site is Multiple Family Residential (R-3)—the R-3 zoning district is consistent with the Multi Family Residential land use designation of the City’s General Plan. The R-3 zoning district identifies areas designed to provide multi-family housing, with a maximum permitted density of up to 30 du/ac. The residential uses and density under the Proposed Project would be consistent with those of the R-3 zoning district, as the project includes the development of 50 residential condominiums at a density of approximately 20.5 dwelling units per acre.

Additionally, the Proposed Project has been designed to adhere to all applicable zoning regulations of the City’s Zoning Code, including but not limited to building height, setback, parking, and landscaping requirements. All street improvements proposed as part of the project would also meet the requirements of the City. Development of the Proposed Project would not require the approval of a zoning code amendment or zone change; nor would it require a variance or any adjustments from the City’s zoning standards.

Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with the City’s Zoning Code. No land use impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

No Impact. See response to Section 3.4(f), above. As substantiated in this section, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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3.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

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

No Impact. The Project Site is mapped as Mineral Resource Zone 1 (MRZ-1), indicating that significant mineral deposits are absent or are unlikely to be present (CGS 1994). No mineral resource areas that would be of value to the region and residents of the state exist on or near the Project Site. Additionally, no locally important mineral resource recovery sites are on or near the Project Site. Mining would also be incompatible with the surrounding uses and is not a permitted use under the R-3 zoning district of the Project Site, which is in a highly urbanized area of the City and surrounded by a mix of residential, commercial, and office uses. Therefore, no impact to mineral resources or mineral resource recovery sites would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

No Impact. See response to Section 3.11(a), above. As substantiated in this section, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

3.12 NOISE

The analysis in this section is based partly on the following technical study, which is included as Appendix H to this Initial Study:


Certain land uses are particularly sensitive to noise. These uses include residential, school, and open space/recreation areas where quiet environments are necessary for enjoyment, public health, and safety. The Project Site is in an urbanized area of the City—it is bordered to the north and northwest by Cerritos Avenue and the Coyote Creek Channel, with residential uses beyond; multi-family residences directly to the west; and single-family residences to the south, beyond Sausalito Street; and commercial uses to the east (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph). The residences directly to the west and south are the only receptors that are potentially sensitive to project-related noise.

Existing Noise Environment

The Project Site abuts a busy thoroughfare (Cerritos Avenue) along the northern site boundary. Roadway noise from traffic along Cerritos Avenue is expected to be the dominant noise source in the project area. Secondary noise sources include operations from the adjacent commercial uses, nearby residential operations (i.e. people talking, property maintenance, etc.), and roadway noise from nearby residential arterials. One weekly service is held at the existing church onsite, at 12:00 p.m. on Sundays.
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City of Los Alamitos Noise Standards

Operational Noise

Noise standards set forth in the Los Alamitos General Plan Public Facilities and Safety Element are listed in Table 7. Additionally, the City regulates noise levels through Chapter 17.24 (Noise) of the City’s Municipal Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Zone</th>
<th>Exterior Noise Standards</th>
<th>Interior Noise Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noise Level</td>
<td>Time Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Residential) Day</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Residential) Night</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10:00 p.m. – 7:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Professional and Institutional)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Anytime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Commercial)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Anytime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The noise levels at the affected property shall not exceed:
- The noise standard for a cumulative period of more than 30 minutes in any hour; or
- The noise standard plus 5 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 15 minutes in any hour; or
- The noise standard plus 10 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 5 minutes in any hour; or
- The noise standard plus 15 dBA for a cumulative period of more than one minute in any hour; or
- The noise standard plus 20 dBA for any period of time.

dBA, or A-Weighted Decibel, is an overall frequency-weighted sound level in decibels which approximates the frequency response of the human ear.

Construction Noise

The City exempts noise associated with construction, repair, remodeling, or grading of any real property from the noise limitations of the City’s Municipal Code, provided that construction activities do not take place between the hours of 8:00 PM and 7:00 AM on weekdays and Saturdays, or any time on Sundays or federal holidays (Section 17.24.020 [Exemptions] of the City’s Municipal Code).

Project Impacts

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Residential land uses are not typically associated with generating high levels of community noise. Project-related operational noise will be primarily due to onsite mechanical/HVAC (heating, ventilation, and air conditioning) equipment, and increases in roadway noise. The following describes the Proposed Project’s long-term operational noise impacts to surrounding noise-sensitive uses.

Roadway Noise

Increases in project-related roadway noise would result from increased trip generation. Project development is expected to generate up to 291 daily trips, per the Traffic Impact Study prepared for the Proposed Project (see Appendix I). However, since the roadways in the project area currently experience high levels of peak hour trips (due to the large amount of surrounding residential uses), the additional project-related daily trips would be marginal. Note that a doubling of traffic flows (i.e., 10,000 vehicles per day to 20,000 per day)
would be needed to create a 3 dB increase in traffic-generated noise levels. Since project implementation would not increase daily trips to the extent that would double traffic flows on project area roadways, the projected increases in project-related traffic flows would be well below a 3 dB increase (i.e., the threshold for an “audible” change).

Stationary Sources

HVAC equipment of the proposed residential buildings would be similar to the equipment associated with the existing church building onsite, as well as those of the surroundings residential uses. Additionally, all proposed HVAC equipment would be placed within appropriate sound enclosures such that the operations would not be notably different than existing conditions in and around the proposed area of improvements. Stationary-source noise generated by the Proposed Project would also be required to adhere to all applicable noise standards and regulations outlined in Chapter 17.24 (Noise) of the City's Municipal Code. The provision of stationary equipment under the Proposed Project would not result in an increase above existing ambient noise levels.

Conclusion

Based on the preceding, project-related permanent noise increases due to activities, equipment, and traffic is not expected to notably contribute to the existing noise environment around the Project Site. Therefore, project-related operational noise impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. Following is a discussion of the potential short and long-term vibration impacts that could result from development of the Proposed Project.

Long-Term Operation Vibration Impacts

For potential project-generated vibration impacts to nearby receptors, the Proposed Project involves a residential development that does not include equipment that could generate substantial levels of long-term groundborne vibration levels. Therefore, vibration from onsite sources would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Short-Term Construction Vibration Impacts

Potential vibration impacts associated with development projects are usually related to the use of heavy construction equipment during 1) demolition and grading phases of construction and/or 2) the operation of large trucks over uneven surfaces during project operations. Construction activities can generate groundborne vibration that varies depending on the construction procedures, equipment used, and proximity to vibration-sensitive uses. Such vibrations may result in two types of potential impacts: 1) architectural damage to nearby buildings and 2) annoyance to vibration-sensitive receptors.
Construction equipment generates vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish in amplitude with distance. Table 8 shows the peak particle velocities of some common construction equipment and haul trucks (loaded trucks). The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) notes that groundborne vibration is typically associated with blasting operations, the use of pile drivers, and large-scale demolition activities, none of which are anticipated for the construction of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Peak Particle Velocity in inches per second (in/sec) at 25 feet</th>
<th>Vibration Level (VdB) at 25 feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Roller</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Bulldozer</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded Trucks</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Bulldozer</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: FTA 2006.*

**Vibration-Induced Architectural Damage**

The threshold at which there is a risk of architectural damage to normal houses with plastered walls and ceilings is 0.200 peak particle velocity (PPV) in/sec (FTA 2006). Earthmoving and compacting soil construction equipment such as vibratory rollers, bulldozers, and haul trucks generate vibration levels no greater than 0.210 PPV in/sec at 25 feet away. Since damage from vibrational energy is most likely to occur when the source and receptor are at their closest relative placement, the nearest reasonable position of individual construction equipment items to a given receptor building are used for architectural damage evaluations.

The nearest buildings to the construction area of the Project Site are the residences along the western Project Site boundary, which are less than 15 feet from the edge of the site. Buildings of the commercial use to the east are approximately 40 feet east of the eastern site boundary, and residential buildings across Sausalito Street to the south are approximately 60 feet away.

The maximum construction-related vibration level onsite would have the potential to exceed the criterion for architectural damage if a vibratory roller is operated within approximately 30 feet of an offsite structure. Also, the operation of large bulldozers or loaded trucks may, potentially, approach or exceed the damage criterion if that equipment is operated within 15 feet of buildings. As the residences to the west of the site are less than 15 feet from the project boundary, operation of construction equipment near the boundary could potentially exceed the 0.200 PPV in/sec threshold for architectural damage. The commercial building to the west and residential buildings to the south are farther than 30 feet away and would not experience vibration levels that would exceed the threshold.

Therefore, architectural-damage vibration impacts on residential buildings to the west would be potentially significant. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure N-1, which would place limitations on
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certain equipment and/or their use at certain distances, impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

**Vibration-Induced Annoyance**

Vibration is typically noticed nearby when objects in a building generate noise from rattling windows or picture frames. It is typically not perceptible outdoors, and therefore impacts are based on the distance to the nearest building (FTA 2006). The effect on buildings near a construction site depends on soil type, ground strata, and receptor building construction. Vibration can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibrations at moderate levels, to slight damage at the highest levels.

