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: Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments

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 3342 Cerritos Avenue (APN 242-222-11), 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: The proposed project includes development of the vacant project site with residential uses. The project includes construction of up to 107 luxury apartment units in two three-story buildings, with two levels of apartment units over one level of enclosed parking garage. Other project components include vehicular and pedestrian access and circulation improvements; surface parking and utility improvements; common landscape/open space and recreation areas; and various hardscape and landscape improvements. Project development requires City approval of a site plan review.

EXISTING CONDITIONS: The project site is vacant and void of any building and vegetation—the site consists mostly of bare or exposed soil. The previous commercial building (equipment rental business) that occupied the northern portion of the project site was recently demolished. The site is bordered by chain-link fencing on all sides. Overhead power lines on wooden poles are located in the northern portion of the project site.

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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### Abbreviations and Acronyms

- **AAQS**: ambient air quality standards
- **AB**: Assembly Bill
- **ACM**: asbestos-containing materials
- **ADT**: average daily traffic
- **amsl**: above mean sea level
- **AQMP**: air quality management plan
- **AST**: aboveground storage tank
- **BAU**: business as usual
- **bgs**: below ground surface
- **BMP**: best management practices
- **CAA**: Clean Air Act
- **CAFE**: corporate average fuel economy
- **CalARP**: California Accidental Release Prevention Program
- **CalEMA**: California Emergency Management Agency
- **Cal/EPA**: California Environmental Protection Agency
- **CAL FIRE**: California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
- **CALGreen**: California Green Building Standards Code
- **Cal/OSHA**: California Occupational Safety and Health Administration
- **CalRecycle**: California Department of Resources, Recycling, and Recovery
- **Caltrans**: California Department of Transportation
- **CARB**: California Air Resources Board
- **CBC**: California Building Code
- **CCAA**: California Clean Air Act
- **CCR**: California Code of Regulations
- **CDE**: California Department of Education
- **CDFW**: California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- **CEQA**: California Environmental Quality Act
- **CERCLA**: Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act
- **cfs**: cubic feet per second
- **CGS**: California Geologic Survey
- **CMP**: congestion management program
- **CNEDDB**: California Natural Diversity Database
- **CNEL**: community noise equivalent level
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>carbon monoxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_{2e}$</td>
<td>carbon dioxide equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corps</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>combined sewer overflows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPA</td>
<td>Certified Unified Program Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>Clean Water Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dB</td>
<td>decibel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dBA</td>
<td>A-weighted decibel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPM</td>
<td>diesel particulate matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTSC</td>
<td>Department of Toxic Substances Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>environmental impact report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>United States Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPCRA</td>
<td>Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG</td>
<td>greenhouse gases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWP</td>
<td>global warming potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>Highway Capacity Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQTA</td>
<td>high quality transit area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>heating, ventilating, and air conditioning system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPCC</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_{dn}$</td>
<td>day-night noise level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_{eq}$</td>
<td>equivalent continuous noise level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBP</td>
<td>lead-based paint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCFS</td>
<td>low-carbon fuel standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>level of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LST</td>
<td>localized significance thresholds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_W$</td>
<td>moment magnitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCL</td>
<td>maximum contaminant level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEP</td>
<td>maximum extent practicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mgd</td>
<td>million gallons per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMT</td>
<td>million metric tons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Abbreviations and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>metropolitan planning organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>metric ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWD</td>
<td>Metropolitan Water District of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAHC</td>
<td>Native American Heritage Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO(_X)</td>
<td>nitrogen oxides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>National Pollution Discharge Elimination System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O(_3)</td>
<td>ozone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OES</td>
<td>California Office of Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>particulate matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTW</td>
<td>publicly owned treatment works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>parts per million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPV</td>
<td>peak particle velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRA</td>
<td>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>recognized environmental condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>risk management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>root mean square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPS</td>
<td>renewable portfolio standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB</td>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Senate Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>Southern California Association of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD</td>
<td>South Coast Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>state implementation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLM</td>
<td>sound level meter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoCAB</td>
<td>South Coast Air Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO(_X)</td>
<td>sulfur oxides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQMP</td>
<td>stormwater quality management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>source receptor area [or state responsibility area]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSMP</td>
<td>standard urban stormwater mitigation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWP</td>
<td>State Water Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRCB</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>toxic air contaminants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNM</td>
<td>transportation noise model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Abbreviations and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tpd</td>
<td>tons per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRI</td>
<td>toxic release inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTCP</td>
<td>traditional tribal cultural places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>United States Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>United States Geological Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UST</td>
<td>underground storage tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWMP</td>
<td>urban water management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>volume-to-capacity ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VdB</td>
<td>velocity decibels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHFHSZ</td>
<td>very high fire hazard severity zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>vehicle miles traveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>volatile organic compound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQMP</td>
<td>water quality management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSA</td>
<td>water supply assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

The proposed project includes development of a vacant project site with residential uses. The project includes construction of up to 107 luxury apartment units in two three-story buildings, with two levels of apartment units over one level of enclosed parking garage. Other project components include vehicular and pedestrian access and circulation improvements; surface parking and utility improvements; common landscape/open space and recreation areas; and various hardscape and landscape improvements.

The City of Los Alamitos, as lead agency, is responsible for preparing environmental documentation in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) 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 (EIR), Negative Declaration, or Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) would be appropriate for providing 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 approximately 3.6-acre (net acres) vacant 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 Figures 1, Regional Location, and 2, Local Vicinity). Interstate and regional access to the City are provided predominantly by Interstate 405 (I-405) and I-605.

The project site, which has an address of 3342 Cerritos Avenue (APN 242-222-11), 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 Figure 3, Aerial Photograph).

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

1.2.1 Existing Land Use

As shown in Figure 4, Site Photographs, the project site is vacant and void of any building and vegetation—the site consists mostly of bare or exposed soil. The previous commercial building (equipment rental business) that occupied the northern portion of the project site (see Figure 3) was recently demolished. The site is bordered by chain-link fencing on all sides. Overhead power lines on wooden poles are located in the
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northern portion of the project site. Current vehicular access to the project site is via a driveway off Cerritos Avenue.

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 and Coyote Creek Channel to the west; commercial, office and light-industrial uses to the north and northeast, across Cerritos Avenue; and commercial and light-industrial uses to the east, abutting the project site and across Chestnut Street.

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.
Figure 1 - Regional Location
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Note: Unincorporated county areas are shown in white.

Source: ESRI, 2018
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Figure 2 - Local Vicinity
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Note: Unincorporated county areas are shown in white.
Source: ESRI, 2018
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Figure 3 - Aerial Photograph
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Figure 4 - Site Photographs

1. Introduction

Looking east across project site.

Looking southwest across project site.

Looking east across project site.

Looking west across project site.

Looking south across project site.

Looking southwest across project site.
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1.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project being proposed involves the development of a new apartment community, the Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments (Proposed Project). Following is a detailed description of the Proposed Project’s overall site plan and character and the various development features/elements and improvements that would be implemented under the project. The project phasing and construction discussion is provided below in Section 1.3.7, Project Phasing and Construction.

1.3.1 Site Plan and Character

The project applicant/developer (Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments, LLC) proposes to construct up to 107 luxury apartment units on the vacant and underutilized project site. The apartment units would be provided at a density of approximately 29.7 dwelling units per acre (107 units divided by 3.6 acres). Table 1 provides a breakdown of the apartment unit plan types that would be offered, which include studios and one-, two-, and three-bedroom units. As shown in the table, the square footage of the plan types would range between 689 and 1,243 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 0 – Bachelor/Studio with 1 bath</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 1A – 1 bedroom with 1 bath</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 2A – 2 bedrooms with 2 baths</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 2B – 2 bedrooms with 2 baths</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 2C – 2 bedrooms with 2 baths</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 3A – 3 bedrooms with 2 baths</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 3B – 3 bedrooms with 2 baths</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The leasing office and lobby of the apartments would be in the northern end of Building B (the apartment building on the east side of the proposed private street), and a number of resident amenities and services (described below) would also be provided in this portion of the apartment building.

Figure 5, Conceptual Site and Landscape Plan, illustrates the overall site and landscape design of the Proposed Project. As shown in Figure 5, the two apartment buildings would be separated from one another by the proposed north-south private street, which would connect Cerritos Street on the north to Sausalito Street on the south. The larger of the two apartment buildings would be placed on the west side of the proposed private street, with the smaller building being placed on the east side. Both buildings would be three stories in height (up to 35 feet), with two levels of apartment units over one level of enclosed parking garage. Each apartment unit would feature a private balcony, with balcony sizes varying depending on the unit plan type.
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Figure 6, *Conceptual Building Perspective: Main Entrance View From Cerritos Avenue*, Figures 7a and 7b, *Conceptual Building Elevations: Building A*, and Figures 8a through 8c, *Conceptual Building Elevations: Building B*, illustrate the conceptual building elevations and architectural style and elements/features of the proposed apartment buildings. As shown in these figures, the proposed architectural style would be Mediterranean, and the proposed buildings include design elements/features (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; decorative recesses; corbels; vinyl windows; metal railings and decorative elements; and concrete S-tile roofs. Building pop-outs and offsets, recesses, 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.

Additionally, as shown in Figures 6 through 8c, the mixture of colors, textures, and materials of the buildings would help balance the intended permanence of the buildings with the people scale of the buildings and their surroundings, as well as with the people scale of the overall development. 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 and pedestrian access and circulation improvements, infrastructure improvements, and 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 common landscape/open space and recreation areas, along the private street, and along the perimeter of the site. All setbacks and other common areas not occupied by buildings or hardscape improvements (e.g., private street, pedestrian walkways) would be landscaped. The proposed landscape plan includes the planting of approximately 226 new trees. Proposed tree types would include but not be limited to Jacaranda, Eucalyptus, Italian Cypress, and Olive trees. All common areas and landscaping would be maintained by the apartment management company.

Various walls, fences, and gates would be provided along the site perimeter and internal to the site—these would include CMU block walls along the western and eastern site boundaries; wrought iron fences with block pilasters along the northern and southern site boundaries; CMU block walls and wrought iron fences with block pilasters around the pool courtyard, as well as wrought iron security gates; and metal gates for the parking garage. Wall and fence heights would be in accordance with the standards of Section 17.16.060 (Fences, Hedges, and Walls) of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code.

Site lighting would consist of building-mounted light fixtures; lighting for pedestrian walkways and common and recreation areas; decorative lighting for landscape and building features; lighting along the private street and for the uncovered surface parking areas; interior lighting for the apartment buildings and parking garages; and security lighting.
Figure 5 - Conceptual Site and Landscape Plan
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All landscape areas are irrigated with an automatic irrigation system.

Property owner shall be responsible for all on-site landscape requirements.
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Figure 6 - Conceptual Building Perspective: Main Entrance View from Cerritos Avenue
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1. Introduction

Material Legend
1. Concrete S-Tile Roofing
2. Stucco
3. Garage Gate
4. Metal Railing
5. Single Hung Vinyl Windows
6. Stucco Trim
7. Corbel
8. Decorative Recess
9. Metal Decorative Element
10. Decorative Tile Element
11. Signage
12. Finial
13. Plaster over Perimeter
14. Stucco Post

*Roof Structure for the housing of air conditioners, elevators, stairways, tanks, ventilating fans and similar equipment.

Source: KTGY, 2018
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Figure 7b - Conceptual Building Elevations: Building A
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Material Legend
1. Concrete S-Tile Roofing
2. Stucco
3. Garage Gate
4. Metal Railing
5. Single Hung Vinyl Windows
6. Stucco Trim
7. Corbel
8. Decorative Recess
9. Metal Decorative Element
10. Decorative Tile Element
11. Signage
12. Finial
13. Plaster over Perimeter
14. Stucco Post

*Roof Structure for the housing of air conditioners, elevators, stairways, tanks, ventilating fans and similar equipment.
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Figure 8a - Conceptual Building Elevations: Building B
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Material Legend
1. Concrete S-Tile Roofing
2. Stucco
3. Garage Gate
4. Metal Railing
5. Single Hung Vinyl Windows
6. Stucco Trim
7. Corbel
8. Decorative Recess
9. Metal Decorative Element
10. Decorative Tile Element
11. Signage
12. Finial
13. Plaster over Perimeter
14. Stucco Post

*Roof Structure for the housing of air conditioners, elevators, stairways, tanks, ventilating fans and similar equipment.

Source: KTGY, 2018
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Figure 8b - Conceptual Building Elevations: Building B
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Material Legend
1. Concrete S-Tile Roofing
2. Stucco
3. Garage Gate
4. Metal Railing
5. Single Hung Vinyl Windows
6. Stucco Trim
7. Corbel
8. Decorative Recess
9. Metal Decorative Element
10. Decorative Tile Element
11. Signage
12. Finial
13. Plaster over Perimeter
14. Stucco Post

*Roof Structure for the housing of air conditioners, elevators, stairways, tanks, ventilating fans and similar equipment.

Source: KTGY, 2018
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Figure 8c - Conceptual Building Elevations: Building B
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Material Legend
1. Concrete S-Tile Roofing
2. Stucco
3. Garage Gate
4. Metal Railing
5. Single Hung Vinyl Windows
6. Stucco Trim
7. Corbel
8. Decorative Recess
9. Metal Decorative Element
10. Decorative Tile Element
11. Signage
12. Finial
13. Plaster over Perimeter
14. Stucco Post

*Roof Structure for the housing of air conditioners, elevators, stairways, tanks, ventilating fans and similar equipment.

Source: KTGY, 2018
1.3.3 Resident Amenities, Services, and Open Space/Recreation Areas

Future apartment residents (and employees) would have access to a number of indoor and outdoor amenities and open space and recreation areas (both common and private), as well as services. These would include a leasing area with offices and a lounge, employee work room, and resource room; a fitness center with restrooms; centralized mail rooms; a clubhouse for resident entertainment and gatherings, which would include a kitchen, TV lounge, and restrooms; an outdoor lounge and dining area connected to the clubhouse; and three internal community open spaces areas in the form of open-air courtyards, enclosed on three sides (described below). The indoor amenities and services would be provided in the northern end of Building B, the apartment building on the east side of the proposed private street.

As shown in Figure 5, Conceptual Site and Landscape Plan, three open-air courtyards would be provided for future residents. The first courtyard would be placed on the western side of Building A, the building on the east side of the private street. This courtyard would feature a lawn area with specimen trees for shade, outdoor furniture and wall seating, natural gas burning fire place, and natural gas burning barbecue and counter. The other two courtyards would be placed on the eastern side of Building B, the building on the west side of the private street. The first, and main courtyard is the pool courtyard, which would be enclosed with CMU block walls and wrought iron fences with block pilasters around the pool courtyard, as well as wrought iron security gates. The pool courtyard would feature a swimming pool and spa, outdoor furniture and wall seating, a natural gas burning barbecue and counter, and specimen trees for shade. The other courtyard would feature a lawn area with specimen trees for shade, outdoor furniture and wall seating, natural gas burning fire place, natural gas burning barbecue and counter, and a loggia/shade structure (up to 20 feet in height) with seating.

Additionally, each apartment unit would feature a private balcony, with balcony sizes varying depending on the unit plan type. All apartment units would also include a washer and dryer room. Furthermore, shared storage rooms for residents would be provided in key areas of the apartment buildings, and individual overhead storage units would be provided within the parking garages.

Refuse areas would be provided on the first level of the apartment buildings within the parking garages for convenient solid waste truck access and to shield the refuse areas from public view; the refuse areas would include separate bins for solid waste and recyclable materials. The parking garages would also include rooms for apartment management storage and electrical needs, and elevators and stairwells.

1.3.4 Access, Circulation, and Parking

As shown in Figure 5, vehicular access for the project site would be provided via new gated full-access driveways (all turning movements permitted) off Cerritos Avenue and Sausalito Street, which would connect to an internal, north-south private street. The Cerritos Avenue driveway would serve as the main access to the project site and would serve project residents, guests, and employees; it would also serve as the access drive for the apartments service providers and vendors. This driveway provides one 20-foot wide entry lane and one 12-foot wide exiting lane. A 3-foot wide raised median designed to house the residential directory and call box for gate access would be located approximately 60 feet from the curb face at this driveway. The Sausalito
driveway would serve as the secondary access to the project site and would be limited to residents only via gated access. The drive aisle width would be 24 feet and would adequately accommodate two-way traffic.

Vehicular access to the parking garages of each apartment building and for service and emergency vehicles would be via the new north-south private street. Once inside the parking garage, vehicles would circulate via drive aisles and vehicle ramps; wayfinding signs would be provided within the parking garage. The parking garage would be restricted to residents, guests, and employees of the apartment complex with gated access entries.

