CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS
3191 Katella Avenue
Los Alamitos, CA 90720

AGENDA
PLANNING COMMISSION/SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
Wednesday, November 28, 2018 – 7:00 PM

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC
This Agenda contains a brief general description of each item to be considered. Except as provided by law, action or discussion shall not be taken on any item not appearing on the agenda. Supporting documents, including staff reports, are available for review at City Hall in the Development Services Department or on the City’s website at www.cityoflosalamitos.org once the agenda has been publicly posted.

Any written materials relating to an item on this agenda submitted to the Planning Commission after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Development Services Department, 3191 Katella Ave., Los Alamitos CA 90720, during normal business hours. In addition, such writings or documents will be made available for public review at the respective public meeting.

It is the intention of the City of Los Alamitos to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in all respects. If, as an attendee, or a participant at this meeting, you will need special assistance beyond what is normally provided, please contact the Development Services Department at (562) 431-3538, extension 303, 48 hours prior to the meeting so that reasonable arrangements may be made. Assisted listening devices may be obtained from the Planning Secretary at the meeting for Individuals with hearing impairments.

Persons wishing to address the Planning Commission on any item on the Planning Commission Agenda shall sign in on the Oral Communications Sign In sheet which is located on the podium once the item is called by the Chairperson. At this point, you may address the Planning Commission for up to FIVE MINUTES on that particular item.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL
   Chair DeBolt
   Vice Chair Riley
   Commissioner Andrade
   Commissioner Culity
   Commissioner Grose
   Commissioner Loe
   Commissioner Sofelkanik

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
4. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**
   At this time, any individual in the audience may address the Planning Commission and speak on any item within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission. If you wish to speak on an item listed on the agenda, please sign in on the Oral Communications Sign-In sheet located on the podium. **Remarks are to be limited to not more than five minutes.**

5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   A. Approve the Minutes for the Regular Meeting of October 24, 2018.

6. **DISCUSSION**
   None.

7. **CONSENT CALENDAR**
   None.

8. **STAFF REPORT**
   None.

9. **PUBLIC HEARING**
   A. Consideration of Site Plan Review (SPR) 18-05
   Katella Deli Addition, Additional Parking, and a Renovation of Exterior
   Consideration of a Site Plan Review for the expansion and reface of a restaurant at 4470 Katella Avenue on a 1.3-acre parcel (per Assessor) in the Commercial Professional Office (C-O) Zoning District (APN 242-121-53) (Applicant: David Abbass, DMA Builders).

   Recommendation:

   1. Open the Public hearing; and,

   2. Take testimony; and,

   3. Make the CEQA finding that the project is a Class 1 Categorical Exemption, pursuant to Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) is appropriate for the project, and that a Notice of Exemption shall be prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.; and if appropriate,

B. Consideration of Site Plan Review (SPR) 18-02
107 Apartment Unit Development in Two Buildings
3342 Cerritos Avenue
Consideration of a Site Plan Review for a development of a 107-unit residential apartment complex located at 3342 Cerritos Avenue on a 3.65-acre (net area) parcel in the Multiple Family (R-3) Zoning District (APN 242-222-11) (Applicant: Christopher Felix, Hutton Development Company representing the Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments, LLC). A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for the project.

Recommendation:

1. Open the Public hearing; and,

2. Take testimony; and,

3. Make the CEQA finding that the project is subject to a Mitigated Negative Declaration, which has been prepared for the proposed project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act; and, if appropriate,


10. ITEMS FROM THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR
11. COMMISSIONER REPORTS

12. ADJOURNMENT

APPEAL PROCEDURES
Any final determination by the Planning Commission may be appealed to the City Council, and must be done so in writing at the Development Services Department, within twenty (20) days after the Planning Commission decision. The appeal must include a statement specifically identifying the portion(s) of the decision with which the appellant disagrees and the basis in each case for the disagreement, accompanied by an appeal fee of $1,000.00 (resident)/$2,349.00 (non-resident) in accordance with Los Alamitos Municipal Code Section 17.68 and Fee Resolution No. 2017-13.