Human annoyance occurs when construction vibration rises significantly above the threshold of human perception for extended periods of time. As such, vibration annoyance is typically assessed via a spatial-averaging methodology (i.e., as heavy construction equipment moves around the project site, average vibration levels at the nearest structures would diminish with increasing distance between structures and the equipment). This methodology is implemented by using the distance from the center of the construction zone to the nearest sensitive receptors.

Residences to the west of the Project Site are located approximately 100 feet from the center of the proposed construction activities onsite, while residences south across Sausalito Street are approximately 300 feet away. The commercial use to the east is not considered a sensitive receptor, and therefore not subject to vibration annoyance impacts. At a distance of 100 feet, average vibration levels experienced at the residences to the west would be 76 VdB due to operation of a vibratory roller, and 69 VdB due to operation of a large bulldozer. At a distance of 300 feet, average vibration levels experienced at the residences to the south would be 62 VdB due to operation of a vibratory roller, and 55 VdB due to operation of a large bulldozer. The threshold for vibration annoyance at vibration-sensitive uses is 78 VdB (FTA 2006). Therefore, average vibration levels at the surrounding residences would be below the 78 VdB threshold for vibration-induced annoyance. More distant residences would experience still lower vibration levels.

Given that the average vibration levels are below the significance threshold for all nearby receptors, vibration-annoyance impacts from construction activities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary. Additionally, construction activities would take place during the daytime hours when less people would be expected to be in the nearby residences or when those present would be less sensitive to vibration annoyance effects.

**Mitigation Measure**

N-1 For demolition, construction, grading, foundation, and erection activities that include the use of vibration-producing equipment, the following measures shall be implemented in close coordination with City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department to ensure that alternative construction techniques are undertaken.
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- Prior to the start of construction activities, the construction contractor shall document, to the extent feasible, the pre-construction baseline conditions by inspecting and reporting on the then-current foundation and structural condition of the offsite buildings and/or structures with ground-based foundations (including pools, hot-tubs, and spas) within 50 feet of any construction site boundary.

- During construction, to the extent feasible the project applicant shall limit the use of vibratory rollers operated within 30 feet of offsite buildings or other structures, and the use of large bulldozers and loaded trucks operated within 15 feet of offsite buildings or other structures.

- During construction, if any vibration levels cause cosmetic or structural damage (including, but not limited to cracks in walls or ceilings [particularly around doors and windows], sticking/rubbing doors or openable windows, fallen or displaced ceiling tiles, and/or items displaced from shelving) to any offsite building(s) within 50 feet of the project site boundary, City staff shall immediately issue a “stop-work” order to the construction contractor to prevent further damage. Work shall not resume until the building(s) are stabilized and/or preventive measures are implemented to relieve further damage to the building(s). At the completion of construction, any damage caused to existing buildings shall be repaired at the expense of the project applicant/construction contractor.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As described in Section 3.12(a), above, operational noise levels related to the Proposed Project would not substantially increase the existing noise environment. Similarly, noise from project-related traffic along local roadways would not significantly increase noise levels in the project area and would likewise not result in a significant impact. Therefore, permanent noise impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** Project-related construction activities would increase noise levels on and near the Project Site above existing levels. Noise produced from construction equipment is commonly held to decrease at a rate of at least 6 decibels (dB) per doubling of distance; conservatively ignoring other attenuation effects from air absorption, ground effects, and/or shielding/scattering effects. For example, a dozer that generates 85 dBA at 50 feet would measure 79 dBA at 100 feet, 73 dBA at 200 feet, 67 dBA at 400 feet, and 61 dBA at 800 feet (at minus 6 dB per distance-doubling).

1 As sound energy travels outward from the source, spreading loss accounts for a 6 dB decrease in noise level. Soft ground and atmospheric absorption effects can decrease this by an additional 1.5 dB.
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In order to aggregate individual construction equipment into sets of common processes/activities, composite construction noise by phase has been characterized by Bolt, Beranek and Newman. In their study, construction noise for ground clearing, excavation, foundations, erection, and finishing are aggregated by class of activity (Synectecology 2017). For residential projects, the loudest phases are typically the excavation and finishing phases; each of which has an aggregate of 88 dBA Leq (when measured at a distance of 50 feet from the summed construction effort). This summed value takes into account both the number of pieces and the spacing of the heavy equipment used in the construction effort. Noise levels are typically reduced from this value due to usage factors, as well as the barrier effects provided by the physical structures themselves (once erected). The 88 dBA Leq value is a reasonable and prudent value for representing most construction activities.

The nearest existing sensitive uses to the Project Site are the residences to the immediate west, which lie approximately 100 feet from the center of the site. The next nearest residential uses are those across Sausalito Street to the south at a distance of approximately 300 feet from the center of the site, while residences to the northwest across Coyote Creek Channel are approximately 725 feet away. At these distances, composite construction noise would be reduced to conservatively estimated levels of 82 dBA Leq at residences to the west, 72 dBA Leq at residences to the south, and 65 dBA Leq at residences to the northwest, due to distance attenuation alone. More distant residences would experience noise levels below 65 dBA Leq.

In addition to distance attenuation, residences to the west are protected by an existing block wall varying from approximately 7.5 to 9 feet in height (Synectecology 2017), which would approximately provide an additional 15 dB of attenuation due to barrier effects. Therefore, construction-generated noise levels experienced at the residences to the west would be around 67 dBA Leq.

Since construction activities would be limited to relatively small- to medium-sized equipment (e.g., bulldozers, dump trucks, loaders, backhoes, pavers), take place during the daytime hours when many people would be out of their houses, and conform to the time-of-day restrictions of the City’s Municipal Code, construction noise impacts would be less than significant. However, for conservative measures, the Focused Noise Analysis prepared for the Proposed Project (see Appendix H) included two measures that would further reduce project-related impacts. These measures have been included in Mitigation Measure N-2. With implementation of the mitigation measure, impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

N-2 The following measures shall be implemented by the construction contractor during the extent of the project’s construction phase:

- All construction equipment engines shall be properly tuned and muffled according to manufacturers’ specifications.

1 Usage factor is the percentage of time during the workday that the equipment is operating at full power (on which the reference noise ratings for typical average and typical maximum noise emissions are based).
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- Staging and construction activities whose specific location on the project site may be flexible (e.g., operation of compressors and generators, cement mixing, general truck idling, etc.) shall be conducted as far as possible from the residences to the west and south.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

**Less than Significant Impact.** The nearest public-use airport to the Project Site is Long Beach Airport, approximately 3.4 miles to the west. The Project Site is outside of the 65-CNEL (community noise equivalent level) noise contour surrounding Long Beach Airport (LACALUC 2017). The nearest private-use airport to the Project Site is the Joint Forces Training Base Los Alamitos (JFTBLA), at approximately 0.9 miles to the southeast. The Project Site is outside of the 60-CNEL noise contour established for JFTBLA (OCALUC 2016). Therefore, project development would not subject people onsite to excessive noise levels from aircraft approaching or departing Long Beach Airport or JFTBLA. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** See response to Section 3.12(e), above. As substantiated in this section, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### 3.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Proposed Project would result in a substantial and unplanned level of growth if estimated development would exceed local or regional population growth projections. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is the regional body charged with allocating regional housing requirements and projecting regional growth down to the local level.

The Proposed Project consists of the development of 50 condominium units at a density of approximately 20.49 du/ac, consistent with the residential density range (20-30 du/ac) permitted for the Multi-Family Residential General Plan land use designation of the Project Site. Therefore, development of the Proposed Project would add 50 additional units to the City’s housing stock. According to the California Department of Finance, the average household size in the City of Los Alamitos in 2017 was 2.66 persons (CDF 2017). Therefore, the project is estimated to house approximately 133 residents at full occupancy. The population of the City of Los Alamitos is forecast to increase from 11,806 people in 2015 to 12,051 people in 2040 (CDR 2016), a net increase of 245 people. The Proposed Project's 133 residents would represent approximately 54 percent of the City’s projected population increase, which does not represent a significant increase.
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Additionally, the Proposed Project’s residential units and associated population increase fall within the buildout assumptions of the 2015 Certified PEIR, which are reflected in the final development capacity numbers by land use in Table 3 (Projected Buildout [2035] by Land Use Designation) of the City’s General Plan Land Use Element. Per Table 3, the residential development capacity for the overall/City-wide Multi-Family Residential land use designation (which applies to the Project Site) is 2,934 dwelling units, with a corresponding population buildout of 7,660 persons. The population increase under the Proposed Project would also be consistent with the regional population forecast for population growth in the City, which is based on General Plan and SCAG projections.