As shown in Figure 5, pedestrian access to the project site for project residents, guests, and employees would be provided via the existing public sidewalk along north side of Sausalito Street and a new public sidewalk along the south side of Cerritos Avenue. Pedestrian access into the project site from the Sausalito Street and Cerritos Avenue public sidewalks would be via pedestrian gates. Internal pedestrian circulation would include a network of pedestrian paths and walkways, which would connect to the apartment buildings and parking garages, as well as the public sidewalks on Sausalito Street and Cerritos Avenue. Access to the individual apartment units would be provided via internal pedestrian corridors/walkways on each level of the apartment buildings, as well as elevators and stairwells.

The parking needs of future apartment residents, employees, and guests (including handicap parking spaces and parking space with charging stations for electric vehicles) would be provided via enclosed parking garages and uncovered parking spaces throughout. A total of approximately 245 parking spaces would be provided. As shown in Figure 5, uncovered parking spaces would be provided along both ends of the private street. Parking for bicycles would also be provided in key areas of the site; these would include open bicycle racks and enclosed storage spaces.

1.3.5 Infrastructure Improvements

1.3.5.1 WATER

Golden State Water Company provided potable water service to the prior commercial use that occupied the project site and would continue to do so for the residential uses under the Proposed Project. As a part of the Proposed Project, a series of new potable water lines would be provided onsite and would connect to the existing water main along Sausalito Street. Proposed potable water infrastructure improvements would entail onsite trenching and installing new lines, and connection to the existing offsite 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 A 12-inch ductile iron water main in Sausalito Street connects to a main extending southward in Walnut Street; and to a second north-south main in Los Alamitos Boulevard (Estrada 2018).
1.3.5.2 WASTEWATER

The Rossmoor/Los Alamitos Sewer District (Sewer District) provided wastewater service to the prior commercial use that occupied the project site and would continue to do so for the residential uses under the Proposed Project. Wastewater collected by the Sewer District from the project site is eventually conveyed to the orange County Sanitation District (OCSD) from which it 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 trunks in Sausalito Street. Proposed wastewater infrastructure improvements would entail onsite trenching and installing new lines, and connection to the existing offsite trunk line. A small portion of the offsite sewer line would be required to connect to the Sewer District’s sewer trunk line to accommodate the Proposed Project. Therefore, some construction would occur within the public right-of-way of Sausalito Street in order to make the necessary infrastructure connections to the existing sewer trunk.

1.3.5.3 DRAINAGE

Under existing conditions, the vacant project site is relatively flat and site drainage is an overland flow traveling in a southerly/southeasterly direction towards Sausalito Street and Chestnut Street. The entire site consists mostly of bare or exposed soil; there are no impervious areas onsite. Onsite runoff generated on the north and south side of the project site drain southerly as overland sheet flow and discharges to the existing gutter along the north side of Sausalito Street. Onsite runoff generated on the southeast side of the project site drains via overland sheet flow and discharges to the existing gutter on the west side of Chestnut Street, which connects to the gutter along Sausalito Street. Site runoff captured by the Sausalito Street gutter enters two catch basins along the north side of the street, one at the southeast corner of the site and one at the southwest corner. The catch basins connect to a 24-inch storm drain pipe in Sausalito Street. The gutters and storm drain pipe intercept and convey runoff from the site westerly to the Los Alamitos Channel (which parallels Coyote Creek Channel) and into the Rossmoor Retarding Basin, to the southwest. The Rossmoor Retarding Basin is pumped into the San Gabriel River. No offsite drainage runs onto the project site. Under existing conditions there are no water quality devices/features onsite to provide any treatment for the “first flush” generated onsite.²

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, conveyance, and treatment systems. Upon project completion, approximately 70 percent of the project site would consist of impervious areas (e.g., buildings, paving) and the remainder would be pervious (e.g., landscaping). Site drainage improvements needed to accommodate the Proposed Project would include new storm drain pipes and inlets, and a water quality treatment and water retention feature (bioretention trench with underdrain). Once runoff enters the storm drain inlets, it would be conveyed via storm drain pipes to the bioretention trenches (which

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.
would treat site runoff) that would be placed along the southern and southeastern site boundaries. The underdrains of the bioretention trenches would be connected to an onsite outlet catch basin that would discharge to a proposed 24-inch diameter storm drain lateral, which would connect to the existing 24-inch storm drain pipe in Sausalito Street. If a storm overwheels the bioretention trenches, runoff would overflow these features and discharge into the gutter on Sausalito Street. The proposed onsite drainage system would be maintained by the apartment management company.

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 garages. 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/rooms).

1.3.6 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). As currently proposed, the green building practices/features that may be incorporated into the Proposed Project are low-flow faucets and toilets; Energy Star appliances; LED lighting; onsite stormwater retention and treatment; electric-vehicle charging stations; 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.

1.3.7 Project Phasing and Construction

Upon City approval of the Proposed Project, project development is anticipated to be completed in three phases—earthwork and soil remediation, grading, and construction. Soil remediation would involve excavation and offsite disposal of approximately 14,174 cubic yards of soil at depths of up to 10 feet below grade surface (remediation work is discussed further in Section 3.8.d of this Initial Study). Overall construction is estimated to take approximately 13 months, starting in January of 2019 and opening year set for 2020. It is anticipated that approximately 1,000 cubic yards of soil would be imported during the grading phase to balance the site.
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 Site Plan Review

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 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 development sites; 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 was certified by the Los Alamitos City Council in March 2015 (2015 Certified EIR).
1. Introduction

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).
2. Environmental Checklist

2.1 BACKGROUND

1. Project Title: Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments

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:
   Tom Oliver, Associate Planner
   562.431.3538 x303

4. Project Location:
   The project site, which has an address of 3342 Cerritos Avenue (APN 242-222-11), 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.

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:
   Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments, LLC
   2520 North Santiago Boulevard
   Orange, CA 92867

6. General Plan Designation: Multi Family Residential

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

8. Description of Project:
   The proposed project includes construction of up to 107 luxury apartment units in two three-story
   buildings, with two levels of apartment units over one level of enclosed parking garage. A more detailed
   description of the Proposed Project is provided in Section 1.3, Project Description.

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; commercial and office uses to the north and northeast, across Cerritos Avenue; and commercial
   and office uses to the east, abutting the project site and across Chestnut Street.

10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required:
    Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
2. Environmental Checklist

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,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics ☐ Agriculture / Forestry Resources ☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources ☐ Cultural Resources ☐ Geology
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions ☐ Hazards / Hazardous Materials ☐ Hydrology / Soils
☐ Land Use / Planning ☐ Mineral Resources ☐ Noise
☐ Population / Housing ☐ Public Services ☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation / Traffic ☐ Tribal Cultural Resources ☐ Service Systems
☐ 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

Printed Name

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS
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.
2. Environmental Checklist

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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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))?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### II. 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</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 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></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</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) 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></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</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) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td>X</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></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>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

- **a)** Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
  - i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.  
    - X
  - ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?  
    - X
  - iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?  
    - X
  - iv) Landslides?  
    - X

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

- **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?  
  - X

- **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?  
  - X

- **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?  
  - X

### VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

- **a)** Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?  
  - X

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

### VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

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

- **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?  
  - X

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

- **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?  
  - 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>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></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. 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) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Environmental Checklist

<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>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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Impact</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>
<td>x</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>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XII. NOISE. Would the project result in:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Impact</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>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>x</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>
<td>x</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>
<td>x</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>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Impact</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>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</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>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:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td>XV. RECREATION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) 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>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 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, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. 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></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. Environmental Checklist

<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>b)</td>
<td>Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (<em>Cumulatively considerable</em> 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>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Environmental Checklist
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3. Environmental Analysis

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. Vistas provide visual access or panoramic views to a large geographic area and are generally located at a point where surrounding views are greater than one mile away. Panoramic views are usually associated with vantage points over a section of urban or natural areas that provide a geographic orientation not commonly available. Examples of panoramic views might include an urban skyline, valley, mountain range, a large open space area, the ocean, or other water bodies.

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 such vistas afforded from the project site or its surroundings.

Additionally, as shown in Figure 3-3, Aerial Photograph, the project site and surrounding area are in a highly-urbanized area of the City. A mix of one- and two-story residential and commercial buildings dominate the surrounding project area. The urban landscape character and features of the project site and surrounding area are consistent with and typical of urbanized areas of the City. The project site and surrounding area do not exhibit any significant visual resources or scenic vistas.

Overall site topography can be characterized as relatively flat, with no notable change in elevation. There are no visible landforms (e.g., mountains, hills, creeks) from the project site or surrounding area; and no landforms are on or within proximity of the project site. Also, there are no designated open space resources onsite or in the vicinity of the project site, a designation typically used to determine the value of certain public vistas in order to gauge adverse effects.

Based on the preceding, no impact to scenic vistas would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

**No Impact.** A scenic highway is generally considered a stretch of public roadway that is designated as a scenic corridor by a federal, state, or local agency. Caltrans defines a scenic highway as any freeway, highway, road, or other public right-of-way, that traverses an area of exceptional scenic quality. 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 2018). 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 2018).

Furthermore, the project site does not contain unique or locally important scenic resources. There are no rock outcroppings or historic buildings onsite—the project site is vacant and void of any buildings and vegetation.

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 with or visually unexpected in its surroundings.

Existing land use and conditions of the project site and surrounding area are depicted in Figures 3, Aerial Photograph, and 4, Site Photographs. As shown in these figures, the project site and surrounding area are in a highly-urbanized area of the City. The project site is vacant and void of any building and vegetation—the site consists mostly of bare or exposed soil. Surrounding land uses consist of residential, commercial, office and light-industrial uses. A mix of one- and two-story residential and commercial buildings dominate the surrounding project area. The urban landscape character and features of the project site and surrounding area are consistent with and typical of urbanized areas of the City.

**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 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. Project development is anticipated to be completed in three phases—earthwork and soil remediation, grading, and construction. Overall construction is estimated to take approximately 13 months,
starting in January of 2019 and opening year set for 2020. Construction activities may be unsightly during the site preparation and construction phases, but they are not considered significant because they are temporary. Construction fencing would be erected to 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.

**Project Operation Phase**

The Proposed Project includes development of the vacant and underutilized project site with residential uses. The project includes construction of up to 107 luxury apartment units in two buildings. Both buildings would be three stories in height (up to 35 feet), with two levels of apartment units over one level of enclosed parking garage. Other project components include vehicular and pedestrian access and circulation improvements; surface parking and utility improvements; common landscape/open space and recreation areas; and various hardscape and landscape improvements. Figure 5, Conceptual Site and Landscape Plan, illustrates the overall site and landscape design of the Proposed Project, and how the proposed buildings and site improvements fit into the overall layout of the project site. As shown in Figure 5, the two apartment buildings would be separated from one another by the proposed north-south private street, which would connect Cerritos Street on the north to Sausalito Street on the south. The larger of the two apartment buildings would be placed on the west side of the proposed private street, with the smaller building being placed on the east side.

Figure 6, Conceptual Building Perspective: Main Entrance View from Cerritos Avenue, Figures 7a and 7b, Conceptual Building Elevations: Building A, and Figures 8a through 8c, Conceptual Building Elevations: Building B, illustrate the conceptual building elevations of the proposed apartment buildings; these figures also illustrate the proposed architectural style (Mediterranean) 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 Mediterranean architectural style. For example, the design elements/features would include stucco walls; decorative recesses; corbels; vinyl windows; metal railings and decorative elements; and concrete 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 6 through 8c, building masses, elevations, and rooflines would be modulated to promote visual interest and articulation of the proposed buildings. Building pop-outs and offsets, recesses, balconies, 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 style. The mixture of colors, textures, and materials of the buildings would also help balance the intended permanence of the buildings with the people scale of the buildings and their surroundings, as well as with the people scale of the overall development. The color scheme and design elements/features of the proposed apartment buildings would also be complimentary to and not detract from those of the existing two-story single-family residences to the west and those of the two-story multifamily residences to the south.
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Additionally, project implementation would provide similar and compatible uses to the existing and future residential uses west and south of the project site. For example, the proposed apartment buildings (including building massing and heights) would be compatible with the residential uses to the west and south, which include two-story buildings that are similar to the height and massing of the buildings of the Proposed Project. The height and massing of the proposed apartment buildings would also be compatible with the height (three stories) and massing of the recently approved Sausalito Street townhomes, which are under construction on the property that abuts the project site to the west (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph).

Furthermore, 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 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 and building plan check process.

Finally, as shown in Figure 4, Site Photographs, the project site is vacant and void of any landscaping—the site consists mostly of bare or exposed soil, which is out of context with the landscaped nature of the surrounding land uses. As shown in Figures 5 through 8c, the proposed 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 installed in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 17.20 (Landscaping) of the City's Zoning Code. The proposed landscape elements would enhance the visual character of the project site and surrounding area, help to visually soften the height and massing of the proposed buildings when viewed from public areas, and help provide visual interest and relief.

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 project site's street frontages. 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 be designed to create 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 buildings, landscaping and site improvements 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.
Conclusion

Based on the preceding, project-related construction and operational activities would not have a significant effect on the existing visual character or quality of the project 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. Lighting effects are associated with the use of artificial light during the evening and nighttime hours. There are two primary sources of light: light emanating from building interiors passing through windows and openings, and light from exterior sources (i.e., street lighting, architectural building illumination, security lighting, parking lot lighting, landscape lighting, and signage). Excessive light and/or glare can impair vision, cause annoyance, affect sleep patterns, and generate safety hazards when experienced by drivers. Uses such as residences, elderly care facilities, and hotels are considered light sensitive, since occupants have expectations of privacy during evening hours and may be subject to disturbance by bright light sources. Light spill is typically defined as the presence of unwanted light on properties adjacent to the property being illuminated. With respect to lighting, the degree of illumination may vary widely depending on the amount of light generated, height of the light source, presence of barriers or obstructions, type of light source, and weather conditions.

Glare is primarily a daytime occurrence caused by the reflection of sunlight or artificial light on surfaces of buildings or objects, including highly polished surfaces such as glass windows or reflective materials and, to a lesser degree, from broad expanses of light-colored surfaces. Perceived glare is the unwanted and potentially objectionable sensation experienced by a person as they look directly into the light source of a luminaire. Daytime glare generation is common in urban areas and is typically associated with buildings with exterior façades largely or entirely composed of highly reflective glass. Glare can also be produced during evening and nighttime hours by the reflection of artificial light sources such as automobile headlights. Daytime glare can also be generated by light reflecting off passing or parked cars. Glare generation is typically related to either moving vehicles or sun angles, although glare resulting from reflected sunlight can occur regularly at certain times of the day and year. Excessive glare not only impedes visibility, but also increases the ambient heat reflectivity in a given area. Glare-sensitive uses include residences, hotels, transportation corridors, and aircraft landing corridors.

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.

Daytime Glare

The Proposed Project includes building materials and architectural treatments that could cause daytime glare, but not to such an extent that they would result in a significant impact. For example, the architectural treatments of the proposed buildings would include style-appropriate architectural building materials, such as stucco walls; vinyl windows; metal railings and decorative elements; and concrete S-tile roofs (see building elevations and perspectives in Figure 6, Conceptual Building Perspective, Figures 7a and 7b, Conceptual Building...
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*Elevations: Building A* and Figures 8a through 8c, *Conceptual Building Elevations: Building B*. With the exception of the vinyl windows, the building materials and architectural treatments are not reflective in nature and would therefore not create substantial day or nighttime glare. As illustrated in Figure 6 through 8c, compared to the amount of nonreflective building materials, the use of vinyl windows is limited (would make up less than 20 percent of the building façade). The proposed building materials are also similar to building materials used on other similar residential development projects in the City as well as with those of residential structures in the surrounding vicinity.

Additionally, as shown in Figures 6 through 8c, the exterior façades of the proposed buildings would not include large expanses of glazing (i.e., glass windows and doors). The proposed glazing could increase sources of glare, because it 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 site and surrounding area and would not increase beyond what is expected for an urban area. Further, glare generated by new glazing would be buffered to an extent by proposed trees along the site boundaries.

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 and Glare**

Site lighting would consist of building-mounted light fixtures; lighting for pedestrian walkways and common and recreation areas; decorative lighting for landscape and building features; lighting along the private street and for the uncovered surface parking areas; interior lighting for the apartment buildings and parking garages; and security lighting. Nighttime lighting and glare from the project site would be visible to the surrounding residential and commercial land uses from various vantage points, and from surrounding roadways. These new sources of nighttime lighting have the potential to increase nighttime light and glare in the project area, which could result in a nuisance.

Although project development would introduce new light sources to the project site and surrounding area, the proposed light sources would be similar to the light sources of the surrounding residential uses and roadways. Considering the existing sources of lighting in the surrounding vicinity, the amount and intensity of nighttime lighting proposed onsite would not be substantially greater or different than existing lighting.

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.

Furthermore, 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 exterior 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 lighting provisions of the City's Municipal Code and Title 24 would ensure that the Proposed Project does not result in significant light impacts. Compliance with these provisions is ensured through the City’s development review and building plan check process.

Based on the preceding, nighttime light and glare impacts related to the project would be less than significant 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.