I hereby certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing Agenda was posted at the following locations: Los Alamitos City Hall, 3191 Katella Avenue; Los Alamitos Community Center, 10911 Oak Street; and, Los Alamitos Museum, 11032 Los Alamitos Boulevard; not less than 72 hours prior to the meeting.

[Signature]
Tom Oliver
Associate Planner

[1/21/18] Date
MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMISSION/SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE MEETING
OF THE CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

REGULAR MEETING – October 24, 2018

1. CALL TO ORDER
The Planning Commission/Subdivision Committee met in Regular Session at 7:00 p.m., Wednesday, October 24, 2018, in the Council Chamber, 3191 Katella Avenue, Chair DeBolt presiding.

2. ROLL CALL
Present: Commissioners:
   Chair DeBolt
   Vice Chair Riley
   Andrade, Grose, Loe (arrived late 7:15 pm) and
   Sofelkanik

Absent: Commissioner Cuilty

Staff: Les Johnson, Development Services Director
       Michael Daudt, City Attorney
       Michelle Müller, Department Secretary
       Tom Oliver, Associate Planner

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair DeBolt.

4. ORAL COMMUNICATION
Chair DeBolt opened the meeting for Oral Communication for items not on the agenda.

There being no speakers, Chair DeBolt closed the public hearing.

5. Approval of Minutes
A. Approve the Minutes for the Regular Meeting of October 24, 2018
Motion/Second: Grose/Andrade
Carried 4/0 (DeBolt abstained, Cuilty and Loe absent): The Planning Commission approved the minutes of the Regular meeting of October 24, 2018.

6. DISCUSSION
None.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR
None.

8. STAFF REPORT
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A. Planned Sign Program (PSP) 18-02
Signage for Laurel Park – 4012 Katella Avenue
Consideration of a Planned Sign Program for Laurel Park Plaza in accordance with the Los Alamitos Municipal Code.

Associate Planner Oliver summarized the staff report.

Chair DeBolt opened the public hearing.

President of Signage Solutions Chris, described the type of signage materials being used on the signs.

Commissioner Andrade expressed his appreciation for the signage.

Chair DeBolt complemented the overall renovation of the building.

Motion/Second: Andrade/Grose

9. PUBLIC HEARING
A. Consideration of a zoning code amendment concerning small wireless cellular installations (also referred to as small cell cites) within the City of Los Alamitos (Citywide) (City initiated).
Continued consideration of possible amendments to the zoning code concerning the location, standards, and general regulation of small wireless cellular installations within the City.

Associate Planner Oliver summarized the staff report.

Associate Planner Oliver summarized the Stakeholders meeting which took place in November.

The Planning Commission and Staff discussed the following about the Stakeholders Meeting:
- The meeting included 18 different representatives (i.e., Verizon and AT&T).
Based on federal regulations, the Planning Commission does not have much control over writing this ordinance.
This ordinance will focus on what will work for the City from an aesthetics standpoint.
Discussed the possibility that there might not be a huge potential for antennas, given the size and density of the City.
Create an environment where there is no attention drawn to these antennas by making them as stealth as possible.
The possibility of making it an administrative approval due to the federal shot-clock requirements.
Schedule a follow-up meeting with the Stakeholders group and Southern California Edison (SCE).
Continuing the item without a date certain to allow sufficient time to draft, discuss and re-notice.

City Attorney Daudt stated that the shot-clock requirements refer to the time limit for processing new applications. Additionally, the 180 days is a timeline for implementing written objective standards.

City Attorney Daudt stated that it would be best to have objective standards in place and published, as different aesthetic rules cannot be applied to different applications.

Associate Planner Oliver stated that in the interim, applications received for wireless antennas could continue to go through the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) process.

The Planning Commission and Staff discussed not continuing the item to next month.

Motion/Second: Grose/Andrade
Carried 6/0 (Culity absent): motion to continue to an unspecified date.

10. **ITEMS FROM THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR**
Development Services Director Johnson provided the Planning Commission with the following updates:
- Coordination for an upcoming Zoning Code Update Study Session. Tentative dates include either November 13th or 15th.
- Cancellation of the December Planning Commission meeting.
- Provided a reminder to the Commissioners with expiring terms to submit the paperwork to re-file.