Furthermore, the Proposed Project would help carry out the goals, objectives, and policies of the City’s General Plan Housing Element (2006-2014) by developing a new for-sale residential development that offers additional housing opportunities in the City. Specifically, the Housing Element (Table 4-1 [Quantified Objectives: 2014-2021]) indicates the need/objective for construction of 61 new dwelling units in the City in order to accommodate the City’s forecast growth in the number of households, to replace expected demolitions and conversion of housing units to nonhousing uses, and to achieve a future vacancy rate that allows for healthy functioning of the housing market. Project development would help accomplish a portion of this need/objective through the provision of 50 condominium units, which be sold at market-rate prices. The objective for new housing units in the Housing Element includes 11 Moderate Income and 26 Above-Moderate Income units, where Moderate Income is between 81 and 120 percent of median household income for Orange County, and Above-Moderate Income is over 120 percent of the median income (City of Los Alamitos 2014b).

Regarding employment, operation of the proposed condominiums would not result in the generation of employment. Project construction however, would generate some temporary employment. The unemployment rate in Orange County in April 2017 was estimated at 3.3 percent (EDD 2017); therefore, the Proposed Project’s construction-related employment generation is expected to be absorbed from the regional labor force and would not attract new workers into the region.

Finally, as discussed in Section 3.18, Utilities and Service Systems, adequate infrastructure and utilities are available to serve the Project Site, and the Proposed Project would not require new infrastructure or extension of existing infrastructure that may indirectly induce population growth nearby.

Based on the preceding, no significant impacts to population and housing would occur as a result of project development and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**No Impact.** No housing exists on the Project Site, which is developed as a church use (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph). Therefore, project development would not displace housing or people. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. See response to Section 3.13(b), above. As substantiated in this section, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

3.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

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

a) Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. Fire protection and emergency services in Los Alamitos is provided by the Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA). Of OCFA’s 62 fire stations in Orange County, Los Alamitos is served by OCFA Fire Station 2, which is at 3642 Green Avenue. Station 17 in the City of Cypress and Station 48 in the City of Seal Beach are less than two miles from Los Alamitos and provide additional fire services to the City. Table 9 lists addresses and equipment for the three nearest fire stations to the Project Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station No. and Address</th>
<th>Equipment and Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCFA Station No. 2 3642 Green Avenue Los Alamitos, CA</td>
<td>Equipment: 1 paramedic assessment unit engines Personnel: 1 Fire Captain, 1 Engineer, 1 Firefighter/Paramedic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCFA Station No. 17 4991 Cerritos Avenue Cypress, CA</td>
<td>Equipment: 1 BLS Engine, 1 Truck, 1 Medic Van Personnel: 2 Fire Captains, 2 Engineers, 3 Firefighters, 2 Firefighter Paramedics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCFA Station No. 48 3131 Beverly Manor Road Seal Beach, CA</td>
<td>Equipment: 1 BLS Engine and 1 Medic Van Personnel: 1 Fire Captain, 1 Engineer, 1 Firefighter, 2 Firefighter Paramedics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


OCFA’s goals for the provision of fire services are listed below. The response time begins when a station receives an alert and ends when the fire unit arrives on scene. This time includes receiving the call, donning personal safety gear as required, and driving to the incident. Safety rules and seat belt laws prohibit personnel from donning safety gear while en route to an incident.

- First-in engines should arrive on-scene to medical aids and/or fires within 7 minutes and 20 seconds 80 percent of the time.
- First-in truck companies should arrive on-scene to fires within 12 minutes 80 percent of the time.
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- First-in paramedic companies should arrive on-scene at all medical aids within 10 minutes 80 percent of the time.

According to OCFA, the average performance standard for responding to emergency and nonemergency calls is within 7 minutes 20 seconds 80 percent of the time, from receipt of the call to the first unit’s arrival on scene (City of Los Alamitos 2014a). Response times in the City of Los Alamitos can be impacted by a number of conditions—the most significant of these are the large area served by OCFA and congestion on Katella Avenue and Los Alamitos Boulevard during the late afternoons and early evenings.

Development of the 50 condominiums and introduction of 133 new residents to the City under the Proposed Project would result in an increase in calls for fire protection and emergency medical service. However, considering the existing firefighting resources available in and near the City, project impacts on fire protection and emergency services (including response times) are not expected to occur. Additionally, the increase in population under the Proposed Project represents approximately 1.1 percent of the total population of the City and would therefore, not trigger the need for new or physically altered fire facilities. OCFA staffing and equipment levels are also currently optimum given the number of calls generated within the City. Staffing salary is sourced from property taxes.

Furthermore, the City involves OCFA in the development review process in order to ensure that the necessary fire prevention and emergency response features are incorporated into development projects. All site and building improvements proposed under the project would be subject to review and approval by OCFA prior to building permit and certificate of occupancy issuance.

Finally, development of the Proposed Project is required to comply with the most current adopted fire codes, building codes, and nationally recognized fire and life safety standards of the City of Los Alamitos and OCFA, such as those outlined in Chapter 15.08 (Fire Code) of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code, which impose design standards and requirements that seek to minimize and mitigate fire risk. Compliance with these codes and standards is ensured through the City’s and OCFA’s development review and building permit process. For example, fire hydrants would be installed at key locations within the Project Site, as required by OCFA to meet the hose-pull requirements and provide adequate fire access for the land uses of the Proposed Project.

Based on the preceding, the Proposed Project would not adversely affect OCFA’s ability to provide adequate service and would not require new or expanded fire facilities that could result in adverse environmental impacts. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Los Alamitos Police Department provides police protection in Los Alamitos (including the Project Site), including neighborhood patrols, investigations, traffic enforcement, community support, drug education, parking control, and crime prevention. The Los Alamitos Police Department is based at their station at 3201 Katella Avenue in Los Alamitos. Response time to calls for service may vary depending on their location at time of dispatch. Response time requirements are classified by priority: Priority 1 calls are dispatched immediately; Priority 2 calls are dispatched as soon as possible; and
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Priority 3 calls are dispatched as soon as a unit is available. The Los Alamitos Police Department’s performance standard for responding to urgent or Priority 1 calls within its service area is under three minutes. There is no performance measure for nonemergency calls (City of Los Alamitos 2014a).

Development of the 50 condominiums and introduction of 133 new residents to the City under the Proposed Project would result in an increase in calls for police protection service. However, considering the existing police resources available in and near the City, project impacts on police protection services (including response times) are not expected to occur. Additionally, the increase in population under the Proposed Project represents approximately 1.1 percent of the total population of the City and would therefore, not trigger the need for new or physically altered police facilities.

Furthermore, to ensure adequate police protection services are provided and to minimize the demands on such services, the Proposed Project would be designed with the security and design measures and strategies that employ Defensible Space concepts. These measures and strategies incorporate the concepts of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), which involves consideration of measures and strategies such as placement and orientation of structures; access and visibility of common areas; and placement of doors, windows, addressing and landscaping. CPTED promotes public safety and physical security, and allows residents the ability to monitor activity in neighboring areas. For example, some of the CPTED design measures and strategies that would be implemented for the proposed apartment complex include but are not limited to:

- The provision of open space and common area gathering locations dispersed throughout the Project Site (i.e., a central community open space area in the northern end of the Project Site, landscaped esplanade and pedestrian paseos along and between residential buildings) to encourage outdoor activity and resident interaction within the site.

- The multistory nature of the condominiums and provision of windows on all sides increases visibility into the area to improve the “eyes on the street” crime prevention method, by providing eyes from a higher vantage point.

- The placement of dense plantings immediately adjacent to buildings will be avoided to eliminate the creation of hiding places.

The City also involves the Los Alamitos Police Department in the development review process in order to ensure that the necessary police protection measures and strategies are incorporated into development projects. All site and building improvements proposed under the project will be subject to review and approval by the Los Alamitos Police Department. The final CPTED design strategies and features that would be required to be implemented for the Proposed Project will be determined and are subject to review and approval by the Los Alamitos Police Department.

Based on the preceding, the Proposed Project would not adversely affect Los Alamitos Police Department’s ability to provide adequate service and would not require new or expanded police facilities that could result in
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adverse environmental impacts. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

c) Schools

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Proposed Project would be served by the Los Alamitos Unified School District (LAUSD), which currently serves over 9,700 students in grades K–12 from Los Alamitos and the City’s sphere of influence (Rossmoor) (City of Los Alamitos 2014a). LAUSD currently operates six elementary schools, two middle schools, one high school, one continuation high school, one adult school, and one child development center.

Development of the 50 condominiums under the Proposed Project would result in an increase in the number of students that would attend LAUSD schools, which in turn could incrementally increase the demand for school facilities. The student generation rates for LAUSD are: 0.3451 at the elementary level, 0.1040 at the junior high school level, and 0.1790 at the high school level (City of Los Alamitos 2014a). Based on these student generation rates, the Proposed Project would generate approximately 17 elementary school students, 5 middle school students, and 9 high school students. The number of students that would be generated under the Proposed Project at each grade level is not considered a significant increase, nor would the increase result in the need of new or expanded school facilities.