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, and not as farmland, on the California Important Farmland Finder maintained by the Division of Land Resource Protection (DLRP 2018). Urban and Built-Up Land is not suitable for grazing or crop production. Additionally, the project site is not in agricultural use and 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—the site is zoned Multiple Family Residential (R-3), which does not permit agricultural uses. The project site is also in an urbanized area of the City; the site does not contain farmland or other agricultural uses and is not adjacent to or in proximity of such uses. Also, aerial photographs dating as far back as 1952 do not show such uses onsite (NETR 2018). Further, the
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The project site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract\(^3\) (DLRP 2016). Therefore, project implementation 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. Forest land is defined as “land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits” (California Public Resources Code § 12220(g)). Timberland is defined as “land…which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of any commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees” (California Public Resources Code § 4526).

As shown in Figure 3, Aerial Photograph, the vacant project site is in an urbanized area of the City and is surrounded by residential, commercial, office and light-industrial uses. Additionally, the project site is not designated or zoned for forest or timber land or used for forestry. As stated above, the site is zoned Multiple Family Residential (R-3). Therefore, project development 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.

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:


---

\(^3\) 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.
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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 2017a).

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 includes construction of up to 107 luxury apartment units in two three-story buildings. 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 Los Alamitos estimated by the California Department of Finance for 2017 is 2.73 persons (CDF 2018). At full occupancy, the 107 apartment units proposed under the project would result in an increase of approximately 292 residents in Los Alamitos. The population of the City is forecast to increase from 11,860 people in 2017 to 12,100 in 2040 (CDF 2018; SCAG 2015), a net increase of 240 people. The Proposed Project’s population would slightly exceed the City’s regional population forecast for 2040 by 52 persons, or 0.4 percent. However, the project site was designated for residential development (land use designation: Multi Family Residential) in the Los Alamitos General Plan Update (2015); the increase in housing units and population due to residential development on the project site was considered and
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analyzed in the 2015 Certified EIR (SCH No. 2013121055) for the Los Alamitos General Plan Update (2015). As concluded in the 2015 Certified EIR, the increases in population and housing due to General Plan Update buildout (which included residential development on the project site) compared to regional forecasts would not be a substantial adverse impact.

Furthermore, the proposed residential land use is consistent with the City’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 3, Comparison of Projected Operational Emissions and Local Daily Criteria Values [pounds/day]); therefore, SCAQMD would not consider the project a substantial source of air pollutant emissions that would have the potential to affect the attainment designations in the SoCAB.

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

Project-related 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.

Anticipated construction activities would include site preparation, rough grading, fine grading, utility trenching, construction of the proposed buildings, asphalt paving, architectural coating, and finishing/landscaping. It is anticipated that approximately 1,000 cubic yards of soil material will be imported during the project’s grading phase. Overall, project construction is estimated to take approximately 13 months to complete, starting in early 2019 and finalizing in 2020. Construction emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2016.3.2, based on the project’s preliminary construction information, construction schedule, and CalEEMod default assumptions. The construction schedule and equipment mix are based on preliminary engineering and are subject to changes during final design and as dictated by field conditions.

Table 2 summarizes the daily construction emissions projected for the Proposed Project. As shown in Table 2, the daily construction emissions would not exceed SCAQMD’s regional significance thresholds for construction activities. Therefore, air quality impacts from project-related construction phase activities would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are necessary.
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### Table 2  Comparison of Projected Construction Emissions and Regional Daily Criteria Values (pounds/day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>VOC</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>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>45.63</td>
<td>22.71</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>33.08</td>
<td>17.96</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>24.73</td>
<td>22.35</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td>37.03</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum</strong></td>
<td>37.03</td>
<td>45.63</td>
<td>22.35</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exceeds Threshold?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RK 2018a.
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 generated by 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 (electricity and natural gas) associated with the proposed buildings. 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 783 average daily trips on a weekday. Weekday project trip generation volumes are higher than weekend volumes. Therefore, weekday trips were used in the operational air quality analysis for the Proposed Project as this represents a worst-case scenario and the greatest potential for long-term operational air quality impacts.

Long-term operational air pollutant emission impacts were modeled using CalEEMod and are summarized in Table 3. As shown in the table, project-related air pollutant emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD's regional emissions thresholds for operational activities. Therefore, long-term operation-related impacts to air quality would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### Table 3  Comparison of Projected Operational Emissions and Local Daily Criteria Values (pounds/day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>VOC</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>1.49</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>20.33</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Sources</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>30.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exceeds Threshold?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RK 2018a.
Note: The CalEEMod model projects summer and winter emissions and the higher of the two values is included in the table.
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c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment 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 2017a). 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). As substantiated in Section 3.3.a, above, construction and operational activities associated with the Proposed Project would not result in emissions in excess of SCAQMD’s significance 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 With Mitigation Incorporated.** The Proposed Project could expose sensitive receptors to elevated pollutant concentrations if it would cause or contribute significantly to elevated pollutant concentration levels. Unlike regional emissions, localized emissions are typically evaluated in terms of air concentration rather than mass so that they can be more readily correlated to potential health effects.

**Localized Significance Thresholds**

Localized significance thresholds (LSTs) are based on the California AAQS, which are the most stringent AAQS that have been established to provide a margin of safety in the protection of public health and welfare. They are designated to protect sensitive receptors most susceptible to further respiratory distress, such as asthmatics, the elderly, very young children, people already weakened by other disease or illness, and people engaged in strenuous work or exercise.

**Short-Term Construction LSTs**

Construction LSTs are based on the size of the project site, distance to the nearest sensitive receptor, and Source Receptor Area. The nearest sensitive receptors proximate to the project site are the residential uses to the south and west (see Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*).

Air pollutant emissions generated by project-related construction activities are anticipated to cause temporary increases in air pollutant concentrations. Table 4 shows the maximum daily construction emissions (in pounds per day) generated during onsite construction activities compared with the SCAQMD’s significant thresholds. Onsite construction emissions consist of fugitive dust emissions and exhaust emissions from operation of off-road construction vehicles.
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Table 4  
Comparison of Projected Construction Emissions and Localized Significance (pounds/day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>PM_{10}</th>
<th>PM_{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onsite Emissions</td>
<td>22.71</td>
<td>45.63</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Construction Threshold</td>
<td>975.20</td>
<td>147.10</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exceeds Threshold? 
No | No | No | Yes

Source: RK 2018a.
Note: The CalEEMod model projects summer and winter emissions and the higher of the two values is included in the table.

As shown in Table 5, project-related construction emissions have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD screening-level construction LSTs. Therefore, mitigation is required to reduce the project’s impact. With implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1, construction LST impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant, as shown in Table 5.

Table 5  
Comparison of Mitigated Projected Construction Emissions and Localized Significance (pounds/day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>PM_{10}</th>
<th>PM_{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onsite Emissions</td>
<td>22.41</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Construction Threshold</td>
<td>975.20</td>
<td>147.10</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exceeds Threshold? 
No | No | No | No

Source: RK 2018a.
Note: The CalEEMod model projects summer and winter emissions and the higher of the two values is included in the table.

**Long-Term Operational LSTs**

Table 6 illustrates the operational related LST associated operation of the Proposed Project. The operational emissions were compared to SCAQMD’s significant thresholds. As shown in the table, the project's operational emissions would not exceed the established LST thresholds. Therefore, long-term operation-related impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Table 6  
Comparison of Projected Operational Emissions and Localized Significance (pounds/day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>PM_{10}</th>
<th>PM_{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onsite Emissions</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Construction Threshold</td>
<td>1.126.49</td>
<td>166.92</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exceeds Threshold? 
No | No | No | No

Source: RK 2018a.
Note: The CalEEMod model projects summer and winter emissions and the higher of the two values is included in the table.

**Carbon Monoxide Hotspots**

Areas of vehicle congestion have the potential to create pockets of CO called hotspots. These pockets have the potential to exceed the state one-hour standard of 20 parts per million (ppm) or the eight-hour standard
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of 9.0 ppm. Because CO is produced in greatest quantities from vehicle combustion and does not readily disperse into the atmosphere, adherence to ambient air quality standards is typically demonstrated through an analysis of localized CO concentrations. Hotspots are typically produced at intersections, where traffic congestion is highest because vehicles queue for longer periods and are subject to reduced speeds.

The SoCAB has been designated attainment under both the National and California AAQS for CO. Under existing and future vehicle emission rates, a project would have to increase traffic volumes at a single intersection by more than 44,000 vehicles per hour—or 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal mixing is substantially limited—in order to generate a significant CO impact (BAAQMD 2017). 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 783 average daily trips on a weekday, which is substantially less than the volumes cited above. Additionally, the SoCAB has since been designated as attainment under both the national and California AAQS for CO. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have the potential to substantially increase CO hotspots at intersections in the vicinity of the project site. In summary, localized air quality impacts related to mobile-source emissions would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Mitigation Measure

AQ-1 All diesel-powered construction equipment shall be equipped with tier four engines and level three diesel particulate filters or better. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant/developer or construction contractor shall provide evidence to the City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department that all diesel-powered construction equipment meets these standards.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would not result in objectionable odors. The threshold for odor is if a project creates an odor nuisance pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 402, Nuisance, which states:

A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. The provisions of this rule shall not apply to odors emanating from agricultural operations necessary for the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals.

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 uses under the Proposed Project do not fall within the aforementioned land uses. Additionally, emissions from construction equipment, such as diesel exhaust and
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volatile organic compounds from architectural coatings and paving activities, may generate odors. However, these odors would be low in concentration, temporary, and are not expected to affect a substantial number of people. Therefore, odor impacts 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 individual species that have special recognition by federal, state, or local conservation agencies and organizations as endangered, threatened, or rare. As shown in Figure 4, Site Photographs, the project site is vacant and void of vegetation—the site consists mostly of bare or exposed soil. As shown in Figure 3, Aerial Photograph, the site is in an urbanized area of the City and is surrounded by residential, commercial, office and light-industrial uses.

Based on the existing conditions of the project site and its surroundings, 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 approximately 80 feet west of the project site, 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 natural communities that are considered rare in the region by regulatory agencies; that are known to provide habitat for sensitive animal or plant species; or are known to be important wildlife corridors. Riparian habitats are those occurring along the banks of rivers and streams. As shown in Figure 4, the project site is vacant and void of vegetation—the site consists mostly of bare or exposed soil. The project site is in an urbanized area of the City and is surrounded by residential, commercial, office and light-industrial uses (see Figure 3). No sensitive natural communities are present onsite, or adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project site. Also, as noted above, Coyote Creek Channel passes approximately 80 feet west of the project site; however, the channel consists of concrete bed and banks and 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.

---

4 Per the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, habitat is where a given plant or animal species meets its requirements for food, cover, and water in both space and time (CDFW 2015).
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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 approximately 80 feet west of the project site, 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?

No Impact. There are no corridors valuable for overland wildlife movement or migration in the City. Coyote Creek Channel (which passes approximately 80 feet west of the project site) 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. Additionally, the project site and surroundings are built out with urban uses and are not available for overland wildlife movement. Furthermore, the project site is vacant and void of vegetation—the site consists mostly of bare or exposed soil (see Figure 4, Site Photograph). Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

No Impact. There are no trees or other biological resources onsite that could be subject to any City of Los Alamitos policies protecting biological resources. Project development would not conflict with such policies, and no impact would occur. As shown in Figure 4, the project site is vacant and void of vegetation—the site consists mostly of bare or exposed soil. There are no trees or other biological resources onsite that could be subject to any City policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Therefore, no impact would occur and 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
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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?

Less Than Significant 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;

iv) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

As shown in Figure 4, Site Photographs, the project site is vacant and void of any building, structures, and vegetation—the site consists mostly of bare or exposed soil. The project site is 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 impacts 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. Archaeological resources are prehistoric or historic evidence of past human activities, including structural ruins and buried resources. Paleontological resources are fossils, that is, the recognizable remains or evidence of past life on earth; including bones, shells, leaves, tracks, burrows, and impressions.

As shown in Figure 4, Site Photographs, the project site is vacant and void of any building, structures, and vegetation—the site consists mostly of bare or exposed soil. The previous commercial building (equipment rental business) that occupied the northern portion of the project site (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph) was recently demolished. As shown in Figure 3, the project site is in an urbanized area of the City; most of the site has already been disturbed due to grading and construction activities associated with the prior commercial uses that occupied the site. Given the 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 is largely flat, and the proposed apartment buildings would be constructed above ground level, with no subterranean floors or basements. Accordingly, deep ground excavations or disturbances (such as would be required for an underground parking structure) would not be required to implement the Proposed Project. The project site and immediate surroundings are also not recognized as an area of having the potential for subsurface archeological or paleontological resources.

Furthermore, 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 activities. Also, a site visit conducted by PlaceWorks personnel did not yield any subsurface archaeological or paleontological artifacts.

Finally, there are no unique geological features onsite or adjacent to or surrounding the project site. The project site exhibits generally flat topography with overall gentle inclination to the south.

Based on the preceding, impacts to archeological or paleontological resources 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. As substantiated in this section, 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. As shown in Figure 3, Aerial Photograph, the project site is in an urbanized area of the City; most of the site has already been disturbed due to grading and construction activities associated with the prior commercial uses that occupied the site. A majority of the surrounding vicinity has also experienced substantial ground disturbance associated with the development of existing homes, roadways, and other urbanized land uses. The project site is largely flat, and the proposed apartment buildings would be above ground level, with no subterranean floors or basements. Accordingly, little ground disturbance would be required to implement 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 have the potential to disturb previously undiscovered subsurface human remains, if any exist. For example, the Proposed Project would involve excavation on portions of the site not previously disturbed. 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 Orange County 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 California 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 (NAHC) so that NAHC can contact the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The MLD shall be provided access to the discovery site. Disposition of human remains and any associated grave goods, if encountered, shall be treated in accordance with procedures and requirements set forth in Sections 5097.94 and 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code; Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code; and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

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 report, which is included as Appendix B to this Initial Study:


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 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 earthquake faults or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones on or within proximity of the project site. The nearest active faults to the site are the Elsinore-Whittier Fault at approximately 1.14 miles to the north; and two segments of the Puente Hills Fault at approximately 2.5 and 7 miles to the north/northwest (AKA 2014). 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 (CGS 2018). 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.** 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.

As noted above, the Elsinore-Whittier Fault is approximately 3.8 miles north of the project site; and two segments of the Puente Hills Fault are approximately 2.5 and 7 miles to the north/northwest. These faults, as well as others in the region, are considered capable of producing strong shaking at the project site, thereby exposing people or structures on the site to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death. The intensity of ground shaking on the project site would depend on the magnitude of the earthquake, distance to the epicenter, and the geology of the area between the epicenter and the project site.

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 enforced by the City’s Development Services Department during the building plan check and development review process. Compliance with the requirements of the CBC for structural safety during a seismic event would reduce hazards from strong seismic ground shaking.

Additionally, 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 Due-Diligence Investigation prepared for the Proposed Project (see Appendix B) includes seismic design parameters pursuant to the CBC, as well as other site-specific design parameters. Incorporation of the design parameters would reduce hazards from strong seismic ground shaking. The City would impose the recommended design parameters as a condition of approval, and project compliance would be ensured through the City's development review and building plan check process.

In summary, implementation of the design parameters outlined in the Geotechnical Due-Diligence Investigation and compliance with the provisions of the CBC would reduce seismic-related ground failure impacts to less than significant levels.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** 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.

As stated in the Geotechnical Due-Diligence Investigation (see Appendix B), liquefaction may occur below the site during periods of strong ground motion. The analysis conducted indicates that liquefaction could lead to a total settlement of the ground surface of up to approximately six inches due to seismic consolidation during liquefaction. Given this condition, differential settlement due to seismic settlement would likely be on the order of one-half of the total settlement or approximately three inches over 30 feet.

The Geotechnical Due-Diligence Investigation includes design parameters for foundation design to withstand the estimated total and differential seismic settlements estimated to occur onsite. Project site grading, design, and construction would conform with the recommended design parameters. The City would impose the recommended design parameters as a condition of approval, and project compliance would be ensured through the City's development review and building plan check process.

Therefore, with implementation of the design parameters outlined in the Geotechnical Due-Diligence Investigation, seismic-related ground failure impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

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 (CGS 2015), which are areas having potential for seismic slope instability. Therefore, geologic hazards associated with landslides are not anticipated at the site. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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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.

**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 on 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 of Rule 403 (Best Available Control Measures), 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, effective July 17, 2012, regulates construction activities to minimize water pollution, including sediment risk from construction activities to receiving waters. Project development 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**

As shown in Figures 3, *Aerial Photograph*, and 4, *Site Photographs*, the project site is vacant and mostly consists of bare or exposed soil. The project site is in an urbanized area of the City and is generally flat. No major slopes or bluffs are on or adjacent to the site. After project completion, the project site would be developed with public safety uses, access and circulation improvements, and landscape improvements and would not contain exposed or bare soil. The proposed landscaping would be water conserving and have deep root systems that enable soil stabilization and minimize erosion. Upon project completion, the potential for soil erosion or the loss of topsoil would be expected to be extremely low.