11. **COMMISSIONER REPORTS**
Commissioner Grose provided a reminder of the Trunk-or-Treat event, taking place on Saturday, October 27th at 5:30pm at Little Cottonwood Park.
Commissioner Loe asked and received the following updates from Staff about projects in the City:
  - The hotel project has completed foundation work. At this time, they are working on their utility connections and undergrounding work.
  - The Olson Company's project [at 3131 Sausalito] cleanup is taking longer than expected as they had additional soil remediation to complete.
  - The restaurant building [at 5252 Katella] has pulled permits. Café Rio is pending lease confirmation; however, Starbucks is confirmed.
  - The 4-unit Garnica project [at 10922 Walnut Street] broke ground this week.
  - The former tire business at 11121 Los Alamitos Boulevard will likely become doctor office spaces.

Development Services Director Johnson advised of the following two projects possibly going before the Planning Commission in November:
  - Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments
  - Katella Deli: minor expansion with a substantial exterior modification.

Commissioner Grose stated that the Cardiology Center on Katella had an open house; the interior remodel turned out beautifully. Additionally, provided a reminder of the upcoming Los Alamitos Beautification Ceremony on November 5th.

Commissioner Riley stated that the Los Alamitos Boulevard project was very slow.

Associate Planner Oliver stated that Los Alamitos Boulevard was approved by City Council to go back to two lanes.

12. ADJOURNMENT
The Planning Commission adjourned the meeting at 7:33 p.m.

ATTEST: Art DeBolt, Chair

Les Johnson, Secretary
City of Los Alamitos
Planning Commission

Agenda Report
Public Hearing

November 28, 2018
Item No: 9A

To: Chair DeBolt and Members of the Planning Commission

Via: Les Johnson, Development Services Director

From: Tom Oliver, Associate Planner

Subject: Consideration of Site Plan Review (SPR) 18-05 Katella Deli Addition, Additional Parking, and a Renovation of Exterior

Summary: Consideration of a Site Plan Review for the expansion and reface of a restaurant at 4470 Katella Avenue on a 1.3-acre parcel (per Assessor) in the Commercial Professional Office (C-O) Zoning District (APN 242-121-53) (Applicant: David Abbass, DMA Builders).

Recommendation:

1. Open the Public hearing; and,

2. Take testimony; and,

3. Make the CEQA finding that the project is a Class 1 Categorical Exemption, pursuant to Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) is appropriate for the project, and that a Notice of Exemption shall be prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.; and if appropriate,


Applicant: David Abbass, DMA Builders

Project Location: 4470 Katella Avenue (APN 242-121-53)
Notice: On November 14, 2018, a Notice of Public Hearing was posted at City Hall, the Community Center, and the Los Alamitos Museum. It was also published in the News Enterprise and public notices were mailed out to all property owners and tenants within 500 feet of the property on this same date.

Environmental: Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15301(e), the project is exempt from CEQA under the Class 1 Categorical Exemption (Existing Facilities) because the proposed addition will not result in an increase of more than 2,500 square feet.

Prior Approvals: Site Plan Review 175-81 Approval of Shopping Center

Background

David Abbass, from DMA Builders, has submitted a Site Plan Review application for the expansion and reface of the 16,602 square foot Katella Deli restaurant at 4470 Katella Avenue, on behalf of the owner of the restaurant. The application requests approval for a 1,758 addition to the existing 16,602 square foot building, full renovation of the exterior of the building in a modern art deco influenced architectural style, and a reconfiguration of the parking area. The additional square footage will allow for a larger retail customer space in the bakery and for an ADA upgrade of the restrooms.
Here is how the Applicant describes the project:

"Proposed remodel and 1,758 square foot addition to the existing Katella Deli restaurant, bar, and bakery. Scope of work includes remodel of the exterior building facades, as well as remodel of interior dining rooms, bar, lounge, retail deli, commercial bakery, kitchen and back of house areas. The addition on the west side of the building is intended to provide new ADA accessible restrooms, an expanded restaurant entry, and retail bakery area. The parking lot is re-configured to add 12 parking stalls and simplify traffic flow within. All exterior paving and landscaping is replaced with new."