Furthermore, the need for additional school services and facilities is addressed by compliance with school impact assessment fees per Senate Bill 50, also known as Proposition 1A. SB 50—codified in California Government Code Section 65995—was enacted in 1988 to address how schools are financed and how development projects may be assessed for associated school impacts. To address the increase in enrollment at LAUSD schools that would serve the Proposed Project, the Developer would be required to pay school impact fees to reduce any impacts to the school system, in accordance with SB 50. These fees are collected by school districts at the time of issuance of building permits. As stated in Government Code Section 65995(h),

> The payment or satisfaction of a fee, charge, or other requirement levied or imposed … are hereby deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts of any legislative or adjudicative act, or both, involving, but not limited to, the planning, use, or development of real property, or any change in governmental organization or reorganization … on the provision of adequate school facilities.

Payment of the school impact fees would offset impacts from increased demand for school services associated with buildout of the Proposed Project by providing an adequate financial base to construct and equip new and existing schools. Although implementation of the Proposed Project would cause an incremental increase in demand for schools, this increase would be offset by the payment of school fees.

Based on the preceding, the Proposed Project would not adversely affect LAUSD’s ability to provide adequate service and would not require new or expanded school facilities that could result in adverse environmental impacts. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.
d) Parks?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** See response to Section 3.15(a), below. As substantiated in this section, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

e) Other public facilities?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Library services in Los Alamitos are provided by Orange County Public Libraries (OCPL), which is operated by the County of Orange. The 33-branch OCPL system provides residents of Orange County and the City of Los Alamitos with access to books, periodicals, and other materials. Members of the system have access to the network’s entire holdings including, 2.5 million books, 48,500 government publications, 75,000 magazines, 92,700 video/DVD materials, 50,000 cassette/CD books, 13,000 e-books, and 2,246 historical photos. (City of Los Alamitos 2014a). The OCPL library closest to Los Alamitos residents is the Los Alamitos/Rossmoor Library in the City of Seal Beach.

Library service demand is population based—because the Proposed Project would result in population increase, the demands for library service for the City would increase. As noted above, the Proposed Project would result in an increase of 133 residents to Los Alamitos. However, the project’s population increase accounts for approximately 1.1 percent of the City’s population, which would not trigger the need for new or physically altered library facilities. The projected increase in library services demand due to project development is considered minimal. Additionally, library needs are assessed annually by OCPL and budget allocations revised accordingly to ensure that adequate levels of service are maintained throughout the City.

Therefore, the Proposed Project would not adversely affect OCPLs ability to provide adequate service and would not require new or expanded library facilities that could result in adverse environmental impacts. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### 3.15 RECREATION

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Los Alamitos provides parks, school fields, and recreation facilities and programming that directly serve the residents of Los Alamitos, Rossmoor, Seal Beach, and Long Beach. Parks and school fields in Rossmoor are direct resources for Rossmoor residents and offer additional open-space resources for Los Alamitos residents. As stated in the Open Space, Recreation, and Conservation Element of the Los Alamitos General Plan, the City's minimum standard goal for providing local park and recreational facilities is 5 acres per 1,000 people. The City currently provides 4.95 acres of neighborhood and community park and recreation space for every 1,000 residents (City of Los Alamitos 2014a).

Demands for parks and recreation services depend on the population within the City’s service area. Development of the 50 condominiums would add approximately 133 residents to the City’s existing population, and therefore would cause some increase in demands for parks and recreation services and
facilities. Section 16.17.090 (Payment of In Lieu Fees for Park and Recreation Purposes,) of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code requires new subdivisions to dedicate land for parks or payment of in-lieu fees instead of or in combination with the dedication of land so long as the fees are equal to the value of the parkland which would otherwise have been dedicated. Although implementation of the Proposed Project would cause an incremental increase in demand for parks, this increase would be minimal and would be offset by the payment of park fees by the Developer. Payment of fees for parks would enable the City to acquire additional parkland, improve new or existing parkland, or both.

Additionally, future project residents would have access to community amenities and open space areas onsite. As shown in Figure 5, Conceptual Site and Landscape Plan, a central community open space area would be provided in the northern end of the Project Site. The community open space area would feature a curved seat wall and specimen tree for shade, bench seating, and a community dog bag station for pet owners. Also, each residence would feature a private yard or patio with a minimum area of 100 square feet. Most homes would also feature a private deck on the second floor.

Therefore, with the provision of community amenities and open space areas and payment of park fees, no significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

No Impact. The Proposed Project does not involve or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

3.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

The analysis in this section is based partly on the following technical study, which is included as Appendix I to this Initial Study:


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

Less Than Significant Impact. RK Engineering Group, Inc. (RK) prepared a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for the Proposed Project. The purpose of the TIS was to evaluate the potential traffic and circulation impacts associated with the Proposed Project and recommend improvements to mitigate impacts (if any) considered significant in comparison to established City of Los Alamitos regulatory thresholds.

In coordination with the City of Los Alamitos Traffic Engineering staff, the TIS evaluated the existing operating conditions at four study intersections in the project vicinity, estimated the trip generation potential
3. Environmental Analysis

of the Proposed Project, and forecast existing and future operating conditions without and with the Proposed Project. The TIS also provided an evaluation for site access and internal circulation. Following is a summary of the findings and conclusions of the TIS.

Existing Circulation and Mobility

Study Area Intersections

The TIS analyzed existing and future weekday daily, AM, and PM peak hour traffic conditions at four study intersections (all under the jurisdiction of the City of Los Alamitos), which are listed below and shown in Exhibit A (Location Map) of the TIS (see Appendix I).

- Los Alamitos Boulevard/Sausalito Street (existing, signalized)
- Oak Street/Katella Avenue (existing, cross-street stop)
- Chestnut Street/Katella Avenue (existing, cross-street stop)
- Project Driveway/Sausalito Street (proposed, cross-street stop)

Study Area Roadways

Roadways in the project area, which were considered in the TIS, include:

- **Sausalito Street** is a two-lane east-west local street with a speed limit of 25 miles per hour (mph).
- **Oak Street** and **Chestnut Street** are both two-lane north-south local streets with 25 mph speed limits.
- **Katella Avenue** in the study area is an eight-lane divided roadway with a 40-mph speed limit classified as a Smart Street (8 Lane) in the City’s General Plan.
- **Los Alamitos Boulevard** in the study area is a four-lane roadway with a two-way median turn lane and a 35-mph speed limit classified as a Primary Arterial in the City’s General Plan.

Sidewalks

There are public sidewalks on both sides of Sausalito Street, which forms the southern boundary of the Project Site.

Bicycle Facilities

A paved off-road (Class I) bicycle path passes along Coyote Creek Channel near the northwestern end of the Project Site. A Class I bicycle path extends east-west along the north side of Oak Middle School from the Coyote Creek Channel bicycle path to Oak Street. Additionally, signed (Class III) bicycle routes are present on both sides of Cerritos Avenue, which abuts the northern site boundary; and along segments of Catalina Avenue and Walnut Street in the study area.
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Public Transit

The following public transit bus routes operate on Los Alamitos Boulevard and/or Katella Avenue in the project study area:\(^1\)

- Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA)
  - **Route 42**: Extends northeast/southwest between the cities of Seal Beach and Orange; operates on Los Alamitos Boulevard in the study area.
  - **Route 46**: Extends east-west between the cities of Los Alamitos and Orange; operates on Cerritos Avenue and Los Alamitos Boulevard in the study area.
  - **Route 50**: Extends east-west between the cities of Long Beach and Orange; operates on Katella Avenue in the study area.
  - **Route 701 (Express, Monday through Friday peak hours only)**: Extends northwest-southeast between the City of Huntington Beach and Downtown Los Angeles; operates on Los Alamitos Boulevard and Katella Avenue in the study area.

- Long Beach Transit
  - **Route 104**: Extends east-west in the cities of Long Beach and Los Alamitos; operates on Cerritos Avenue and Los Alamitos Boulevard in the study area.

Intersection Analysis

Methodology

The Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) method, used for analyzing signalized intersections, compares traffic volumes using an intersection to the capacity of the intersection (V/C ratio). The ICU method describes intersection operation as a Level of Service (LOS) according to V/C ratio. LOS A, representing free flow, corresponds to a V/C ratio of 0.60 or less; and LOS F, representing forced or breakdown flow, corresponds to a V/C ratio of 1.00 or greater.

The Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) method, used for analyzing unsignalized intersections, defines LOS as a qualitative measure based on factors such as speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort and convenience, and safety. LOS are classified by delay per vehicle in seconds, with LOS A being 10 seconds or less and LOS F being over 50 seconds. LOS A represents free flow and LOS F forced or breakdown flow, as with the ICU method. LOS are defined in more detail in Section 2 and Appendix J of the TIS, which is included as Appendix I of this Initial Study.