Additionally, 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 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 bioretention facility; common area landscape management; sweeping of streets; 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 Proposed Project's operation phase—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.** 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 impacts would occur.

**Subsurface Site Soils**

The Geotechnical Due-Diligence Investigation prepared for the Proposed Project (see Appendix B) included exploratory borings on key areas of the project site. Soil materials encountered during the borings consisted mainly of alluvium and artificial fill. Artificial fill was encountered in one of the borings; it consisted of dark gray, moist, soft to medium stiff sandy silt. Alluvial deposits were encountered below the artificial fill materials. The alluvium typically consisted of fine-grained soils consisting of clayey silt and silty clay.
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**Static Settlement**

In general, the artificial fill materials encountered onsite are considered unsuitable in their existing condition to support the proposed apartment buildings and site improvements. The existing fill soils are poorly compacted and are likely highly compressible. These materials would likely cause settlements beyond the tolerances of proposed site development.

The Geotechnical Due-Diligence Investigation outlines a number of design parameters, including the removal of existing artificial fill soils; replacement of such soils back onto the site; and moistening and recompaction of such soils. The recommendations include replacement of removed soils with engineered, moistened, and compacted fill soils. Project site grading, design, and construction would conform with the recommended design parameters. The City would impose the recommended design parameters as a condition of approval, and compliance would be ensured through the City’s development building and plan check review process. After implementation of the recommended design parameters, impacts related to soil settlement would be reduced to a level of less than significant. No mitigation measures are necessary.

**Soil Expansion**

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. As stated in the Geotechnical Due-Diligence Investigation, the near-surface soils onsite are generally anticipated to possess a low expansion potential. Adverse effects of expansive soils can readily be mitigated by the use of post-tension slab foundations and properly detailed flatwork. Project development would be implemented in accordance with the recommended design parameters of the Geotechnical Due-Diligence Investigation. The City would impose the recommended design parameters as a condition of approval. With implementation of the design parameters, which would be ensured through the City’s development review and building plan check process, project development would not subject people or structures to substantial hazards arising from ground subsidence. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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.** See response to Section 3.6.c, above. As substantiated in this section, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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 in the surrounding roadways. 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.
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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 GHGs is fossil fuel use. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has identified four major GHGs—water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and ozone (O₃)—that are the likely cause of an increase in global average temperatures observed within the 20th and 21st centuries. Other GHGs identified by the IPCC that contribute to global warming to a lesser extent include nitrous oxide (N₂O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), hydro fluorocarbons, per fluorocarbons, and chlorofluorocarbons.⁶, ⁷

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.⁸

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.

---

⁶ Water vapor (H₂O) 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.

⁷ 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.

⁸ 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).
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 the construction and operation phases 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 project’s construction phase. Project-related operation and construction emissions are shown in Table 7.

As shown in the table, the Proposed Project would result in a net-increase of 1,551 metric tons of carbon dioxide–equivalent (MTCO$_2$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$_2$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.

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 Southern California Association of Governments’ (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. A consistency analysis of the Proposed Project with these plans is presented below.
**CARB Scoping Plan**

The CARB 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 2008 Scoping Plan is applicable to state agencies and is not directly applicable to cities/counties and individual projects. Nonetheless, the 2008 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. In November 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 Scoping Plan provides the strategies for the state to meet the 2030 GHG reduction target 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. For 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 CALGreen. Additionally, 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. 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
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strategy in the 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 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. Additionally, 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 HQTAs 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).

Furthermore, 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 3.11 in 2010 to an even more jobs-rich 3.22 in 2035 (City of Los Alamitos 2014).

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:

- Environmental Update to Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, LOR Geotechnical Group, Inc., February 2018. (Appendix C)

- Revised Remedial Action Plan, Rambol Environ, June 2017. (Appendix D)

- Addendum to the Revised Remedial Action Plan, Rambol Environ, July 2017. (Appendix E)
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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. The term “hazardous material” can be defined in different ways. For purposes of this environmental document, the definition of “hazardous material” is the one outlined in the California Health and Safety Code, Section 25501:

Hazardous materials that, because of their quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics, pose a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment if released into the workplace or the environment. Hazardous materials include, but are not limited to, hazardous substances, hazardous waste, and any material that a handler or the unified program agency has a reasonable basis for believing that it would be injurious to the health and safety of persons or harmful to the environment if released into the workplace or the environment.

“Hazardous waste” is a subset of hazardous materials, and the definition is essentially the same as in the California Health and Safety Code, Section 25117, and in the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66261.2:

Hazardous wastes are those that, because of their quantity, concentration, or physical, chemical, or infectious characteristics, may either cause, or significantly contribute to an increase in mortality or an increase in serious illness, or pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or the environment when improperly treated, stored, transported, disposed of, or otherwise managed.

Hazardous materials can be categorized as hazardous nonradioactive chemical materials, radioactive materials, and biohazardous materials (infectious agents such as microorganisms, bacteria, molds, parasites, viruses, and medical waste).

Exposure of the public or environment to hazardous materials could occur through but not limited to the following means: improper handling or use of hazardous materials or waste, particularly by untrained personnel; transportation accident; environmentally unsound disposal methods; and/or fire, explosion, or other emergencies. The severity of potential effects varies with the activity conducted, the concentration and type of hazardous material or wastes present, and the proximity of sensitive receptors.

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 Project would involve the use of small amounts of hazardous materials, such as cleansers, paints, fertilizers, and pesticides for cleaning and maintenance purposes. 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 Health Care Agency, Environmental Health Division...
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(OCHCA-EHD); and Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA). 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.

Additionally, residential uses (as those of the Proposed Project) 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. The Proposed Project would also be operated with strict adherence to all emergency response plan requirements set forth by the OCHCA-EHD 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 involve use of hazardous materials including cleansers and degreasers; fluids used in routine maintenance and operation of construction equipment, such as oil and lubricants; fertilizers; pesticides; and architectural coatings including paints. 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 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.

9 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.
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Furthermore, strict adherence to all emergency response plan requirements set forth by OCHCA-EHD 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.

Hazardous Materials Associated with Project Construction and Operation

See response to Section 3.8(a), above. As substantiated 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 Associated with Project Site Conditions

As shown in Figure 4, Site Photographs, the project site is vacant and void of any building and vegetation—the site consists mostly of bare or exposed soil. The previous commercial building (equipment rental business) and hardscape improvements that occupied the northern portion of the project site (see Figure 3) was recently demolished. Neither the building nor related hardscape improvements demolished were associated with or contained hazardous materials (LOR 2017).

On the west side of the project site are two approximately 10,000-gallon inactive underground storage tanks (USTs) and associated piping and fueling dispensers. The USTs historically contained diesel and gasoline; their usage ended sometime in 2015. In October 2016, the USTs were placed under temporary regulatory closure via a permit issued by OCHCA-EHD. The temporary closure of the USTs required the removal of all products from the tanks and associated piping (i.e., the entire diesel and gasoline fueling system), followed by triple rinsing, degassing, and pressure integrity testing of the tanks (LOR 2017). The USTs would be removed from the project site prior to site development and permanently closed in accordance with all applicable requirements of OCHCA-EHD, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWQCB), and Los Alamitos.

Additionally, no significant hazardous materials or hazardous wastes were observed during the site assessment investigation conducted by LOR Geotechnical Group, Inc. 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, Rambol Environ prepared a Revised Remedial Action Plan and an
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Addendum to the Revised Remedial Action Plan (see Appendices D and E), which were submitted to SARWQCB for review and approval. The Revised Remedial Action Plan requires excavation of soil contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons and lead and installation of soil vapor barriers under specific site structures. The Addendum to the Revised Remedial Action Plan requires extending the excavation footprint, dewatering and removal of groundwater accumulated in excavation areas, and the mixing of an oxygen release compound and chemical oxidant into the bottom of each excavation.

The Revised Remedial Action Plan and Addendum to the Revised Remedial Action Plan would be carried out under SARWQCB oversight; the project applicant/developer is also required to inform SARWQCB prior to the commencement of any site activities. Site assessments conducted for the project site and the remedial action plans 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 1,100 feet to the east, and Oak Middle School at approximately 1,700 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 Chestnut Street, which forms a portion of the eastern site boundary, provide access to the site and could 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 aforementioned school sites.

Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no migration measures are necessary.

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.** A Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was conducted for the project site by LOR Geotechnical Group, Inc. (see Appendix C). As stated in the Phase II ESA, various site investigations and assessments were conducted for the project site from 1999 to 2015. Per the site assessments and investigation, the project site was listed on hazardous
materials lists compiled by federal, state, and regional agencies. In response to the findings of the site assessments and investigations, Rambol Environ prepared a Revised Remedial Action Plan and an Addendum to the Revised Remedial Action Plan (see Appendices D and E), which were submitted to SARWQCB for review and approval. Following is a discussion of the site assessments and the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of these assessments and remedial action plans.

**Onsite Fuel System Spill Detection and Upgrade (1999)**

In 1999, and after upgrades to the two USTs onsite, OCHCA-EHD issued a Notice of Responsibility after detecting gasoline impacted soil in excited soil from the site. OCHCA-EHD directed an investigation and found that the likely source of the contamination were spills from the fill port during deliveries. A new fill protection system was installed as part of the upgrade, thereby eliminating the threat of future contamination. The quantity of the impacted soil was less than two cubic yards and was disposed of by the property owner to the satisfaction of OCHCA-EHD. A Remedial Action Completion Certificate was issued to the property owner at that time in April of 1999.

**Limited Phase II ESA (2014)**

A Limited Phase II ESA was prepared by Stantec for the project site; the Phase II ESA indicated that a Phase I ESA was completed by Stantec in 2014. Per the Phase I ESA, Velsicol Chemical Company (Velsicol) occupied the project site and the adjacent property to the west (3311 Sausalito Street) 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.

Upon Velsicol vacating the project site in the 1960s, California Batching Equipment (CBE) occupied the site in the 1960s, as well as the property to the west. Per the Phase I ESA, CBE manufactured conveyor belt systems and other heavy equipment. Both operations reportedly used and stored chemicals 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.

**Draft Phase I ESA (2015)**

A draft Phase I ESA was prepared for the project site by EnviroSoil, Inc., in 2015. The report indicated that there were three locations onsite of potential environmental concern:

- The first area was located in the southern part of the site reported to have been used to temporarily store/stage lead-contaminated soil by a contractor working for the City of Los Alamitos. The report recommended these soils be tested for lead contamination.

- The southeastern part of the site was identified as the second area of concern. A manufactured pond was historically located in this area during the time when hydrocarbon processing was taking place on the site. The report recommended testing for hydrocarbon in the soils at this location.
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- The third area was the northeastern, south-central, and east-central portions where ASTs existed during the time the site was used as an oil refinery. It was recommended to test for hydrocarbons at this location.

**Phase II ESA (2016-2017)**

A Phase II ESA involving soil and groundwater sampling, soil vapor sampling, groundwater level measurement, and geophysical surveys was conducted by LOS Geotechnical Group, Inc., on- and offsite between August 2016 and January 2017 (See Appendix C).

Soils were tested for Volatile Organic Carbons (VOCs), Semi-Volatile Organic Carbons (SVOCs), organochlorine pesticides (OCPs), Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPHs), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), metals, and/or lead. Soil vapor was tested for VOCs and TPHs. Groundwater was analyzed for VOCs, TPHs, and lead.

**Soil Testing Results**

It was found that in general, VOCs and TPHs were detected in soils on most of the site in the upper 10 ft below ground surface (bgs). Some of the concentrations exceed USEPA's Regional Screening Level (RSL) for residential/commercial/industrial soils. The highest soil concentrations were found in the former AST areas and where the manufactured pond used to be located. Lead was reported in numerous one-foot samples in the south portion of the site as exceeding the California Human Health Screening Level (CHHSL) for residential and commercial/industrial scenarios. The bulk of the contamination is above groundwater levels, which limited the downward migration of TPHs and VOCs. Groundwater onsite levels are between 12 and 16 bgs.

A soil sample collected offsite at Sausalito Street, south of the project site, had TPH as Diesel (TPH-D), and TPH as Gasoline (TPH-G) concentrations that were higher than the RSL for residential soil within the upper 10 feet. The sample also showed concentrations of naphthalene and 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene that were above the RSL for residential and commercial/industrial soil.

**Soil Vapor Testing Results**

In general, TPHs were detected in most soil vapor samples collected at five feet bgs across much of the site. Benzene, ethylbenzene, and naphthalene concentrations exceeded the CHHSL for residential and/or commercial/industrial scenarios in soil vapor samples with the highest concentrations of TPHs and VOCs.

Eight five-foot soil vapor probes were installed offsite on the southern boundary of the site at Sausalito Street. One of the eight samples showed benzene, and ethylbenzene concentrations that were higher than the CHHSL for residential use, but lower than the CHHSL for commercial/industrial use. At nine feet bgs, the concentration of benzene remained above the CHHSL for residential use.

**Groundwater Testing Results**

Groundwater samples collected from three monitoring wells in the northern portion of the project site showed a benzene concentration higher than the California drinking water Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) in one of the three samples. Groundwater samples collected from two monitoring wells in the
southern portion of the site showed a benzene concentration higher than the MCL in both samples. Toluene at a concentration higher than the MCL was detected in one of the two samples. Total dissolved solids (TDS) concentrations in groundwater exceed 3,000 TDS, making it unsuitable for municipal or domestic water use. Groundwater samples offsite, from Sausalito Street, showed benzene concentrations above the MCL.

**Conclusion**

Based on the history of the project site, most of the onsite soil, soil vapor, and groundwater contamination have occurred 65 to 70 years ago, related to the former onsite refinery operations. The Phase II ESA concluded that based on the on- and offsite assessments conducted, the investigation of soil and soil vapor contamination is adequate. The Phase II ESA recommends further groundwater sampling both onsite and offsite to verify groundwater flow direction, groundwater quality, and the extent of groundwater impacts.

**Revised Remedial Action Plan (2017)**

**Soil Remediation**

In response to the Phase II ESA prepared by LOS Geotechnical Group, Inc., Rambol Environ prepared a Revised Remedial Action Plan (See Appendix D) for remediating soil contamination to levels sufficient for residential development on the project site, for both the construction and operational phases. The construction remediation phase includes the excavation of shallow hydrocarbon- and lead-impacted soil and transport of the soil to an approved offsite facility. A site-specific Health and Safety Plan would be required to be implemented during the construction phase to protect construction workers from excavation activities that involve impacted soil. Prior to commencement of excavation, an Excavation Plan would be required to be submitted to the City of Los Alamitos, presenting the excavation details described in the Revised Remedial Action Plan.

Additionally, a Work Plan would be required to be submitted to SARWQCB for approval prior to commencement of the remediation activities. Continuous oversight of excavation activities would be conducted to assess the potential for chemical impacts based on evidence of staining, discoloration, odors, etc. VOCs would be screened in accordance with local air monitoring requirements. Suppressants would be used to control exposure to airborne Contaminants of Concern (COCs). After excavations have been completed, samples would be collected and analyzed for TPHs, VOCs, naphthalene, and lead to confirm the cleanup was successful.

**Groundwater Evaluation and Assessment**

The Revised Remedial Action Plan reviewed prior groundwater analyses conducted on the project site and at the adjacent site to the west. Data indicates that shallow groundwater at both sites are contaminated with hydrocarbons. Based on the distribution and concentration of contaminants, it appears that multiple releases from multiple sources have occurred in the 1940s due to the refinery that was operating onsite. Because the impacts are from multiple sources, and due to the groundwater being located in a low permeable shallow zone, the extent of contamination seems to be localized. Following the completion of soil excavation, groundwater wells would be installed to monitor groundwater in consultation with SARWQCB.
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Addendum to Revised Remedial Action Plan (2017)

The Addendum to the Revised Remedial Action Plan (see Appendix E) prepared by Rambol Environ summarizes the additional groundwater characterization conducted and the additional scope of remedial work necessary based on the results.

A total of 15 shallow grab groundwater samples were collected across the site in addition to five groundwater monitoring wells that were also sampled. Due to the detection of TPH-D, TPH-G, Benzene, Naphthalene, VOC’s and Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE)\textsuperscript{10}, additional actions were recommended over and above the actions listed in the Revised Remedial Action Plan. The additional actions include:

- Extending the excavation footprint to include the full extent of the former manufactured pond.
- Dewatering and removal of groundwater accumulated in excavation areas.
- Mixing of an oxygen release compound and chemical oxidant into the bottom of each excavation.

The Revised Remedial Action Plan and the Addendum combined recommend excavation and offsite disposal of approximately 14,174 cy of soil at depths of up to 10 feet bgs.

Following the completion of the remedial excavations, and after the Proposed Project is complete, a Work Plan would be submitted to SARWQCB for the installation of groundwater monitoring wells. The wells would conduct quarterly groundwater monitoring for up to three years and additional actions may be required based on the results.