Discussion

Project Location

The existing property is shown below. The 1.3-acre property currently includes the existing 16,602 square foot restaurant and its parking:
## Surrounding Zoning and Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Commercial Professional Office (C-O)</td>
<td>Existing restaurant and parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Commercial Professional Office (C-O)</td>
<td>Larger restaurant and more parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of Site</td>
<td>Planned Light Industrial (P-M-ROZ)</td>
<td>Industrial buildings of Arrowhead Industries across Katella Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Site</td>
<td>Private residential homes in the Commercial Professional Office (C-O) &amp; Single Family Residential (R-1) Zones</td>
<td>Private homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Site</td>
<td>Commercial Professional Office (C-O)</td>
<td>Restaurant, retail, and office types of businesses in large mini-mall buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Site</td>
<td>Multiple Family (R-3)</td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential structures across an alley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here are photos of the sides of the building:

Looking at the entrance on the west side, parking lot side of the building (below):

Looking at the north side of the building on Katella (below):
Looking at the northeast corner of the building, at Katella Avenue and Lexington Drive (below):

Looking at the southeast corner of the building, at Lexington and the alley (below):
Site Plan Review (SPR 18-05)

Chapter 17.50.020 Applicability, in the Zoning Code, states:

"A commercial or industrial site development, tentative parcel map, residential development plan, conditional use permit, or the addition of square footage to an existing multiple-family residential, commercial, or industrial structure shall be subject to the site plan review process."

This project proposes to add square footage to an existing commercial structure, which requires this Site Plan Review (SPR). A larger site plan is attached to this report as an exhibit of the approving resolution.

Analysis

- Development Standards

The project site is located in the Commercial Professional Office (C-O) Zoning District. The C-O zoning district identifies areas established to provide for administrative and professional offices, limited retail commercial and other related uses and facilities. The C-O zoning district is consistent with the "commercial" land use designation of the General Plan. The table below identifies the development features that are required under Section 17.10.030 Table 2-05 (Commercial/Industrial Zoning Districts General Development Standards). In addition to the requirements set forth below, there are specific requirements that are set forth elsewhere in the Los Alamitos Municipal Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Feature</th>
<th>C-O</th>
<th>Subject Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>No requirement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel width (ft.)</td>
<td>No requirement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel depth (ft.)</td>
<td>No requirement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel coverage</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Yes - 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum height limit - Main Structures (ft.)</td>
<td>3 stories or 40 ft. (2),(6)</td>
<td>Yes - two stories, Yes - 28 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front setback</td>
<td>15 ft. (3)</td>
<td>Yes - with staggering 23 ft. average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side setback</td>
<td>Not required unless abutting a residential zoning district, then 10 ft.</td>
<td>Yes - 10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street side yard setback (corner parcel)</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
<td>Yes - 10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear setback</td>
<td>10 ft. unless rear parcel abuts a C-G or P-M zoning district, then no setback is required</td>
<td>Yes - 292 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) An additional 20 feet, for a maximum height of five stories (not to exceed 60 feet), may be allowed upon approval of a CUP. Factors to be considered by the commission:
a. A structure with increased height shall be located at least 100 feet from a residential zoning district.
b. The commission may require that vision into adjacent residences be limited from a structure with increased height.
c. Open space shall constitute 10 percent of the total site area, in addition to the 10 percent required to be landscaped.
d. The structure shall have no more gross floor area than could have been achieved if the structure were 40 feet or less in height. In computation of gross floor area, floor area devoted to parking shall be disregarded.

(3) Shall extend across the full width of the parcel (except for access drives, walks, fences, and minor ornamental structures). Commission may allow staggering of setbacks as part of a total development plan, but in no case shall a setback of less than 10 feet be allowed.

(6) When adjacent to a residential zoning district, height limits in C-O district shall be:
   a. One-story structure within 10-25 feet of a residential zoning district.
   b. Two story structure within 25-75 feet of a residential zoning district.
   c. Three-story structure within 75 plus feet for a residential zoning district.