\(^1\) The study area respecting public transit services includes the segment of Cerritos Avenue between Los Alamitos Boulevard and the Coyote Creek Channel, and the intersection of Los Alamitos Boulevard and Cerritos Avenue.
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Acceptable Level of Service and Significance Thresholds

The City of Los Alamitos considers LOS D or better to be acceptable. The City defines significant impacts to intersection operation as follows:

- **Signalized Intersections:** The ICU value under “With Project” conditions is 0.901 or greater (LOS E or F) and the ICU increase attributable to the project is 0.010 or greater.

- **Unsignalized Intersections:** The worst-case approach delay, based on HCM methodology, is 35.01 seconds or greater (LOS E or F), and the project-related increase in traffic under “With Project” conditions is 1 percent or more.

Traffic Analysis Scenarios

The TIA analyzed existing and future weekday daily, AM and PM peak hour traffic conditions for the following traffic scenarios:

- Existing Year (2017) Without Project Conditions
- Existing Year (2017) With Project Conditions
- Project Opening Year (2019) With Ambient Growth & Cumulative Projects Without Project Conditions
- Project Opening Year (2019) With Ambient Growth & Cumulative Projects With Project Conditions
- General Plan Buildout Year (2035) With Ambient Growth & Cumulative Projects Without Project Conditions
- General Plan Buildout Year (2035) With Ambient Growth & Cumulative Projects With Project Conditions

For the three with-project scenarios, the TIS analyzed operation of one future intersection, Project Driveway/Sausalito Street – which would be controlled by a cross-street stop – in addition to the three existing intersections analyzed. It should be noted that the existing church use onsite has two driveways intersecting Sausalito Street (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph), compared to the one driveway under the Proposed Project (see Figure 5, Conceptual Site and Landscape Plan).

Additionally, a total of 17 planned and/or approved cumulative projects in the cities of Los Alamitos, Cypress, and Long Beach were considered in the cumulative traffic analysis of the TIA. Exhibit I (Cumulative Projects Location Map) of the TIA depicts the location of the cumulative projects (see Appendix I).

Project Trip Generation

The Proposed Project is estimated to generate 22 trips in the AM peak hour, 26 trips in the PM peak hour, and 291 daily trips, as shown in Table 10.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10</th>
<th>Project Trip Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Generation Rate</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trips Generated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Trip Distribution and Assignment

Project trip distribution was estimated based on near-term conditions, and the highways that are either in place or will be contemplated by approximately 2019, the project buildout year. Project-generated traffic was assigned from the site to the adjoining roadway system based upon the site’s trip generation, trip distribution, and proposed arterial highway and local street systems that would be in place by the time of initial occupancy of the Proposed Project.

Existing Year (2017) Intersection Operations

Existing Year (2017) Without Project Conditions

Two of the existing study area intersections currently operate at unacceptable LOS F under the Existing Year (2017) Without Project conditions, as shown in Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11</th>
<th>Intersection Operations: Existing Year (2017) Without Project Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Traffic Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Blvd/Sausalito St</td>
<td>TS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak St/Katella Ave</td>
<td>CSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut St/Katella Ave</td>
<td>CSS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Existing Year (2017) With Project Conditions

Existing Year (2017) With Project conditions were estimated by adding existing traffic volumes to project traffic volumes. As shown in Table 12, the unsignalized intersections of Oak Street at Katella Avenue and Chestnut Street at Katella Avenue would operate at LOS F under the Existing Year (2017) With Project conditions, which are the two same intersections that would operate at LOS F under the Existing Year (2017) Without Project conditions. However, the project-related increase in traffic volume at the deficient study area intersections is less than one percent. The City defines significant impacts to unsignalized intersections as follows: the project-related increase in traffic under the “With Project” conditions is one percent or more. Therefore, the Proposed Project’s traffic impact at these study-area intersections would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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Table 12  Intersection Operations: Existing Year (2017) With Project Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Analysis Methodology</th>
<th>V/C Ratio/Delay</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Driveway/Sausalito St</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Blvd/Sausalito St</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak St/Katella Ave</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>952.8</td>
<td>632.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut St/Katella Ave</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Opening Year (2019) Intersection Operations

Opening Year (2019) Without Project Conditions

Opening Year (2019) Without Project traffic volumes were estimated by adding forecast traffic from ambient growth and cumulative projects to existing traffic volumes. As shown in Table 13, the unsignalized intersections of Oak Street at Katella Avenue and Chestnut Street at Katella Avenue would operate at LOS F under the Opening Year (2019) Without Project conditions, similar to the Existing Year (2017) Without Project conditions.

Table 13  Intersection Operations: Opening Year (2019) Without Project Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Analysis Methodology</th>
<th>V/C Ratio/Delay</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Blvd/Sausalito St</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>0.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak St/Katella Ave</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>1217.9</td>
<td>1425.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut St/Katella Ave</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>150.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Opening Year (2019) With Project Traffic Conditions

Opening Year (2019) With Project traffic conditions were forecast by adding project traffic volumes to the Opening Year (2019) Without Project traffic volumes. As shown in Table 14, the unsignalized intersections of Oak Street at Katella Avenue and Chestnut Street at Katella Avenue would operate at LOS F under the Opening Year (2019) With Project conditions. However, the project-related increase in traffic volume at the deficient study area intersections is less than one percent. The City defines significant impacts to unsignalized intersections as follows: the project-related increase in traffic under the “With Project” conditions is one percent or more. Therefore, the Proposed Project’s traffic impact at these study-area intersections would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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Table 14  Intersection Operations: Opening Year (2019) With Project Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Analysis Methodology</th>
<th>V/C Ratio/Delay</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Driveway/Sausalito St</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Blvd/Sausalito St</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak St/Katella Ave</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>1225.4</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut St/Katella Ave</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


General Plan Buildout Year (2035) Intersection Operations

General Plan Buildout Year (2035) Without Project Conditions

General Plan Buildout Year (2035) Without Project traffic volumes were forecast by adding forecast traffic from ambient growth and cumulative projects to existing traffic volumes. As shown in Table 15, the unsignalized intersections of Oak Street at Katella Avenue and Chestnut Street at Katella Avenue would operate at LOS F under the General Plan Buildout Year (2035) Without Project conditions.

Table 15  Intersection Operations: General Plan Buildout Year (2035) Without Project Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Analysis Methodology</th>
<th>V/C Ratio/Delay</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Blvd/Sausalito St</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak St/Katella Ave</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>2757.8</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut St/Katella Ave</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>193.3</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RK 2017

General Plan Buildout Year 2035 With-Project Traffic Conditions

General Plan Buildout Year (2035) With Project conditions were forecast by adding project traffic volumes to the General Plan Buildout Year (2035) Without Project traffic volumes. As shown in Table 16, the unsignalized intersections of Oak Street at Katella Avenue and Chestnut Street at Katella Avenue would operate at LOS F under the General Plan Buildout Year (2035) With Project conditions. However, the project-related increase in traffic volume at the deficient study area intersections is less than one percent. The City defines significant impacts to unsignalized intersections as follows: the project-related increase in traffic under the “With Project” conditions is one percent or more. Therefore, the Proposed Project's traffic impact at these study-area intersections would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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Table 16  Intersection Operations: General Plan Buildout Year 2035 With-Project Traffic Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Analysis Methodology</th>
<th>V/C Ratio/Delay</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AM</strong></td>
<td><strong>PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Driveway/Sausalito St</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Blvd/Sausalito St</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak St/Katella Ave</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>2770.5</td>
<td>2570.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut St/Katella Ave</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>193.0</td>
<td>426.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Conclusion

Based on the preceding, no significant traffic impacts were identified in any of the three with-project traffic scenarios analyzed, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Additionally, during the City’s development review process, the Developer would be required to comply with the requirements of the City’s Municipal Code, including payment of the transportation impact fee, as outlined in Chapter 12.16 (Transportation System Improvement Program) of the City’s Municipal Code. As stated in Section 12.16.050 (Use of Fees), the revenue derived from the fees, together with the interest earned, shall be used by the City to pay for construction of transportation facilities or projects listed in the program documents. As stated in Section 12.16.040 (Time for Payment of Fees), the fees are due upon issuance of the first building permit or grading permit and are imposed as a condition of subdivision approval.

Alternative Modes of Transportation Analysis

Impacts to alternative modes of transportation are discussed in Section 3.16(f), below.

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

No Impact. The congestion management program in effect in Orange County is the 2015 Orange County Congestion Management Program (CMP), which was issued by the Orange County Transportation Authority in November 2015. The CMP requires analysis of traffic impacts to CMP roadways and intersections if a project generates 2,400 or more daily trips, or 1,600 or more daily trips for projects that directly access the CMP highway system. All freeways and toll roads, and selected arterial roadways, in Orange County are elements of the CMP Highway System.