Update to Phase II ESA (2018)

An environmental update to the Phase II ESA was provided by LOS Geotechnical Group, Inc. (see Appendix C). The update involved a letter stating that there are no changes to the findings of the Phase II ESA due to:

- The short time period between the Phase II ESA and the update.
- The lack of implementation of any remedial measures.
- The lack of any significant changes to subsurface soil and groundwater on the project site.

Conclusion

Assessment and mitigation actions outlined in the Revised Remedial Action Plan and Addendum to the Revised Remedial Action Plan would be completed by the project applicant/developer to obtain written regulatory closure and clearance from SARWQCB in order to facilitate residential development on the project site. Assessment and mitigation actions of the plans would be conducted under SARWQCB oversight. As SARWQB is requesting monitoring of at least three years prior to issuing a closure letter, project development would 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

\textsuperscript{10} MTBE is a gasoline additive used as an oxygenate and to raise the octane number of gasoline. Its use has declined in the United States in response to environmental and health concerns related to groundwater polluted by MTBE.
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Revised Remedial Action Plan and Addendum to the Revised Remedial Action 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 Revised Remedial Action Plan prepared by Rambol Environ and dated June 2017 (incorporated herein by this reference), and the Addendum to the Revised Remedial Action Plan prepared by Rambol Environ and dated July 31, 2017 (incorporated herein by this reference). The City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department staff shall ensure that all requirements of the plans have been implemented accordingly. This does not include any monitoring by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board that may be required under the plans.

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 Revised Remedial Action Plan prepared by Rambol Environ and dated June 2017 (incorporated herein by this reference) and the Addendum to the Revised Remedial Action Plan prepared by Rambol Environ and dated July 31, 2017 (incorporated herein by this reference). This shall not prevent the City from issuing any permits that may be required for purposes of soil remediation work.

HAZ-3 The apartment regulations established for the new apartment development shall include a provision that requires the project applicant/developer and/or established apartment management company 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 and/or established apartment management company 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 residents. The notice is in addition to any other provisions that may be included in the established apartment management rules and regulations. The project applicant/developer shall furnish the City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department with proof of the notice provided to future residents prior to the issuance of occupancy.
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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?

Less than Significant Impact. Project Site is approximately 1.7 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?

No Impact. There are no private airstrips in proximity of the project site. However, helicopters operate from JFTBLA, which as noted above, is approximately 1.7 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, no impact associated with private air strips would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

No 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.
The Proposed Project would also be required to go through the City's development review and building plan check 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, no impact would occur 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 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 (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 Drainage Report, CASC Engineering and Consulting, June 28, 2018. (Appendix G)

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

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. The project site is in the Coyote Creek Watershed, which covers 165 square miles; 85.5 square miles of which lie in north Orange County, with the remainder in Los Angeles County. Water quality in 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 (wildlife habitat, agricultural supply, fishing, etc.) for receiving waters along with water quality criteria and standards necessary to support these uses consistent with federal and state water quality laws. The downstream receiving waters for the project site include Coyote Creek Channel, San Gabriel River Reach 1 (Estuary to Firestone), San Gabriel River Estuary, Alamitos Bay, San Pedro Bay Near/Offshore
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Zones, and eventually the Pacific Ocean (CASC 2018a). Coyote Creek Channel, which passes west of the project site (see Figure 3, *Aerial Photograph*), flows into the San Gabriel River just above the river's mouth.

Coyote Creek Channel is listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List of Water-Quality Limited Segments for bacteria and diazinon (pesticide). The San Gabriel River Reach 1 is listed for ammonia, copper, diazinon, indicator bacteria, Lead, pH, and toxicity. San Gabriel River Estuary is listed for copper, dioxin, nickel, and oxygen. Expected pollutants from the Proposed Project include suspended solids and sedimentation, nutrients, pathogens, pesticides, oil and grease, and trash and debris (CASCA 2018a). Therefore, the project's primary pollutants of concern are pathogens and pesticides, due to impairments to Coyote Creek and San Gabriel River. The remainder of the impairment sources of each of the three aforementioned water bodies would not be of concern, as the proposed project would not result in the generation of any of these sources.

Under existing conditions, the vacant project site is relatively flat and site drainage is an overland flow traveling in a southerly/southeasterly direction towards the gutters in Sausalito Street and Chestnut Street. The entire site consists mostly of bare or exposed soil; there are no impervious areas onsite. An existing 24-inch diameter storm drain and two catch basins, located in Sausalito Street along the southern project frontage, intercepts and conveys runoff from the project site westerly to the Los Alamitos Channel (which parallels Coyote Creek Channel) and into the Rossanmoor Retarding Basin, to the southwest. The Los Alamitos Retarding Basin is pumped into the San Gabriel River. Under existing conditions there are no water quality devices/features onsite to provide any treatment for the “first flush” generated onsite.11

Impacts to water quality of receiving waters generally range over three different phases of a development project:

- During the earthwork and construction phase, when the potential for erosion, siltation, and sedimentation would be the greatest.
- Following construction and before the establishment of ground cover, when the erosion potential may remain relatively high.
- Following project completion, when impacts related to sedimentation would decrease markedly, but those associated with urban runoff would increase.

Following is a discussion of the potential water quality impacts resulting from urban runoff that would be generated during 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

---

11 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.
cause deterioration in the quality of downstream receiving waters if construction-related sediments, erosion, or pollutants wash into the existing storm drain system and facilities in the area.

Construction-related activities that are primarily responsible for sediment releases are related to exposing previously stabilized soils to potential mobilization by rainfall/runoff and wind. Such activities include removing vegetation from the site, grading the site, and trenching for infrastructure improvements. Environmental factors that affect erosion include topographic, soil, and rainfall characteristics. Non-sediment-related pollutants that are also of concern during construction relate to non-stormwater flows and generally include construction materials (e.g., paint and stucco); chemicals, liquid products, and petroleum products used in building construction or the maintenance of heavy equipment; and concrete and related cutting or curing residues. Construction-related activities of the Proposed Project would generate pollutants that could adversely affect the water quality of downstream receiving waters if appropriate and effective stormwater and non-stormwater management measures are not used to keep pollutants out of and remove pollutants from urban runoff.

Construction projects of one acre or more are regulated under the Statewide General Construction Permit (CGP), Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ, issued by the State Water Resources Control Board in 2012. Projects obtain coverage by developing and implementing an 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. Categories of BMPs used in SWPPPs are described in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8 Construction Best Management Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion Controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sediment Controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Erosion Controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking Controls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 8  Construction Best Management Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Storm Water Management Controls</td>
<td>Prohibit discharge of materials other than stormwater, such as discharges from the cleaning, maintenance, and fueling of vehicles and equipment. Conduct various construction operations, including paving, grinding, and concrete curing and finishing, in ways that minimize non-stormwater discharges and contamination of any such discharges.</td>
<td>Water conservation practices, temporary stream crossings, clear water diversions, illicit connection/discharge, potable and irrigation water management, and the proper management of the following operations: paving and grading, dewatering, vehicle, and equipment cleaning, fueling and maintenance, pile driving, concrete curing, concrete finishing, demolition adjacent to water, material over water, and temporary batch plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management and Controls (i.e., good housekeeping practices)</td>
<td>Management of materials and wastes to avoid contamination of stormwater.</td>
<td>Stockpile management, spill prevention and control, solid waste management, hazardous waste management, contaminated soil management, concrete waste management, sanitary/septic waste management, liquid waste management, and management of material delivery storage and use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CASQA 2012.

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 8, 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(s) 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.
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), Rambol Environ prepared a Revised Remedial Action Plan and Addendum to the Revised Remedial Action Plan for site soil remediation and groundwater monitoring (see Appendices D and E). The plans require excavation of contaminated soil and further assessment, and remediation of groundwater as needed. Implementation of the requirements set forth in the plans would be ensured through implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 through HAZ-3 and the City’s development review process. 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**

Operational-related activities of the Proposed Project (e.g., runoff from parking areas, solid waste storage areas, and landscaped areas) would generate pollutants that could adversely affect the water quality of downstream receiving waters if effective measures are not used to keep pollutants out of and remove pollutants from urban runoff.

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 the Santa Ana Region. Pursuant to this “Fourth-Term” MS4 Permit, the co-permittees 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-permittees’ 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 hydromodification 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,

12 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.

13 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.”
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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 WQMP was prepared for the Proposed Project (see Appendix F). The WQMP specifies BMPs that would be implemented to minimize water pollution from the project site during the operation phase. As outlined in the 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 provided in the WQMP.

As outlined in the WQMP, the BMPs that would be implemented for the Proposed Project include but are not limited to landscaping, bioretention trenches with underdrains on the eastern and southern boundary of the site, and street trees along the exterior of the project site. Runoff from the apartment buildings would drain towards landscaping and pervious features onsite that direct flows to the proposed bioretention facilities. All drainage from interior streets would be conveyed via storm drain inlets towards the proposed bioretention facilities. The underdrains of the bioretention trenches would be connected to an onsite outlet catch basin that will discharge to a proposed 24-inch diameter storm drain lateral in Sausalito Street. The proposed BMPs would treat runoff until a storm event overwhelms the BMPs. In this case, runoff would overflow the BMPs and discharge into the gutter on Sausalito Street. 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 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 and San Gabriel River. The combination of BMPs identified in the 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.

Furthermore, as noted above, under existing conditions, site drainage is an overland flow traveling in a southerly/southeasterly direction towards Sausalito Street and Chestnut Street. The entire site consists mostly of bare or exposed soil; there are no impervious areas onsite. There are no water quality devices/features onsite to provide any treatment for the “first flush” generated onsite. Therefore, project implementation would result in a beneficial impact to water quality as it would introduce BMPs that would treat site runoff.

Based on the preceding, no significant water quality and waste-discharge impacts from operation activities of the Proposed Project would 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. Environmental factors that affect erosion include topographic, soil, and wind and rainfall characteristics. Siltation is most often caused by soil erosion or sediment spill. Following is a discussion of the potential erosion and siltation impacts that could occur during the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Project.

**Project Construction**

As discussed above in Section 3.9.a, the project construction contractor would be required to prepare and implement an SWPPP pursuant to the CGP during grading and construction. The SWPPP would specify erosion- and sediment-control BMPs that the project construction contractor would implement prior to and during grading and construction to minimize erosion and siltation impacts on- and offsite. Erosion-control BMPs are designed to prevent erosion, whereas sediment controls are designed to trap or filter sediment once it has been mobilized. BMPs that would be implemented 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
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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 and sediment from project-related grading and construction activities. The construction-phase BMPs would also ensure effective control of not only sediment discharge, but also of pollutants associated with sediments (e.g., nutrients, heavy metals, and certain pesticides).

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

As shown in Figure 4, Site Photographs, the project site is vacant and void of any building and vegetation—the site consists mostly of bare or exposed soil, which is vulnerable to erosion or siltation. 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 WQMP (see Appendix F), which would minimize soil erosion into stormwater and thus minimize sedimentation downstream. Such BMPs include landscaping, and bioretention trenches with underdrains; see Section 3.9.a, above for further description. The proposed landscaping would be water conserving and have deep root systems that enable soil stabilization and minimize erosion.

Furthermore, the project development would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site area and would not alter the course of a stream or a river.

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. Under existing conditions, the vacant project site is relatively flat and site drainage is an overland flow traveling in a southerly/southeasterly direction towards Sausalito Street and Chestnut Street. The entire site consists mostly of bare or exposed soil; there are no impervious areas onsite. Onsite runoff generated on the north and south side of the project site drain southerly as overland sheet flow and discharges to the existing gutter along the north side of Sausalito Street. Onsite runoff generated on the southeast side of the project site drains via overland sheet flow and discharges to the existing gutter on the west side of Chestnut Street, which connects to the gutter along Sausalito Street. Site runoff captured by the Sausalito Street gutter enters two catch basins along the north side of the street, one at the southeast corner of the site and one at the southwest corner. The catch basins connect to a 24-inch storm drain pipe in
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Sausalito Street. The gutters and storm drain pipe intercept and convey runoff from the site westerly to the Los Alamitos Channel (which parallels Coyote Creek Channel) and into the Rossmoor Retarding Basin, to the southwest. The Rossmoor Retarding Basin is pumped into the San Gabriel River. No offsite drainage runs onto the project site.

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, conveyance, and treatment systems. Upon project completion, approximately 70 percent of the project site would consist of impervious areas (e.g., buildings, paving) and the remainder would be pervious (e.g., landscaping). The site drainage improvements and BMPs needed to accommodate the Proposed Project would include new storm drain pipes and inlets, landscaping, and a water quality treatment and water retention feature (bioretention trenches with underdrain). Once runoff enters the storm drain inlets, it would be conveyed via storm drain pipes to the bioretention trenches (which would treat site runoff) that would be placed along the southern and southeastern site boundaries. The underdrains of the bioretention trenches would be connected to an onsite outlet catch basin that would discharge to a proposed 24-inch diameter storm drain lateral, which would connect to the existing 24-inch storm drain pipe in Sausalito Street. If a storm overwhelms the bioretention trenches, runoff would overflow these features and discharge into the gutter on Sausalito Street.

Peak stormwater discharges from the project site in the existing and proposed conditions for the 10- and 100-year storm events are shown in Table 9. As shown in the table, the proposed 10-year onsite peak flow rate condition would be 6.8 cfs, which is a negligible increase over the existing rate of 6.6 cfs. Additionally, the proposed 100-year onsite peak flow rate would be 10.8 cfs, which is less than the existing peak flow rate of 10.9 cfs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storm Event</th>
<th>Existing Condition (in cubic feet per second)</th>
<th>Proposed Condition (in cubic feet per second)</th>
<th>Net Change (in cubic feet per second)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-year storm</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-year storm</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CASC, 2018b.

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 storm water 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.
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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 with Mitigation Incorporated. See response to Section 3.9.a, above. As substantiated in this section, impacts would be less than significant after implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-3.

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 1.7 miles east of the Project Site. Therefore, impacts from a seiche would not occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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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 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. As shown in Figures 3, Aerial Photograph, and 4, Site Photographs, the vacant project site and surrounded by residential, commercial, office, and light-industrial uses. The Proposed Project includes development of the project site with up to 107 luxury apartment units in two three-story buildings, with two levels of apartment units over one level of enclosed parking garage. The Proposed Project would occur in an urbanized area of the City and would be compatible with the surrounding land uses. The Proposed Project would not introduce a new land use that would disrupt existing land use patterns, nor would it introduce a physical barrier that would separate land uses that are not already separated.

Additionally, while there are established residential neighborhoods to the south and west of the project site, development of the Proposed Project would not physically divide these neighborhood’s 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 neighborhoods 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. The Proposed Project would not physically change the surrounding neighborhood street patterns or otherwise impede movement through the neighborhoods.

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.
3. Environmental Analysis

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 Los Alamitos General Plan and Zoning Code (Title 17 [Zoning] of the Los Alamitos Municipal 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 land use designation of the site and the permitted density, the Proposed Project includes the development of 107 luxury apartment units at a density of approximately 29.7 du/ac. 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 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 sidewalks along Sausalito Street and Chestnut Street; project development also includes development of a new public sidewalk along south side of Cerritos Avenue, which forms the project site's northern boundary. The Proposed Project also includes the provision of bicycle racks and enclosed storage spaces in in key areas of the site, as well as safe and convenient access for bicyclists within the site and to Sausalito Street and Cerritos Avenue.

Additionally, the Proposed Project would not affect any existing environmental resources, including but not limited to natural habitat, forest, farmland, or riparian areas. Furthermore, the surrounding vicinity is already developed with urbanized land uses, largely residential and commercial (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph). The Proposed Project would not represent a change in land use patterns or an inconsistency with the City's General Plan land use plan.

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.
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Zoning Consistency

The City’s Zoning 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 107 luxury apartment units at a density of approximately 29.7 du/ac.

Additionally, 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, which help ensure that development projects in the City are designed and implemented in a manner that is not detrimental to the project site or its surroundings. The Proposed Project has been designed and would be developed in accordance with the applicable development standards of the City's Zoning Code, including those related to building height and setbacks, walls and screening, parking, landscaping, and building and site plan design. All street improvements proposed as part of the project would also be designed and constructed in accordance with the City’s engineering design standards. Compliance with the City's development and design standards would be ensured through the City's development review process.

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.

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 Multiple Family Residential (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 report, which is included as Appendix H to this Initial Study:


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 With Mitigation Incorporated.

Stationary Noise

The stationary noise impacts associated with the Proposed Project would include onsite generated noise such as condenser unit noise from rooftop HVAC (heating, ventilating, and air conditioning system) units. Typical HVAC units produce a noise level of approximately 75 dBA at a distance of 10 feet. Future mechanical equipment associated with the Proposed Project would be located at least 150 feet from the nearest residential receptors (residences to the south across Sausalito Street) and conservatively not accounting for vertical distance. At this distance, the sound pressure level associated with HVAC units would be reduced to approximately 51 dBA or less, which would not exceed the City’s daytime threshold of 55 dBA. Additionally, air conditioning would not be expected to operate during nighttime hours (i.e., 10 PM to 7 AM), the coolest part of a day when residents tend to turn off their air conditioning and open windows to cool the house.