One study area roadway, Katella Avenue, is a CMP roadway; however, there are no CMP intersections in the study area. As shown in Table 10, Project Trip Generation, the Proposed Project is projected to generate approximately 291 daily vehicle trips, and therefore, does not meet the criteria required for a CMP traffic analysis. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with the CMP. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

No Impact. The Project Site is approximately 0.9 mile northwest of JFTBLA, from which both fixed-wing aircraft and helicopters operate. The approach and departure routes for fixed-wing aircraft to and from JFTBLA do not pass over the Project Site; approach routes are from the northeast, passing east of the site, while the departure route is to the southwest over the City of Seal Beach (OCALUC 2016). The Project Site is however, in the area surrounding JFTBLA where heights of structures are regulated to prevent obstructions to air navigation pursuant to Federal Aviation Administration Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77. The imaginary surface limiting structure heights over the Project Site is at approximately 300 feet above mean sea level (amsl). The elevation onsite ranges from approximately 29 feet amsl at the northeast corner of the site to approximately 25 feet amsl at the south end of the site. Therefore, the tallest structure permitted onsite under the JFTBLA Airport Environs Land Use Plan is approximately 171 feet in height. The proposed project involves the construction of three-story condominium buildings at 35 feet in height. The proposed building heights would not exceed the height permitted onsite under FAR Part 77 and would therefore, not pose an obstruction to air navigation. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

No Impact. As shown in Figure 5, Conceptual Site and Landscape Plan, vehicular access to the Project Site would be provided via one stop-controlled all-access driveway (all turning movements permitted) off Sausalito Street. The proposed intersection would be approximately 75 feet west of the intersection of Walnut Street and Sausalito Street. Internal site circulation would consist of a main driveway extending north-south through the site and east-west drive aisles providing access between the main driveway and individual units. Turning movements between the driveway and Sausalito Street would not conflict with turning movements at existing intersections.

The City and OCFA have adopted roadway design standards that preclude the construction of any unsafe roadway, circulation, or access design features. The design of the proposed internal drive aisles, access driveways, and other circulation improvements would be required to adhere to the City’s Standard Plans and OCFAs design standards, which are imposed on project developments by the City and OCFA during the building plan check and development review process. Compliance with these established design standards would ensure that hazards due to design features would not occur and that the placement of the circulation improvements would not create a conflict for motorists, pedestrians, or bicyclists traveling within or around the Project Site.

Furthermore, the Proposed Project would provide a network of low-speed internal drive aisles that would be safe and walkable for pedestrians, while maintaining an efficient circulation system for vehicles. The Proposed Project would also not include incompatible uses such as farm equipment on area roadways.

Therefore, no impacts resulting from hazards due to design features or incompatible uses would occur as a result of the Proposed Project and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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**e) Result in inadequate emergency access?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As outlined above, the Proposed Project would introduce various onsite vehicular access and circulation improvements. To address fire access needs, the improvements would be required to be designed in accordance with all applicable OCFA design standards for emergency access (e.g., minimum lane width and turning radius). For example, internal drive aisles would be designed to meet the minimum width requirements of OCFA to allow the passing of emergency vehicles.

Additionally, the Proposed Project would be required to incorporate all applicable design and safety requirements as set forth in the most current adopted fire codes, building codes, and nationally recognized fire and life safety standards of the City and OCFA, such as those outlined in Chapter 15.08 (Fire Code) of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code. Compliance with these provisions and standards is ensured through the City’s and OCFA’s development review and building plan check process.

Additionally, during the building plan check and development review process, the City would coordinate with OCFA and the Los Alamitos Police Department to ensure that the necessary fire prevention and emergency response features are incorporated into the Proposed Project and that adequate circulation and access are provided within the access and circulation components of the Proposed Project. All site and building improvements proposed under the project would be subject to review and approval by the City, OCFA, and Los Alamitos Police Department prior to building permit and certificate of occupancy issuance.

Implementation of the Proposed Project would also not require major road closures or otherwise impact the functionality of Sausalito Street as a public safety access route. However, some minor improvements would be required within the Sausalito Street right-of-way, which would require temporary closure of small portions of these roads. For example, some construction would occur within the public right-of-way of these roads in order to make the necessary potable water and wastewater infrastructure connections, and in order to accommodate the new driveway proposed off Sausalito Street. Any minor road closures would be temporary and would only be necessary during the construction activities associated with these improvements. All proposed road closures would also be subject to review and approval by the City. Upon completion of the roadway improvements, all road conditions would be restored to normal.

Therefore, no impacts to emergency access would occur as a result of the Proposed Project and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**No Impact.** Project development would not result in an impact to the public sidewalk on the north side of Sausalito Street along the site frontage. The public sidewalk would remain under the Proposed Project. Additionally, there are no bicycle facilities on Sausalito Street fronting the Project Site, and no transit bus routes operate on Sausalito Street. Therefore, no impact would occur to such facilities or services and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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3.17 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is:

- Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

- A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

Less Than Significant Impact. Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) requires meaningful consultation with California Native American Tribes on potential impacts to tribal cultural resources, as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074. Tribal cultural resources are sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either eligible or listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or local register of historical resources (CNRA 2016).

As part of the AB 52 process, Native American tribes must submit a written request to the relevant lead agency (in this case, the City of Los Alamitos) if it wishes to be notified of projects within its traditionally and culturally affiliated area. The lead agency must provide written, formal notification to the tribes that have requested it within 14 days of determining that a project application is complete, or deciding to undertake a project. The tribe must respond to the lead agency within 30 days of receipt of the notification if it wishes to engage in consultation on the project, and the lead agency must begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving the request for consultation. Consultation concludes when either 1): the parties agree to mitigation measures to avoid a significant effect, if one exists, on a tribal cultural resource, or 2) a party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached. AB 52 also addresses confidentiality during tribal consultation per Public Resources Code Section 21082.3(c).

To date, five tribes (Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians; Gabrielleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation; Juaneno Band of Mission Indians, Achachemen Nation; San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians; and Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians) have requested to be included on the City’s AB 52 consultation list, which is a list of tribes the City maintains for consultation purposes for the purpose of mitigating potential impacts to tribal cultural resources under CEQA. A letter was sent to each of the tribes on May 24, 2017, which requested comments and responses from the tribes. The 30-day noticing requirement under AB 52 was completed on June 24, 2017, and to date, none of the tribes has responded to the City’s AB 52 consultation letter.

Based on the preceding, impacts to tribal cultural resource would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.
3.18 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The analysis in this section is based partly on the following technical study, which is included as Appendix G to this Initial Study:

- **Hydrology Study**, Alan Short, P.E., November 15, 2016.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Orange County Sanitation District (OCSD) is responsible for the collection, treatment, and disposal of domestic, commercial, and industrial wastewater generated by people living and working in central and northwestern Orange County. OCSD facilities, Reclamation Plant No. 1 in the City of Fountain Valley and Treatment Plant No. 2 in the City of Huntington Beach, would receive wastewater generated from the Proposed Project. Both plants provide a mix of advanced primary and secondary treatment. OCSD is required by federal and state law to meet applicable standards of treatment plant discharge requirements. Specifically, OCSD’s wastewater treatment system is subject to NPDES Permit No.CA0110604 issued by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board in 2012 under Order No. R8-2012-0035 (SARWQCB 2012). The NPDES permit regulates the amount and type of pollutants that the system can discharge into receiving waters. OCSD’s wastewater treatment system is operating in compliance with and would continue to operate subject to state waste discharge requirements and federal NPDES permit requirements, as set forth in the NPDES permit and order.

Additionally, the Proposed Project consists of residential development and does not propose any industrial or commercial land uses that could require special treatment. Furthermore, as discussed in greater depth below in Section 3.18(b), project-generated effluent can be accommodated with the available capacity of the OCSD system; therefore, project occupancy would not require an expansion of capacity that may result in exceedance of the existing waste discharge requirements.

Therefore, the additional wastewater (quantity and type) that would be generated by the Proposed Project and treated by OCSD would not impede OCSD’s ability to continue to meet its wastewater treatment requirements. Impacts on OCSD’s wastewater treatment requirements would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

b) **Require or result in the construction of new water or waste water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Following is a discussion of the Proposed Project’s potential impacts on water and wastewater treatment facilities.
3. Environmental Analysis

**Water Treatment**

Golden State Water Company (GSWC) provides water to the City of Los Alamitos, including the Project Site. Water imported by GSWC is treated at the Jensen, Weymouth, or Diemer Filtration Plants, which are owned and operated by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). Water treatment facilities filter and/or disinfect water before it is delivered to customers. Once treated, the water is delivered to land uses in the City. The three filtration plants have a total capacity of approximately 1.79 billion gallons per day (gpd) (MWD 2017). Recycled water is treated at OCSD’s Plant 1 in Fountain Valley and/or Plant 2 in Huntington Beach. Plant 1 has capacity of 182 million gallons per day (mgd) and average flows of 117 mgd, for residual capacity of about 65 mgd. Plant 2 has capacity of 150 mgd and average flows of 67 mgd, for residual capacity of approximately 83 mgd (OCSD 2016a).

As noted below in Section 3.18(d), total estimated project water demand is approximately 14,500 gpd. Based on the water treatment capacities of the aforementioned treatment plants, there is sufficient water treatment capacity in the region for project water demand. Therefore, project development would not require the construction of new or expanded water treatment facilities. No significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Wastewater Treatment**

Wastewater treatment available to Los Alamitos is described in Section 3.18(a), above. As noted in Section 3.18(a), OCSD provides wastewater treatment for Los Alamitos via two reclamation plants: Reclamation Plant No. 1 in Fountain Valley and Treatment Plant No. 2 in Huntington Beach. Reclamation Plant No. 1 has a capacity of 204 million gallons per day (mgd) for advanced primary and secondary treatment; the plant treats an average of 97 mgd, and the remaining capacity at this plant is approximately 107 mgd (OCSD 2013). Current capacity for Treatment Plant No. 2 is 168 mgd of primary treated wastewater and 150 mgd of secondary treated wastewater. The current average flow of primary treated wastewater is 103 mgd; therefore, remaining capacity at this plant is approximately 67 mgd (OCSD 2013).

Wastewater generation is taken to be 100 percent of indoor water use. Project operation is forecast to generate an indoor water demand of approximately 178.5 gpd per unit (CAPCOA 2016), or approximately 8,925 gpd for the 50 condominiums proposed under the project. The amount of wastewater that would be generated by the Proposed Project is less than 1 percent of OCSD’s total remaining daily treatment capacity of Reclamation Plant No. 1 and Treatment Plant No. 2. There is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity in the region for the estimated project wastewater generation.

Additionally, in order for OCSD to keep its facilities in good condition to prevent system failures, permit violations, sewage spills, and beach closures, individual property owners would be required to pay a yearly sewer service fee to OCSD. The sewer service fee is for the collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater that is collected, treated, and/or recycled by OCSD. The fee is collected annually as a line item on property tax bills (OCSD 2016b).

Therefore, project development would not require the construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities. No significant impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Project development would include installation of an onsite storm drainage system; impacts of such installation would be part of the impacts of the whole project analyzed throughout Chapter 3, *Environmental Analysis*, of this Initial Study. Project development would not involve or require construction of new or expanded off-site drainage facilities, as substantiated in Section 3.9(d), above. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** GSWC provides water to the City of Los Alamitos, including the Project Site. Groundwater comprises nearly all GSWC’s water supplies. GSWC forecasts that it will have sufficient water supplies to meet demands in its service area over the 2020-2040 period in normal, single-dry-year, and multiple-dry-year conditions; supply and demand forecasts for that period in normal year conditions are shown in Table 17.

**Table 17 Water Supplies and Demands in Acre-Feet Per Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplies</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>13,324</td>
<td>14,798</td>
<td>14,967</td>
<td>15,138</td>
<td>15,309</td>
<td>15,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imported Water</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>1,701</td>
<td>1,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,441</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,722</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,983</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,246</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,510</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,701</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Demands</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,440</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,722</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,983</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,246</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,510</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,701</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Project operation is estimated to generate indoor water demands of approximately 8,925 gpd. Outdoor water demand is estimated at approximately 112.5 gpd per unit or 5,625 gpd. Therefore, total estimated project water demands are approximately 14,500 gpd. As noted above, GSWC forecasts that it will have sufficient water supplies to meet demands in its service area over the 2020-2040 period in normal, single-dry-year, and multiple-dry-year conditions. There are adequate water supplies to meet the water demands of the Proposed Project, and development the Proposed Project would not require GSWC to obtain new or expanded water supplies.

Additionally, the City’s current and future water needs and projections (which include the demands of the potential residential development on the Project Site consistent with the City’s General Plan land use designation of the site, Multi Family Residential) outlined in the GSWC’s 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) are based in part on the City’s General Plan land use plan. The City’s General Plan and the associated population projections (which included the potential/future population increase of developing the Project Site with residential uses) were utilized in the 2015 UWMP in projecting current and future water demands. Therefore, the City’s current and future water demands outlined in the 2015 UWMP took into
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consideration future development of the Project Site with residential uses and its associated population increase.

Furthermore, as noted in Section 1.3.8, *Green Building and Sustainability*, the Proposed Project would be designed to include a number of green building practices/features that would help reduce water usage and demand, including tankless water heaters, low flow faucets and toilets, and drip irrigation. Other green building practices/features would be considered by the City as the Proposed Project is refined during the design and construction phase. The Proposed Project's landscaping would also be required to be installed and maintained in compliance with the water-efficient landscape requirements outlined in Chapter 13.05 (Water Efficient Landscaping) of the City’s Municipal Code.

Finally, development of the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the provisions of GALGreen, which contains requirements for indoor water use reduction and site irrigation conservation. Specifically, project development would be required to adhere to mandatory residential measures outlined in Division 4.3 (Water Efficiency and Conservation) of CALGreen, including those of Sections 4.303 (Indoor Water Use) and 4.304 (Outdoor Water Use).

Based on the preceding, there are adequate water supplies to meet the water demands of the Proposed Project and project development would not require GSWC to obtain new or expanded water supplies. Therefore, impacts on water supplies due to project development would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Impacts would be less than significant, as substantiated in Section 3.18(b), above.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Trash, recyclables, and green waste within the City are collected by Consolidated Disposal Service. In 2015, the latest year for which data are available, approximately 96 percent of the solid waste landfilled from the City was disposed of at three landfills in Orange County, which are operated by OC Waste and Recycling: Frank R. Bowerman Landfill near the City of Irvine, Olinda Alpha Landfill near the City of Brea, and Prima Deshecha Landfill near the City of San Juan Capistrano (CalRecycle 2017a). Table 18 identifies the capacities of landfills that serve the City.
### Development of the Proposed Project

Development of the Proposed Project would result in the generation of solid waste from the short-term construction period and from long-term project operations. Condominium units are estimated to generate about 5.31 pounds of solid waste per unit per day (CalRecycle 2017f). Applying this generation rate, the 50 condominiums under the Proposed Project are estimated to generate approximately 265.5 pounds of solid waste per day. Project construction would also generate some greenwaste from site clearance and solid waste (e.g., asphalt, concrete) from demolition of the existing church building and parking lots.

As demonstrated in Table 18, there is adequate landfill capacity in the region for the Proposed Project's forecast solid waste disposal, and project development would not require additional landfill capacity at any of the three landfills serving the City. Additionally, the total amount of solid waste expected to be generated under the Proposed Project would be minimal compared to the total permitted daily maximum solid waste tonnage per day of the three landfills serving the City.

Additionally, bins for both solid waste and recycling would be provided in a designated location within the parking garage of each condominium unit. The provision of recycling bins would help reduce the amount of solid waste that would need to be transported to the landfills serving the Proposed Project.

Furthermore, development of the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the provisions of CALGreen, which outlines requirements for construction waste reduction, material selection, and natural resource conservation. For example, Section 5.408 (Construction Waste Reduction, Disposal, and Recycling) of CALGreen requires that at least 50 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste from nonresidential construction operations be recycled and/or salvaged for reuse.

Based on the preceding, no significant impacts on landfill capacity would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

**No Impact.** See response to section 3.18(f), above.
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Additionally, the following federal and state laws and regulations govern solid waste disposal. USEPA administers the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 and the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, which govern solid waste disposal. In the State of California, Assembly Bill 939 (Integrated Solid Waste Management Act of 1989; Public Resources Code 40050 et seq.) required every California city and county to divert 50 percent of its waste from landfills by the year 2000 by such means as recycling, source reduction, and composting. In addition, AB 939 requires each county to prepare a countywide siting element specifying areas for transformation or disposal sites to provide capacity for solid waste generated in the county that cannot be reduced or recycled for a 15-year period. AB 1327, the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991, requires local agencies to adopt ordinances mandating the use of recyclable materials in development projects. There are 36 solid waste diversion programs in the City of Los Alamitos, including composting, recycling, household hazardous waste, and business waste reduction programs (CalRecycle 2017g).

Compliance with AB 939 is measured in part by actual disposal rates compared to target disposal rates; actual rates at or below target rates are consistent with AB 939. Actual disposal rates for the City of Los Alamitos in 2015, the latest year for which data are available, were 7.9 pounds per day (ppd) per resident and 7.0 ppd per employee; target disposal rates were 10.8 ppd per resident and 9.3 ppd per employee (CalRecycle 2017g). Therefore, disposal rates in Los Alamitos in 2015 were consistent with AB 939. The Developer would be required to comply with all applicable laws and regulations governing solid waste, including those listed above, and in doing so, not affect the City's ability to continue to meet the required AB 939 waste diversion requirements.