Furthermore, future mechanical equipment associated with the Proposed Project would be located at least 115 feet from the nearest non-residential sensitive receptor (outdoor pool area of the Best Western to the east) and conservatively not accounting for vertical distance. At this distance, the sound pressure level associated with a common central air conditioning unit would be reduced to approximately 54 dBA or less, which would not exceed the City’s threshold of 60 dBA for commercial uses.

Therefore, stationary noise impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Construction Vehicles and Noise

The degree of construction noise may vary for different areas of the project site and also vary depending on the construction activities. Noise levels associated with the construction will vary with the different phases of
construction and as a function of distance. Construction noise levels would diminish rapidly with distance from the construction site at a rate of 6 dBA per doubling of distance. For example, a noise level of 86 dBA measured 50 feet from the noise source would reduce to 80 dBA at 100 feet.

Noise sources associated with permitted construction activity is exempted from the provisions of the City’s Municipal Code provided that activities do not take place weekdays between the hours of 8:00 PM and 7:00 AM on weekdays and Saturday, or at any time on Sundays or federal holidays.

Construction usually consists of five phases: site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating. The loudest phase of construction is anticipated to be the paving phase (RK 2018b). Noise levels during construction are projected from an average distance of 240 feet on the project site to the adjacent residential homes. Construction noise may vary for different areas of the site. During the paving phase, the combined noise level is projected to be approximately 80 dBA Lmax and 74 dBA Leq, both at 240 feet from the property line. The maximum noise level from any single piece of equipment is 76 dBA Lmax. Provided construction activities compliance with the hours allowed in the City’s Municipal Code, they would occur during the least noise-sensitive portions of the day. Additionally, the most significant construction-related noise impacts (paving phase) would occur for a limited period of time, approximately 18 days.

However, construction noise would still exceed existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Therefore, further measures are needed to reduce noise generated during the project’s construction phase. These measures are included in Mitigation Measure NOI-1. With implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, best management practices would be instated to reduce project-related construction noise and temporary impacts to the surrounding sensitive receptors would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

NOI-1 As required by the City of Los Alamitos Municipal Code Section 17.24, construction activities shall not take place weekdays between the hours of 8:00 PM and 7:00 AM on weekdays and Saturday, or at any time on Sundays or federal holidays. In addition, the following best management practices shall be observed:

- At least 90 days prior to the start of construction activities, all offsite residences within 300 feet of the project site shall be notified of the planned construction activities. The notification shall include a brief description of the project, the activities that would occur, the hours when construction would occur, and the construction period’s overall duration. The notification shall include the telephone numbers of the City’s and contractor’s authorized representatives that are assigned to respond in the event of a noise or vibration complaint.

- The project sponsor and contractors shall prepare a Construction Noise Control Plan. The details of the Construction Noise Control Plan, including those listed herein, shall be included as part of the permit application drawing set and as part of the construction drawing set.
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- At least 10 days prior to the start of construction activities, a sign shall be posted at the entrance(s) to the job site, clearly visible to the public, which includes permitted construction days and hours, as well as the telephone numbers of the City's and contractor's authorized representatives that are assigned to respond in the event of a noise or vibration complaint. If the authorized contractor's representative receives a complaint, he/she shall investigate, take appropriate corrective action, and report the action to the City.

- During the entire active construction period, equipment and trucks used for project construction shall utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment re-design, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds), wherever feasible.

- During the entire active construction period, stationary noise sources shall be located as far from sensitive receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, or insulation barriers or other measures shall be incorporated to the extent feasible.

- During the entire active construction period, noisy operations shall be combined so that they occur in the same time period as the total noise level produced would not be significantly greater than the level produced if the operations were performed separately (and the noise would be of shorter duration).

- Haul routes that avoid the greatest amount of sensitive use areas shall be selected.

- Signs shall be posted at the job site entrance(s), within the onsite construction zones, and along queueing lanes (if any) to reinforce the prohibition of unnecessary engine idling. All other equipment shall be turned off if not in use for more than 5 minutes.

- During the entire active construction period and to the extent feasible, the use of noise producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells shall be for safety warning purposes only. The construction manager shall use smart back-up alarms, which automatically adjust the alarm level based on the background noise level or switch off back-up alarms and replace with human spotters in compliance with all safety requirements and laws.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Vibratory impacts during construction are assessed for architectural damage to buildings. The construction vibration assessment utilizes reference vibration levels and methodology set forth by Caltrans. The project is not expected to require the use of impact pile driving equipment or other heavy earthmoving activity, such as blasting, that would be considered a significant source of vibration. Typical construction activity that may cause vibration major source of vibration during construction is expected to be from vibratory rollers used for the roadway extension. Estimated levels are projected to be less
than 0.1 PPV (inches/second) at a distance of 50 feet. Buildings located near the site are considered new residential structures and modern industrial/commercial buildings that have a minimum damage potential threshold of 0.5 PPV (in/sec). Based on the results of the analysis, vibration levels would be below the 0.5 PPV (in/sec) damage threshold of significance at adjacent structures.

The vibration impacts to human annoyance perception falls within the barely perceptible to distinctly perceptible. Typically, a significant impact may occur when vibration levels exceed the strongly perceptible threshold. Therefore, the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration is considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are necessary.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Traffic noise along the adjacent roadways (Cerritos Avenue, Chestnut Street, and Sausalito Street) will be a main source of noise impacting the project site and the surrounding area. The project is anticipated to have a minimal impact on future traffic noise levels. Noise levels were calculated to increase by less than 1 dBA CNEL as a result of project implementation. Typically, the human ear can barely perceive the change in noise level of 3 dB, which is considered the threshold of significance for CEQA purposes, and therefore the minor increase in noise is considered less than significant. 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. See response to Section 3.12.a, above. As substantiated in this section, project-related construction noise would comply with the allowable construction hours per the City’s Municipal Code and would adhere to the measures outlined in Mitigation Measure NOI-1.

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

No Impact. The 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.
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f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

**No Impact.** 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 advisory body charged with allocating regional housing requirements and projecting regional growth down to the local level.

The Proposed Project consists of the development of 107 apartment units at a density of approximately 29.7 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 107 additional units to the City’s housing stock. According to the California Department of Finance, the average household size in Los Alamitos in 2017 was 2.73 persons (CDF 2018). Therefore, the project is estimated to house approximately 292 residents at full occupancy. The population of the City is forecast to increase from 11,860 people in 2017 to 12,100 in 2040 (CDF 2018; SCAG 2015), a net increase of 240 people. The Proposed Project’s population would slightly exceed the City’s regional population forecast for 2040 by 52 persons, or 0.4 percent.

However, the project site is designated for residential development (land use designation: Multi Family Residential) in the Los Alamitos General Plan; the increase in housing units and population due to residential development on the project site was considered and analyzed in the 2015 Certified EIR (SCH No. 2013121055) for the Los Alamitos General Plan Update (2015). As concluded in the 2015 Certified EIR, the increases in population and housing due to General Plan Update buildout (which included residential development on the project site) compared to regional forecasts would not be a substantial adverse impact.

Additionally, the Proposed Project’s residential units and associated population increase, which fall within the buildout assumptions of the 2015 Certified EIR, 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.

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-rent 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 this need/objective through the provision of 107 apartment units.

The proposed apartment complex would also be built at a density that the California Department of Housing and Community Development recognizes as a density of development where the market rate rent tends to be a more affordable workforce housing option than the for-sale market rate tends to be.

Regarding employment, operation of the proposed apartments would not generate large-scale employment; approximately 10 employees (e.g., management, leasing, and maintenance staff) would be generated. The Proposed Project’s construction phase would also 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 operation- and 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 vacant (see Figure 3, Aerial Photograph). Therefore, project development would not displace housing or people. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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 that 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 are provided by the Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA), which serves 23 cities and the unincorporated areas of Orange County. Specifically, the City is served by OCFA's Operations Division 1. Of OCFA's 62 fire stations, Los Alamitos is served by OCFA 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 each less than two miles from Los Alamitos and provide additional fire services to the City. Table 10 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>
</table>
| OCFA Station No. 2 3642 Green Avenue Los Alamitos, CA | Equipment: 1 Paramedic Engine  
Personnel: 1 Fire Captain, 1 Engineer, 1 Firefighter/Paramedic |
| OCFA Station No. 17 4991 Centitos Avenue Cypress, CA | Equipment: 1 Paramedic Engine, 1 Truck,  
Personnel: 2 Fire Captains, 2 Engineers, 3 Firefighters, 2 Firefighters/Paramedics |
| OCFA Station No. 48 3131 Beverly Manor Road Seal Beach, CA | Equipment: 1 Paramedic Engine, 1 Patrol Vehicle  
Personnel: 1 Fire Captain, 1 Engineer, 2 Firefighters/Paramedics |

Source: OCFA 2018.

OCFA’s response time 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.
- First-in paramedic assessment companies should arrive on-scene at all medical aids within 7 minutes 20 seconds 80 percent of the time (Rivers 2018).

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 107 apartments and introduction of 292 new residents to the City under the Proposed Project would result in an increase in calls for fire protection and emergency medical service. Specifically, the Proposed Project is anticipated to create a typical range of fire services calls, such as structure fires, electrical fires, and medical emergencies. However, considering the existing firefighting resources available in and near
the City, project impacts on fire protection and emergency services are not expected to occur. Implementation of the Proposed Project is also not anticipated to increase OCFA’s response times to either to the project site or the surrounding vicinity. Per OCFA, development of the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for new or physically altered fire facilities in order to maintain acceptable OCFA service ratios, response times or other performance objectives (Rivers 2018). OCFA staffing and equipment levels are currently optimum given the number of calls generated within the City and could absorb the additional calls and responses that could be generated by the Proposed Project. Also, OCFA staffing salary is sourced from property taxes.

Additionally, the project site is an infill site already served by OCFA; therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in an expansion of OCFA’s service area. In the event of an emergency at the project site that requires more resources than Fire Station No. 2 could provide, OCFA would direct resources to the site from other OCFA stations nearby.

However, per OCFA, project approval would require a secured fire protection agreement (SFPA) between the project applicant/developer and OCFA. SFPAs ensure that development projects provide for and contribute their pro rata fair share costs of emergency response, fire protection services, equipment, and facilities for the benefit of residents residing within the project area (OCFA 2016). An SFPA must be agreed to before the City of Los Alamitos issues the first grading permit for the Proposed Project; such an agreement would be added as a condition of approval as required by OCFA (Rivers 2018). Project applicant/developer compliance with the condition of approval would be ensured through the City’s development review and building plan check process.

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, project development 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 plan check 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. Knox boxes would also be required where necessary (i.e., stairwells where the doors are locked for entry, vehicular and parking structure gated entries) to provide access for OFD personnel.

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. Department staff consists of 29 full-time employees including 25 sworn officers; and six part-time employees comprising three reserve officers and three police service aides (LAPD 2018). The Los Alamitos Police Department station is 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 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 2014).

Development of the 107 apartment units and introduction of 292 new residents to the City under the Proposed Project would result in an increase in calls for police protection service. Specifically, the Proposed Project is anticipated to generate a typical range of police service calls as similar developments, such as vehicle burglaries, residential thefts, and disturbances.

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. Per the Los Alamitos Police Department, development of the Proposed Project would not trigger the need for new or physically altered police facilities in order to maintain acceptable police service ratios, response times or other performance objectives (Karrer 2018). The Los Alamitos Police Department’s staffing and equipment levels could absorb the additional calls and responses that could be generated by the Proposed Project.

Additionally, the project site is an infill site already served by the Los Alamitos Police Department; therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in an expansion of their service area. The Proposed Project is also not anticipated to require that the Los Alamitos Police Department to alter its range of services offered in Los Alamitos or increase its response times. 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 buildings 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
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and pedestrian paseos along and between residential buildings) to encourage outdoor activity and resident interaction within the site.

- The multistory nature of the buildings 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 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 2014). LAUSD currently operates six elementary schools, two middle schools, one high school, one continuation high school, one adult school, and one child development center. The project site is in the attendance areas of Lee Elementary School, Oak Middle School, and Los Alamitos High School.

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 2014). Applying LAUSD’s student generation rates, development of the 107 apartment units under the Proposed Project is estimated to generate approximately 37 elementary school students, 11 junior high school students, and 19 high school students, for a total of 67 students. Project student generation would cause a capacity deficit of 28 students at Lee Elementary School; a deficit of 8 students at Oak Middle School; and would leave Los Alamitos High School with remaining available capacity for 46 students (see Table 11). 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.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11</th>
<th>Estimated Project Student Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment 2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Elementary School</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Middle School</td>
<td>1,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos High School</td>
<td>3,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: CDE 2018; Vlasic 2018; DeSimas 2018.

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 project applicant/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 development 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 that 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
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Library service demand is population based—because the Proposed Project would result in population increase, the demands for library service (e.g., books, periodicals, and similar materials) for the City would increase. As noted above, the Proposed Project would result in an increase of 292 residents to Los Alamitos. Using the California State Library standard of 4 volumes and 0.7 square foot per capita, the Proposed Project would generate an estimated demand for approximately 1,168 volumes and 204 square feet of library space. However, the increase in population associated with the Proposed Project would have a nominal effect on the library service ratio, and library service capacity would continue to be met with development of the Proposed Project. Project development would not result in a direct need for new or expanded library facilities.

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. Furthermore, aside from the Los Alamitos/Rossmoor Library, other OCPL libraries in nearby communities would be available to project residents.

Therefore, the Proposed Project would not adversely affect OCPL’s 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. There are currently about 317.5 acres of parks and recreation facilities in the City consisting of approximately 18.0 acres of parks; 26.9 acres of spaces and facilities under City control; and 272.6 acres of spaces and fields open to the public but not under City control (City of Los Alamitos 2014). 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 2014).14

14 The quantity of parkland per resident is based on the 18.0 acres of parks; 26.9 acres of facilities under City control; and 5 percent of the 272.6 acres of facilities not under City control [or 13.48 acres]; for a total of 58.44 acres of parks and facilities; and the City's 2013 population of 11,384.
The nearest City parks to the project site are Oak Academy Park at 10821 Oak Street, approximately 0.25 mile to the southwest; and Stansbury Park at 3711 Toland Avenue, approximately 0.6 mile to the northeast. Oak Academy Park is on the campus of Oak Middle School and includes a lighted softball field, two lighted soccer fields, a track, and lighted volleyball and basketball courts. Stansbury Park includes play equipment and turf (City of Los Alamitos 2018).

Demands for parks and recreation services depend on the population within the City’s service area. Development of the 107 apartment units under the Proposed Project would add approximately 291 residents to the City’s existing population, and therefore would cause some increase in demands for parks and recreation services and facilities. The project would generate demand for approximately 1.45 acres of parkland per the City’s parkland standard. The Proposed Project involves a for-rent apartment development, which does not require City approval of a subdivision map. Therefore, the provisions of Section 16.17.090 (Payment of In Lieu Fees for Park and Recreation Purposes) of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code — which requires new subdivisions to dedicate land for parks or payment of in-lieu fees instead of or in combination with the dedication of land — do not apply to the Proposed Project.

However, the project’s increase in demand for park and recreational facilities is not anticipated to result in substantial physical deterioration of the City’s park and recreation facilities and amenities. While there would be an increase in use of these facilities and amenities, there would be more than sufficient open space and parkland for the Proposed Project’s residents, since future project residents would have access to a number of indoor and outdoor amenities and open space and recreation areas, both common and private. These would include a fitness center with restrooms; a clubhouse for resident entertainment and gatherings, which would include a kitchen, TV lounge, and restrooms; an outdoor lounge and dining area connected to the clubhouse; and three internal community open spaces areas in the form of open-air courtyards, enclosed on three sides. Each apartment unit would also feature a private balcony, with balcony sizes varying depending on the unit plan type. The provision of these onsite amenities would help reduce pressure put on existing City parks and recreational facilities by new residents of the Proposed Project.

As shown in Figure 5, Conceptual Site and Landscape Plan, the first courtyard would be placed on the western side of Building A, the building on the east side of the private street. This courtyard would feature a lawn area with specimen trees for shade, outdoor furniture and wall seating, natural gas burning fire place, and natural gas burning barbecue and counter. The other two courtyards would be placed on the eastern side of Building B, the building on the west side of the private street. The first, and main courtyard is the pool courtyard, which would be enclosed with CMU block walls and wrought iron fences with block pilasters around the pool courtyard, as well as wrought iron security gates. The pool courtyard would feature a swimming pool and spa, outdoor furniture and wall seating, a natural gas burning barbecue and counter, and specimen trees for shade. The other courtyard would feature a lawn area with specimen trees for shade, outdoor furniture and wall seating, natural gas burning fire place, natural gas burning barbecue and counter, and a loggia/shade structure (up to 20 feet in height) with seating.

Therefore, with the provision of community amenities and open space and recreation areas, and with payment of park fees, no significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As discussed above and shown in Figure 5, the Proposed Project includes the development of number of recreational areas and amenities within the confines of the project site. The Proposed Project does not involve any construction of recreational facilities beyond what is proposed to serve future residents of the apartment complex. Additionally, project development does not propose or require construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities in the City. Furthermore, construction of the Proposed Project's recreational areas and amenities by themselves are not considered likely to result in a significant construction- or operational-related impact. The physical impacts associated with construction of the Proposed Project's recreational areas and amenities are also analyzed in other sections of this Initial Study. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur under the Proposed Project and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### 3.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

The analysis in this section is based partly on the following technical report, 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 With Mitigation Incorporated.** 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’s Traffic Engineering staff, the TIS evaluated the existing operating conditions at nine study area intersections in the project vicinity, estimated the trip generation potential 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.
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Existing Circulation and Mobility

Study Area Intersections

The TIS analyzed existing and future weekday daily, AM, and PM peak hour traffic conditions at nine study area intersections (all under the jurisdiction of the City of Los Alamitos), which are listed below and shown in Figure 9, Study Area Intersections.

- Oak Street at Catalina Street (existing, all-way stop)
- Walnut Street at Sausalito Street (existing, all-way stop)
- Walnut Street at Katella Avenue (existing, signalized)
- Chestnut Street at Cerritos Avenue (existing, cross-street stop)
- Chestnut Street at Sausalito Street (existing, all-way stop)
- Los Alamitos Boulevard at Cerritos Avenue (existing, signalized)
- Los Alamitos Boulevard/Sausalito Street (existing, signalized)
- Project Driveway 1 at Cerritos Avenue (proposed)
- Project Driveway 2 at Sausalito Street (proposed)

Study Area Roadways

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

- **Sausalito Street** and **Catalina Street** are both two-lane east-west local streets with speed limits of 25 miles per hour (mph).

- **Oak Street**, **Walnut Street**, and **Chestnut Street** are each two-lane north-south local streets with 25 mph speed limits.

- **Katella Avenue** is an eight-lane divided roadway with a 40-mph speed limit; it is classified as a Smart Street (eight-lane) in the City’s General Plan.

- **Los Alamitos Boulevard** is a divided four-lane roadway with turn lanes at major intersections in the project vicinity and a 35-mph speed limit; it is classified as a Primary Arterial in the City’s General Plan.

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.
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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 to this Initial Study.

Acceptable Level of Service and Significance Thresholds
The City 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 TIS analyzed existing and future weekday daily, AM and PM peak hour traffic conditions for the following traffic scenarios:

- Existing Year (2018) Without Project Traffic Conditions
- Background Without Project Traffic Conditions
- Background With Project Traffic Conditions
- Project Opening Year (2020) Without Project Traffic Conditions
- Project Opening Year (2020) With Project Traffic Conditions
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Figure 9 - Study Area Intersections
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Project Trip Generation, Distribution, and Assignment

Trip Generation

The Proposed Project is estimated to generate 49 trips in the AM peak hour, 22 trips in the PM peak hour, and 783 daily trips, as shown in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12</th>
<th>Project Trip Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Generation Rate</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trips Generated</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: RK 2018c</td>
<td></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 2020, 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.

Cumulative Project Traffic

Table 4-3 lists cumulative development projects near the project site, which would be expected to contribute new vehicular traffic to the project study area for the Background and Opening Year (2020) traffic conditions. The cumulative projects are shown in Figure 10, Cumulative Projects Map. The list of cumulative projects was obtained from the cities of Los Alamitos, Cypress, and Long Beach. As shown in Table 13, the cumulative projects are estimated to generate 16,397 daily trips.
It should be noted that at the time of preparation of the TIS (May 2018), the list of cumulative development projects provided by the City was consistent with the list of current projects at that time. The TIS was reviewed and approved by the City Engineer prior to being incorporated into and forming the base for the traffic analysis contained in this section of the Initial Study. Subsequent to City approval of the TIS, one of the cumulative development projects (Village 605, which involved development of a retail center with over 113,000 square feet of commercial uses) was recently removed from the City’s list as it was determined that the project would no longer move forward and be implemented. Instead, the property owner of the site that would have housed the Village 605 project plans to make improvements to the existing vacant office buildings that occupy that site and continue to use the buildings for office use, as was the case prior to the buildings being vacant for many years. Since re-use of the buildings as offices is a permitted use and does not require any form of discretionary review or approval from the City, it would not be considered a cumulative development project and therefore, not contribute to the cumulative traffic background.

Therefore, the cumulative traffic considered in the TIS for the Background and Opening Year (2020) traffic conditions represents a worst-case scenario as the number of trips associated with the proposed retail uses of the Village 605 project were considered in these traffic scenarios. However, even if the Village 605 project and its associated background cumulative traffic trips were eliminated, the significant findings and conclusions identified in the TIS under the Background With and Opening Year (2020) With Project traffic conditions would remain the same. Therefore, no changes to the TIS were made subsequent to the City being informed that the Village 605 project would no longer move forward, and the findings and conclusions of the TIS remain the same.
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- Village 605 - Retail Center
- Olympia Stapakis - 5 Condominiums
- Mike Garnicia & Ron Wikstrom - 4 Unit Apartment
- Fairfield Inn & Suites - 108 Room Hotel
- TTM 17830 - Retail Commercial & Single Family Homes
- 2,432 TSF Convenience Store
- Residential Development - 50 Residential Condominiums
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**Existing Year (2018) Without Project Traffic Conditions**

As shown in Table 14, one existing study area intersection, Chestnut Street at Cerritos Avenue, currently operates at LOS F under the Existing Year (2018) Without Project traffic conditions. The level of service deficiency found at this deficient intersection is common for many unsignalized local cross-street intersections with arterial roadways. The primary cause of this deficiency is due to traffic from the stop-controlled local street (Chestnut Street) turning left onto the uncontrolled primary arterial (Cerritos Avenue). In order for vehicles to make a left turn from Chestnut Street, there must be a sufficient occurrence of gaps in the unrestricted traffic flow on the main street, and the level of service is determined based on this worst approach delay, not the intersection operations as a whole.

**Table 14** Intersection Operations: Existing Year (2018) Without Project Traffic Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Analysis Methodology</th>
<th>V/C Ratio or Delay</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oak Street/Catalina St</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Katella Avenue</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>0.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Boulevard/Cerritos Avenue</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Blvd/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>0.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Driveway 1/Cerritos Avenue (proposed)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Driveway 2/Sausalito Street (proposed)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RK 2018c.

Notes: TS = Traffic Signal; CSS = Cross-street stop; AWS = All Way Stop; HCM = Highway Capacity Manual; ICU = Intersection Capacity Utilization.

**Existing Vehicle Gaps**

As a part of the TIS, existing gaps in traffic on Cerritos Avenue at Chestnut Street were analyzed to determine whether vehicles could make left turns from side streets and private driveways onto Cerritos Avenue near the project site. To do this, vehicle gap counts were collected along Cerritos Avenue. The minimum gap required per vehicle was assumed to be eight seconds. The analysis determined that gaps in traffic on Cerritos Avenue would allow 57 cars to make left turns (or proceed straight through) at the intersection of Chestnut Street during the AM peak hour and 85 during the PM peak hour, sufficient for the existing demand at that intersection.

**Background Traffic Conditions**

Background traffic conditions were estimated by adding estimated traffic conditions from cumulative projects to existing traffic conditions. Project related traffic impacts were assessed for background traffic conditions by comparing intersection LOS for “without” and “with” project scenarios.
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**Background Without Project Traffic Conditions**

As shown in Table 15, all study area intersections are expected to operate at acceptable LOS in the AM and PM peak hours under the Background Without Project traffic conditions with the exception of the Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue intersection, which is projected to operate at LOS F in the AM peak hour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Analysis Methodology</th>
<th>V/C Ratio or Delay AM</th>
<th>V/C Ratio or Delay PM</th>
<th>Level of Service AM</th>
<th>Level of Service PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oak Street/Catalina Street</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Katella Avenue</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Boulevard/Cerritos Avenue</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Blvd/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Driveway 1/Cerritos Avenue (proposed)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Driveway 2/Sausalito Street (proposed)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RK 2018c.
Notes: TS = Traffic Signal; CSS = Cross-street stop; AWS = All Way Stop; HCM = Highway Capacity Manual; ICU = Intersection Capacity Utilization.

**Background With Project Traffic Conditions**

As shown in Table 16, all study area intersections are expected to operate at acceptable LOS in the AM and PM peak hours under the Background With Project traffic conditions, with the exception of the Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue intersection, which is projected to continue to operate at LOS F in the AM peak hour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Analysis Methodology</th>
<th>V/C Ratio or Delay AM</th>
<th>V/C Ratio or Delay PM</th>
<th>Level of Service AM</th>
<th>Level of Service PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oak Street/Catalina Street</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Katella Avenue</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Boulevard/Cerritos Avenue</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Blvd/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Driveway 1/Cerritos Avenue (proposed)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Driveway 2/Sausalito Street (proposed)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RK 2018c.
Notes: TS = Traffic Signal; CSS = Cross-street stop; AWS = All Way Stop; HCM = Highway Capacity Manual; ICU = Intersection Capacity Utilization.

The intersection of Chestnut Street at Cerritos Avenue is currently deficient (LOS F) under existing conditions (see Table 14) and is forecast to continue to operate deficiently under future scenarios (see Tables
15 and 16). A significant impact would occur at this intersection if the project-related increase in traffic under Background With Project traffic conditions is one percent or greater.

Table 17 shows the project related increase in traffic at the intersection of Chestnut Street and Cerritos Avenue. As shown in the table, the project related traffic increase at the intersection would exceed one percent compared to the without project traffic conditions. Therefore, this impact is considered potentially significant and mitigation would be required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Background Without Project Traffic Conditions</th>
<th>Background With Project Traffic Conditions</th>
<th>Traffic Increase with Project</th>
<th>Percent Increase with Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue</td>
<td>AM     169</td>
<td>PM     103</td>
<td>AM     171</td>
<td>PM     105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RK 2018c.

1 Total volume for northbound approach leg on Chestnut Street (worst case approach leg for delay).

**Opening Year (2020) Traffic Conditions**

**Opening Year (2020) Without Project Traffic Conditions**

Opening Year (2020) Without Project traffic conditions, which were estimated by adding estimated traffic conditions from ambient regional growth (estimated as one percent per year for two years) to Background Without Project traffic conditions, are shown in Table 18. As shown in the table, all study area intersections are expected to operate at acceptable LOS in the AM and PM peak hours under the Opening Year (2020) Without Project traffic conditions with exception of the Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue intersection, which is projected to operate at LOS F in the AM peak hour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Analysis Methodology</th>
<th>V/C Ratio or Delay</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oak Street/Catalina Street</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Katella Avenue</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Boulevard/Cerritos Avenue</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Blvd/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>0.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Driveway 1/Cerritos Avenue (proposed)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Driveway 2/Sausalito Street (proposed)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RK 2018c.

Notes: TS = Traffic Signal; CSS = Cross-street stop; AWS = All Way Stop; HCM = Highway Capacity Manual; ICU = Intersection Capacity Utilization.
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**Opening Year (2020) With Project Traffic Conditions**

Opening Year (2020) With Project traffic conditions, which were estimated by adding estimated project traffic generation to Opening Year (2020) Without Project traffic conditions, are shown in Table 19. As shown in the table, all study area intersections are expected to operate at acceptable LOS in the AM and PM peak hours under the Opening Year (2020) With Project traffic conditions with exception of the Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue intersection, which is projected to continue to operate at LOS F in the AM peak hour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Analysis Methodology</th>
<th>VIC Ratio or Delay AM</th>
<th>VIC Ratio or Delay PM</th>
<th>Level of Service AM</th>
<th>Level of Service PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oak Street/Catalina Street</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Katella Avenue</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue Unmitigated</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue Mitigated</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Katella Avenue</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Katella Avenue</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Boulevard/Cerritos Avenue</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Driveway 1/Cerritos Avenue (proposed)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Driveway 2/Sausalito Street (proposed)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RK 2018c.

Notes: TS = Traffic Signal; CSS = Cross-street stop; AWS = All Way Stop; HCM = Highway Capacity Manual; ICU = Intersection Capacity Utilization.

Project-generated traffic would have a significant impact at the intersection of Chestnut Street and Cerritos Avenue if the increase in traffic at the northbound leg of that intersection is one percent or more. The analysis of project traffic contribution determined that project traffic would add more than one percent to the Opening Year (2020) without project traffic volumes at the northbound leg: 1.16 percent in the AM peak hour and 1.9 percent in the PM peak hour. Therefore, this impact is considered potentially significant and mitigation would be required.

**Conclusion**

As demonstrated above, project related increase in traffic would result in a significant impact at the intersection of Chestnut Street and Cerritos Avenue under the Background With Project and Opening Year (2020) With Project traffic conditions. As stated in the TIS, a traffic signal is not recommended or feasible at the Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue intersection to reduce the identified significant impact due to the proximity of the signalized intersection of Los Alamitos Boulevard and Cerritos Avenue, less than 300 feet away.

However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure TRAF-1, impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant. As stated in this mitigation measure, the project applicant/developer would coordinate with the City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department to have signage installed at the Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue intersection, prohibiting northbound left turns and through movements from
Chestnut Street to Cerritos Avenue during weekday peak hours. Peak hours are considered to be from 7:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Page 2-3 of TIS describes how LOS is defined and reported in Los Alamitos (see Appendix I). Tables 15, 16, 18, and 19, above, show the quantification of LOS with and without northbound left turns. For unsignalized intersections with stop control on the minor cross street, the calculation of LOS is determined based on the worst movement (movement experiencing highest vehicle delay) at the intersection. For the intersection of Chestnut Street at Cerritos Avenue, the worst movement is the northbound left turn from Chestnut Street to westbound Cerritos Avenue. By prohibiting left turns, the intersection's peak hour LOS would no longer be defined by this failing movement. Specifically, as shown in Table 19, with installation of the sign prohibiting left turns onto Cerritos Avenue during the peak hours, the identified AM deficiency of 72.4 (LOS F) would be reduced to 25.5 (LOS D). All other movements at this intersection are shown to operate at acceptable LOS (D or better) during peak hours. Therefore, by prohibiting northbound left turns, the intersection would operate at an acceptable LOS.

Site Access Analysis

LOS Analysis

As shown in Figure 5, Conceptual Site and Landscape Plan, vehicular access for the project site would be provided via new full-access driveways (all turning movements permitted) off Cerritos Avenue and Sausalito Street. As a part of the TIA, site access analysis was conducted for both driveways. Based on the proposed driveway geometry and the HCM operational analysis conducted for these access driveways, both driveways would perform at acceptable LOS during the peak hours under the Opening Year (2020) With Project traffic conditions. No significant vehicle delays are expected entering or exiting either access driveway. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigations measures are necessary.

Vehicle Gap Analysis

As a part of the TIA, vehicle gap counts were collected along Cerritos Avenue to evaluate the feasibility of making left turns from the proposed access driveway onto Cerritos Avenue. Based on the current traffic conditions, the gap service potential along Cerritos Avenue would allow approximately 30 cars to make a left turn at out of the project driveway during the AM peak hour and 41 cars have the potential to complete a turn during the PM peak hour. Based on the project traffic volume data of the TIS, there are enough gaps in traffic along Cerritos Avenue to serve the future project demand at this intersection during the peak hours. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Alternative Modes of Transportation Analysis

Impacts to alternative modes of transportation are discussed in Section 3.16(f), below. As substantiated in that section, no impacts on alternative modes of transportation would occur.

Mitigation Measure

TRAF-1 At least three months prior to issuance of occupancy permits, the project applicant/developer shall coordinate with the City of Los Alamitos Development Services
3. Environmental Analysis

Department to have signage installed at the Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue intersection, prohibiting northbound left turns and through movements from Chestnut Street to Cerritos Avenue during weekday peak hours. Peak hours are considered to be from 7:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. The project applicant/developer shall be responsible for the cost of installing the sign.

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

**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 12, *Project Trip Generation*, the Proposed Project is projected to generate approximately 783 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.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** As shown in Figure 5, *Conceptual Site and Landscape Plan*, vehicular access for the project site would be provided via new full-access driveways (all turning movements permitted) off Cerritos Avenue and Sausalito Street, which would connect to an internal, north-south private street. The proposed driveway off Cerritos Avenue would be approximately 180 feet west of the intersection of Chestnut Street and Cerritos Avenue; the proposed driveway off Sausalito Street approximately 180 feet west of the intersection of Chestnut Street and Sausalito Street. Vehicular access to the parking garages of each apartment building and for service and emergency vehicles would be via the new north-south private street.