Assembly Bill 341 (Chapter 476, Statutes of 2011) mandates recycling for commercial and multi-family residential land uses. Assembly Bill 1826 (California Public Resources Code Sections 42649.8 et seq.) requires recycling of organic matter by businesses, and multifamily residences of five or more units, generating such wastes in amounts over certain thresholds. Organic waste means food waste, green waste, landscape and pruning waste, nonhazardous wood waste, and food-soiled paper waste that is mixed in with food waste. Multifamily residences are not required to have a food waste diversion program. The Proposed Project would include storage areas for recyclable materials and organic matter recycling in accordance with the two laws.

Section 5.408 (Construction Waste Reduction, Disposal, and Recycling) of the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen; Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 11) requires that at least 50 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste from nonresidential construction operations be recycled and/or salvaged for reuse. At least 50 percent of nonhazardous demolition debris from demolition of the church building and parking lot would be recycled or salvaged in compliance with the referenced regulation.

Therefore, no impact related to solid waste statutes and regulations would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
3.19 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. The Project Site is currently developed and disturbed and is in a highly-urbanized area of the City. As shown in Figures 3, Aerial Photograph, and 4, Site Photographs, the site is developed with a church use and its associated improvements. Onsite vegetation includes a number of decorative trees and shrubs along the site boundaries and internal to the Project Site. As shown in Figure 3, the Project Site is surrounded by a mix of residential, office, and commercial uses. The Project Site does not contain any sensitive natural resources that could be disturbed as a result of project development. As demonstrated in Section 3.4, Biological Resources, implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in the reduction of the habitat of fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Impacts to nesting habitat for migratory birds would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 (see Section 3.4[d], above). Additionally, as demonstrated in Section 3.5, Cultural Resources, no historic resources were identified onsite, and therefore the project does not have the potential to eliminate important examples of California history or prehistory.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Section 3.10, Land Use and Planning, includes a detailed analysis of the Proposed Project’s potential land use impacts. Specifically, this section includes a detailed analysis of adopted land use regulations applicable to the Project Site, which include the City’s General Plan and zoning code, and the Proposed Project’s consistency with these adopted land use regulations. As demonstrated in Section 3.10, implementation of the Proposed Project would be consistent and not conflict with the City’s General Plan or zoning code. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not weigh short-term goals above long-term environmental goals of the City. The issues relevant to development of the Proposed Project are confined to the immediate project area.

Additionally, the Project Site is in a highly-urbanized area of the City where supporting utility infrastructure (e.g., water, wastewater, and drainage) and services (e.g., solid waste collection) currently exist. The Project Site is also generally too small in scope to appreciably contribute to existing cumulative impacts.

Cumulative traffic impacts were also considered in the TIS prepared for the Proposed Project (see Appendix I), whose findings and conclusions are provided in Section 3.16, Transportation/Traffic. Specifically, the TIA
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included traffic that would be generated by the related cumulative projects in the project study area under the various traffic scenarios analyzed. As concluded in Section 3.16, no impacts would occur under these future traffic conditions, which considered cumulative traffic impacts.

Finally, impacts related to other topical areas such as air quality, GHG, hydrology and water quality, and recreation would not be cumulatively considerable with development of the Proposed Project in conjunction with other cumulative projects.

In consideration of the preceding factors, the Proposed Project’s contribution to cumulative impacts would be rendered less than significant; therefore, project impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

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

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. As discussed in the respective topical sections of this Initial Study, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in impacts in the areas of geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, and noise, which may cause adverse effects on human beings. However, feasible mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures GEO-1, HAZ-1 through HAZ-4, N-1, and N-2) have been identified to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would have no substantial adverse effects on human beings.
4. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Project-specific mitigation measures have been categorized in matrix format, as shown in Table 19. The matrix identifies the environmental factor, specific mitigation measures, schedule, and responsible monitor. The mitigation matrix serves as the basis for scheduling the implementation of, and compliance with, all mitigation measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsibility for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-1 Prior to the commencement of any proposed actions (e.g., site clearing, demolition, grading) during the breeding/nesting season (February 1 to August 31, as defined by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife), the monitoring biologist contracted by the project applicant shall conduct a preconstruction survey(s) to identify any active nests in and near the project area no more than three days prior to initiation of the action. If the biologist does not find any active nests that would be potentially impacted, the proposed action may proceed. However, if the biologist finds an active nest within or adjacent to the action area and determines that the nest may be impacted, the biologist shall delineate an appropriate buffer zone around the nest using temporary plastic fencing or other suitable materials, such as barricade tape and traffic cones. The buffer zone shall range from a 300- to 500-foot radius at the discretion of the biologist and in coordination with the construction contractor. Only specified activities (if any) approved by the qualified biologist in coordination with the construction contractor shall take place within the buffer zone until the nest is vacated. Activities that may be prohibited within the buffer zone by the biologist may</td>
<td>Project Applicant/Developer, Construction Contractor, and Monitoring Biologist</td>
<td>Prior to the commencement of any proposed actions (e.g., site clearing, demolition, grading) during the breeding/nesting season</td>
<td>City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 19</th>
<th>Mitigation Monitoring Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Responsibility for Implementation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include but not be limited to grading and tree clearing. Once the nest is no longer active and upon final determination by the biologist, the proposed action may proceed within the buffer zone. Any active nests observed during the survey shall be mapped on a recent aerial photograph, including documentation of GPS coordinates.</td>
<td>Project Applicant/Developer, Geotechnical/Soils Engineer, and Construction Contractor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GEOLGY AND SOILS

**GEO-1** Prior to the issuance of grading and/or building permits, the project applicant shall demonstrate to the City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department that all design parameters (including those listed as "recommended") provided in the project’s Geotechnical Report prepared by Albus-Keefe & Associates and dated May 19, 2017 (incorporated herein by this reference), have been incorporated into the project design and grading plans. During grading and construction activities, the City’s Development Services Department staff shall verify that all such activities are implemented in accordance with the design parameters of the Geotechnical Report.

Project Applicant/Developer, Geotechnical/Soils Engineer, and Construction Contractor | Prior to the issuance of grading and/or building permits | City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department |

### HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

**HAZ-1** The project applicant/developer shall comply with all requirements set forth in the Final Draft Response Plan prepared by Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. and dated February 13, 2017 (incorporated herein by this reference), which was approved by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board on April 24, 2017. The City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department staff shall ensure that all requirements of the plan have been implemented accordingly. This does not include any monitoring by the Regional Water Quality Control Board that may be required under the plan.

Project Applicant/Developer, Geotechnical/Soils Engineer, and Construction Contractor | Prior to the issuance of occupancy or temporary occupancy permits | City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department, with oversight from the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (as needed) |
### Table 19 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsibility for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-2</td>
<td>Project Applicant/Developer, Construction Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance or grading and/or building permits</td>
<td>City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>No grading permit or other building permits shall be issued until the City of Los Alamitos receives clearance from the appropriate County of Orange agency that the necessary remediation work has been completed in accordance with the Final Draft Response Plan prepared by Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. and dated February 13, 2017 (incorporated herein by this reference), which was approved by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board on April 24, 2017. This shall not prevent the City from issuing any permits that may be required for purposes of soil remediation work.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-3</td>
<td>Project Applicant/Developer, Site Assessment Specialist, Homeowners Association, with oversight from the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWQCB) or other regulatory agency until such time as SARWQCB issues a regulatory closure letter. Upon issuance of the closure letter by SARWQCB, the project applicant/developer or HOA shall furnish the City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department with a copy of the letter.</td>
<td>Throughout the continued monitoring of the wells installed onsite and upon issuance of the closure letter by SARWQCB</td>
<td>City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-4</td>
<td>Project Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of occupancy or temporary occupancy permits</td>
<td>City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The project applicant/developer shall be required to record a separate notice to provide notification of the presence of vapor barriers (where such building features are installed) to future project owners and residents. The notice is in addition to any other provisions that may be included in the established Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&amp;Rs). The project applicant/developer shall furnish the City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department with proof of the notice provided to future owners or residents.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsibility for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HYDRLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 (listed above) apply here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOISE</td>
<td>N-1</td>
<td>Project Applicant/Developer, Construction Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to the start of and during construction activities</td>
<td>City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 19 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsibility for Monitoring</th>
<th>Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the completion of construction, any damage caused to existing buildings shall be repaired at the expense of the project applicant/construction contractor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-2 The following measures shall be implemented by the construction contractor during the extent of the project's construction phase:</td>
<td>Project Applicant/Developer, Construction Contractor</td>
<td>During the extent of the project's construction phase</td>
<td>City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All construction equipment engines shall be properly tuned and muffled according to manufacturers' specifications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staging and construction activities whose specific location on the project site may be flexible (e.g., operation of compressors and generators, cement mixing, general truck idling, etc.) shall be conducted as far as possible from the residences to the west and south.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
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