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 project would also not include incompatible uses such as farm equipment on area roadways.

Additionally, 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 engineering plans and OCFAs design standards, which are imposed on project developments by the City and OCFA during the development review and building plan check 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.

For example, the design of the proposed vehicular access driveways and intersections would be required to adhere to the City’s and Caltrans’ sight distance requirements, which would ensure that vehicles exiting/entering the project site would be able to make safe turning movements out of/into the site without any visual or physical obstructions (e.g., walls, trees, parked vehicles). For example, Section 405.1 of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual indicates that the minimum corner sight distance for intersections of private roads shall be equal to the stopping sight distance given in Table 201.1 (Sight Distance Standards) of the manual.

As outlined in the TIS (see Appendix I), Cerritos Avenue has a design speed of 55 mph; based on the stopping sight distance standards of Table 201.1, the minimum sight distance for intersections of private roads with Cerritos Avenue is 500 feet. Sausalito Street has a design speed of 25 mph; the minimum sight distance for intersections of private roads with Sausalito Street is 150 feet. As substantiated in the TIS, adequate sight distance would be provided at the intersection of proposed access driveway off Cerritos Avenue.

However, with regard to the proposed access driveway off Sausalito Street, adequate sight distance would be provided at the intersection with implementation of parking restrictions on the north side of Sausalito Street. Currently, the segments of the north side of Sausalito Street extending east and west from the proposed access driveway currently permit on-street parking. The allowance of parking near the proposed driveway
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would obstruct visibility at the intersection. Therefore, mitigation is required to reduce the potential sight distance impact at this intersection. Per Mitigation Measure TRAF-2, on-street parking would be restricted on the north side of Sausalito Street, east and west of the street’s intersection with the proposed project’s access driveway. With implementation of the on-street parking restrictions, the total loss of existing parking would be approximately eight spaces. With implementation of Mitigation Measure TRAF-2, this impact would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

TRAF-2 No on-street parking shall be allowed on the north side of Sausalito Street, east and west of the street’s intersection with the proposed project’s access driveway. Specific parking restrictions shall be as follows: no parking 30 feet to the west and 50 feet to the east to allow for adequate sight distance. The restricted parking area shall be marked and/or signed accordingly.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant Impact. As outlined above, the Proposed Project would introduce a number of new onsite vehicular access and circulation improvements. To address emergency and 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. The minimum height requirement would also be provided for the parking garage entries in order to accommodate fire trucks and other large 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 Los Alamitos and OFD, such as those outlined in Chapter 15.08 (Fire Code) of the City’s Municipal Code. Compliance with these standards is ensured through the City’s and OCFA’s development review and building plan check process.

Furthermore, during the development review and building plan check process, the City would coordinate with OCFA and LAPD to ensure that the necessary fire prevention and emergency response features are incorporated into the Proposed Project and that adequate circulation and access (e.g., adequate turning radii for fire trucks) are provided within the traffic and circulation components of the Proposed Project. Knox boxes would also be required where necessary (i.e., stairwells where the doors are locked for entry, vehicular and parking structure gated entries) to provide access for emergency personnel. All site and building improvements proposed under the project would be subject to review and approval by the City, OCFA, and LAPD.

Finally, implementation of the Proposed Project would not require major road closures or otherwise impact the functionality of Cerritos Avenue of Sausalito Street as public safety access routes. However, some minor improvements would be required within the Cerritos Avenue and Sausalito Street rights-of-way, which would require temporary closure of small portions of these roads. For example, some construction would occur.
3. Environmental Analysis

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 access driveways. 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.

Based on the preceding, impacts to emergency access would be less than significant 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. Following is a discussion of the potential impacts to alternative modes of transportation as a result of development of the Proposed Project.

Pedestrian Facilities

Under existing conditions, there are public sidewalks on both sides of Sausalito Street, which forms the southern boundary of the project site, and Chestnut Street, which forms a portion of the eastern site boundary. No sidewalks are present along the southern portion of Cerritos Avenue, which forms the northern boundary of the project site.

As shown in Figure 5, Conceptual Site and Landscape Plan, pedestrian access to the project site for project residents, guests, and employees would be provided via the existing public sidewalk along the north side of Sausalito Street and a new public sidewalk along the south side of Cerritos Avenue. Internal pedestrian circulation would include a network of pedestrian paths and walkways, which would connect to the apartment buildings and parking garages, as well as the public sidewalks on Sausalito Street and Cerritos Avenue. Access to the individual apartment units would be provided via internal pedestrian corridors/walkways on each level of the apartment buildings, as well as elevators and stairwells.

The proposed pedestrian circulation system would seamlessly connect to the public sidewalks along Cerritos Avenue and Sausalito Street. Project residents would be within walking distance of complementary uses surrounding the Project Site, which include commercial, retail, and restaurant uses. The Proposed Project's pedestrian circulation system would be accessible from and connect to all points of the project site as well as points of interest beyond the project site.

Additionally, the design and construction of the proposed pedestrian circulation improvements would be required to adhere to the design standards set forth by the City, including the provision of safe, convenient, and accessible pedestrian routes. For example, well-marked, publicly accessible paths of travel would be required to be provided in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations.

Therefore, development of the Proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. In
fact, the Proposed Project would enable and enhance the use of pedestrian facilities in the project area. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Bicycle Facilities**

Under existing conditions, there are no bicycle facilities on Sausalito Street fronting the Project Site. However, 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, just southwest of the project site. 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.

The proposed internal walkways and drive aisles would provide a means for project residents to access Sausalito Street and Cerritos Avenue and the public sidewalk along these streets for bicycling. Section 21100(h) of the California Vehicle Code allows bicycles to ride on sidewalks. Once on Cerritos Avenue and Sausalito Street, project residents would have access to the aforementioned bicycle facilities, as well as those (both local and regional, existing, and future) shown in Figure 8 (Existing and Planned Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities) of the Mobility and Circulation Element and Figure 3-9 (Corridor H: Seal Beach-Orange Avenue) of OCTA’s Bikeway Strategy. Additionally, project residents would have an opportunity to store bicycles within their dwelling units. Parking for bicycles would also be provided in key areas of the site, which would help promote bicycle use; these would include open bicycle racks and enclosed storage spaces.

Furthermore, Cerritos Avenue is a truck route designated by the City of Los Alamitos, and it is expected that project construction equipment and delivery trucks would access the site from Cerritos Avenue. However, project construction workers would use standard safety measures where a construction access crosses a bicycle lane or bicycle route—such as flag persons—and construction traffic would not pose a substantial hazard to bicyclists using the bicycle lane.

Therefore, development of the Proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding bicycle facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. In fact, the Proposed Project would enable and enhance the use of bicycle facilities. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Public Transit Facilities**

As an alternative to automobile transportation, the Orange County Transportation Authority and Long Beach Transit provides public transit bus service in and near Los Alamitos. The following public transit bus routes operate on Los Alamitos Boulevard and/or Katella Avenue in the project study area:

- **Orange County Transportation Authority**
  - **Route 42:** Extends northeast/southwest between the cities of Seal Beach and Orange; operates on Los Alamitos Boulevard in the study area.
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- **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 102**: Extends east-west in the cities of Long Beach and Los Alamitos; operates on Cerritos Avenue in the study area.
  - **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.

The Proposed Project has been designed to provide convenient access to aforementioned public transit routes. For example, future project residents, employees and visitors would be within walking distance of public transit provided along Los Alamitos Boulevard and Katella Avenue; a number of bus stops are located along these roadways. Safe access to the bus stops from the project site would be available via the Proposed Project’s pedestrian paths internal to the site and those surrounding the project site.

Therefore, development of the Proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. In fact, the Proposed Project would enable and enhance the use of public transit. No impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### 3.17 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project 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**

**No Impact.** As shown in Figure 4, *Site Photographs*, the project site is vacant and void of any building, structures, and vegetation—the site consists mostly of bare or exposed soil. The project site is 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 impacts to historical resources would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.
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b) 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, 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 2018).

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; Gabrieleño 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 April 2, 2018, which requested comments and responses from the tribes. The 30-day noticing requirement under AB 52 was completed on May 1, 2018, 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 information in this section is based partly on the following technical report, which is included as Appendix G of this Initial Study:
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a) Exceed waste water treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Rossmoor/Los Alamitos Area Sewer District would be responsible for the collection of wastewater generated by the Proposed Project. OCSD would be responsible for conveying the collected sewage through a series of regional trunk lines for treatment at its regional treatment plants. Specifically, OCSD’s 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 by 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.

Based on the preceding, 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.

### 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 2017a).

As noted below in Section 3.18(d), total estimated project water demand is approximately 31,137 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. 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 2017aa).

Wastewater generation is taken to be 100 percent of indoor water use. As noted below in Section 3.18(d), project operation is forecast to generate an indoor water demand of approximately 178.5 gpd per unit, or approximately 19,099 gpd for the 107 apartment units 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 2017b).

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. Additionally, project development would not involve or require construction of new or expanded offsite 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 potable water service to 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 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 20</th>
<th>Water Supplies and Demands in Acre-Feet Per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>13,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imported Water</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Supplies</td>
<td>13,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Demands</td>
<td>13,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As shown in Table 21, project operation is estimated to generate indoor water demands of approximately 19,099 gpd, based on an indoor water demand of 178.5 gpd per unit. Outdoor water demand is estimated at approximately 112.5 gpd per unit or 12,038 gpd. Combined, total estimated project water demand is approximately 31,137 gpd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 21</th>
<th>Project Water Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario</td>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Demands</td>
<td>Prop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


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 project development 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
3. Environmental Analysis

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 low-flow faucets and toilets and Energy Star appliances. 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 2017, the latest year for which data are available, approximately 99 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 Sanitary Landfill near the City of Irvine, Olinda Alpha Landfill near the City of Brea, and El Sobrante in Corona (CalRecycle 2018a). Table 22 identifies the capacities of the three primary landfill facilities that serve the City.
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. Apartment units are estimated to generate approximately 5.31 pounds of solid waste per unit per day (CalRecycle 2017d). Applying this generation rate, the 50 apartment units under the Proposed Project are estimated to generate approximately 568 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 22, 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 garages. 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, impacts on landfill capacity would be less than significant 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 2018e).

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 2018e). Therefore, disposal rates in Los Alamitos in 2015 were consistent with AB 939. The project applicant/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.

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. 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, office, light-industrial, and commercial
uses. As shown in Figure 4, Site Photographs, the project site is vacant and void of any building and vegetation—the site consists mostly of bare or exposed soil.

The project site and surrounding area do not contain any sensitive natural resources that could be disturbed as a result of project development. As substantiated 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 were deemed to be less than significant.

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. Impacts were deemed to be less than significant.

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.** 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. Project implementation would not require the construction of new or expansion of existing utility infrastructure and services. The project site is also generally too small in scope to appreciably contribute to existing cumulative impacts.

Furthermore, impacts related to other topical areas such as air quality, GHG, hydrology and water quality, and traffic 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 not result in significant impacts in the areas of air quality, GHG, and geology and soils which may cause adverse effects on human beings. Impacts related to these environmental effects were deemed to be less than significant.

As discussed in the respective topical sections of this Initial Study, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in adverse impacts in the areas of air quality; hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, and noise, which may cause adverse effects on human beings. However, feasible mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures AQ-1, HAZ-1 through HAZ-4, and NOI-1) have been identified to reduce
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these impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, with implementation of mitigation measures, the Proposed Project would not result in 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 23. 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 23 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>AIR QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-1</td>
<td>All diesel-powered construction equipment shall be equipped with tier four engines and level three diesel particulate filters or better. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant/developer or construction contractor shall provide evidence to the City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department that all diesel-powered construction equipment meets these standards.</td>
<td>Project Applicant/Developer and Construction Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading permits</td>
<td>City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-1</td>
<td>The project applicant/developer shall comply with all requirements set forth in the Revised Remedial Action Plan prepared by Rambol Environ and dated June 2017 (incorporated herein by this reference), and the Addendum to the Revised Remedial Action Plan prepared by Rambol Environ and dated July 31, 2017 (incorporated herein by this reference). The City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department staff shall ensure that all requirements of the plans have been implemented accordingly. This does not include any monitoring by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board that may be required under the plans.</td>
<td>Project Applicant/Developer, Geotechnical/Soils Engineer, Site Assessment Specialist, and Construction Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading permits</td>
<td>City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department, with oversight from SARWQCB (as needed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<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>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 Revised Remedial Action Plan prepared by Rambol Environ and dated June 2017 (incorporated herein by this reference) and the Addendum to the Revised Remedial Action Plan prepared by Rambol Environ and dated July 31, 2017 (incorporated herein by this reference). This shall not prevent the City from issuing any permits that may be required for purposes of soil remediation work.</td>
<td>Project Applicant/Developer, Geotechnical/Soils Engineer, Site Assessment Specialist, and Construction Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of grading and/or building permits</td>
<td>City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-3</td>
<td>The apartment regulations established for the new apartment development shall include a provision that requires the project applicant/developer and/or established apartment management company 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 and/or established apartment management company shall furnish the City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department with a copy of the letter.</td>
<td>Project Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>During project operation and upon issuance of the closure letter by SARWQCB</td>
<td>City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department, with oversight from SARWQCB (as needed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-4</td>
<td>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 residents. The notice is in addition to any other provisions that may be included in the established apartment management rules and regulations. The project applicant/developer shall furnish the City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department with proof of the notice provided to future residents prior to the issuance of occupancy.</td>
<td>Project Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of occupancy</td>
<td>City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Table 23 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><strong>NOISE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| NOI-1              | As required by the City of Los Alamitos Municipal Code Section 17.24, construction activities shall not take place weekdays between the hours of 8:00 PM and 7:00 AM on weekdays and Saturday, or at any time on Sundays or federal holidays. In addition, the following best management practices shall be observed:  
  • At least 90 days prior to the start of construction activities, all offsite residences within 300 feet of the project site shall be notified of the planned construction activities. The notification shall include a brief description of the project, the activities that would occur, the hours when construction would occur, and the construction period’s overall duration. The notification shall include the telephone numbers of the City’s and contractor’s authorized representatives that are assigned to respond in the event of a noise or vibration complaint.  
  • The project sponsor and contractors shall prepare a Construction Noise Control Plan. The details of the Construction Noise Control Plan, including those listed herein, shall be included as part of the permit application drawing set and as part of the construction drawing set.  
  • At least 10 days prior to the start of construction activities, a sign shall be posted at the entrance(s) to the job site, clearly visible to the public, which includes permitted construction days and hours, as well as the telephone numbers of the City’s and contractor’s authorized representatives that are assigned to respond in the event of a noise or vibration complaint. If the authorized contractor’s representative receives a complaint, he/she shall investigate, take appropriate corrective action, and report the action to the City.  
  • During the entire active construction period, equipment and trucks used for project construction shall utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved | Project Applicant/Developer and Construction Contractor | Through the duration of construction activities | City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department | |
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<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>mufflers, equipment re-design, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds), wherever feasible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- During the entire active construction period, stationary noise sources shall be located as far from sensitive receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, or insulation barriers or other measures shall be incorporated to the extent feasible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- During the entire active construction period, noisy operations shall be combined so that they occur in the same time period as the total noise level produced would not be significantly greater than the level produced if the operations were performed separately (and the noise would be of shorter duration).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Haul routes that avoid the greatest amount of sensitive use areas shall be selected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Signs shall be posted at the job site entrance(s), within the onsite construction zones, and along queueing lanes (if any) to reinforce the prohibition of unnecessary engine idling. All other equipment shall be turned off if not in use for more than 5 minutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- During the entire active construction period and to the extent feasible, the use of noise producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells shall be for safety warning purposes only. The construction manager shall use smart back-up alarms, which automatically adjust the alarm level based on the background noise level or switch off back-up alarms and replace with human spotters in compliance with all safety requirements and laws.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 23 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><strong>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAF-1</td>
<td>At least three months prior to issuance of occupancy permits, the project applicant/developer shall coordinate with the City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department to have signage installed at the Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue intersection, prohibiting northbound left turns and through movements from Chestnut Street to Cerritos Avenue during weekday peak hours. Peak hours are considered to be from 7:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. The project applicant/developer shall be responsible for the cost of installing the sign.</td>
<td>Project Applicant/Developer and Construction Contractor</td>
<td>At least three months prior to issuance of occupancy permits</td>
<td>City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAF-2</td>
<td>No on-street parking shall be allowed on the north side of Sausalito Street, east and west of the street's intersection with the proposed project's access driveway. Specific parking restrictions shall be as follows: no parking 30 feet to the west and 50 feet to the east to allow for adequate sight distance. The restricted parking area shall be marked and/or signed accordingly.</td>
<td>Project Applicant/Developer and Construction Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of occupancy</td>
<td>City of Los Alamitos Development Services Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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