- **Parking**

In consideration of parking for the subject property, Katella Deli is party to a Covenant and Agreement to Maintain Reciprocal Access and Parking with the parcels to the west of this parcel down to the location of the Subway Restaurant. These buildings were originally developed as one shopping center, even though they are now owned by two separate owners. As part of this Agreement, the Katella Deli must maintain a minimum of 103 spaces.

The Applicant is proposing redesign to the existing parking lot that will increase the parking from 102 to 114 spaces. The proposed minor expansion of 1,758 square feet requires 8 new spaces. The new parking lot will ensure compliance with all applicable parking standards including space dimensions being a minimum of 9 feet by 19 feet spaces and the required landscaping being provided.

The following table identifies the required parking spaces for the proposed project:

**Restaurant Parking Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$17,260,040 Parking Requirements</td>
<td>Required Shopping Center = 74 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Spaces</td>
<td>Required by reciprocal parking Agreement = 103 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center - 1 space per 250 sq. ft.</td>
<td>New 1,758 sq. ft. addition = 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing spaces = 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided Spaces</td>
<td>More than sufficient - 114 Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Katella Deli Project
November 28, 2018
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• **Circulation**

Vehicular access is to remain as is with an access point on Katella Avenue, the alley to the south, as well as connecting with the shopping center parking lot to the west. In this new parking configuration, parking spaces are entered along both sides of two 24-feet wide driveways.

• **Architecture**

The proposed architectural style is modern with an art deco influence. The following represents architectural items/features being proposed:

- Metal canopies
- Awnings
- Backlit glass transom windows
- Stone Wainscot
- Plant Trellis
- Accent paint squares
- Control joints to break up stucco expanses
- Cornice molding
• **Landscaping**

LAMC Section 17.20.030 (Landscape Area Requirements) speaks to landscaping requirements that non-residential structures shall provide. When an addition to a structure is less than 25% of the existing floor area, there is a requirement to provide whatever additional landscaping that they can incorporate. (LAMC § 17.20.020(B)). According to the site plan the front setback area, side setbacks, and the parking areas will include landscape areas that total approximately 8,314 square feet or 11% percent of the total site area which equals the landscape that was on the parcel before. The landscaping will add many trees surrounding, and within, the parking area, as well as replace the landscaping surrounding the entire parcel bringing a fresh new look to the area that will rely on plants rather than a grass lawn. Of particular note, the center median in the parking lot will have decorative fencing and water permeable-paved walkways. The project will be required to comply with Chapter 13.05 “Water Efficient Landscaping,” and Chapter 13.04 “Water Conservation”, of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code. These would be included as conditions of approval.

• **Lighting**

The existing building currently has exterior light fixtures located on all four sides of the structure. Fixtures will be replaced and new fixtures added. A condition has been added requiring all lights to direct light only on the subject property. The proposed style of fixture for the parking area lighting is shown below.
- **Refuse and Recycling Storage Areas**

The project will add less than 30 percent floor area, therefore upgrading the existing trash enclosure areas is not required (Los Alamitos Municipal Code 17.16.110.2).

**Findings**

In order to approve a Site Plan Review, the following findings would be required to be affirmed (LAMC § 17.50.040):

1. The design and layout of the proposed development are consistent with the development and design standards/guidelines of the applicable zoning district.
   
   **Staff Response:** This project is consistent with the standards of the Commercial Professional Office (C-O) Zoning District for a commercial addition.

2. The design and layout of the proposed development would not interfere with the use and enjoyment of neighboring existing or future developments, and would not create traffic or pedestrian hazards.
   
   **Staff Response:** The project will add more parking, a sensible circulation pattern, fresh landscaping, and a new look. It will improve the traffic and safety, as well as the aesthetic environment for the neighborhood surrounding the business.

3. The design of the proposed development would maintain and enhance the attractive, harmonious, and orderly development contemplated by this chapter.
   
   **Staff Response:** The architectural detailing improves the look of the structure and will represent an attractive renovation to a commercial building in the City which will encourage other building owners in the area to upgrade their own properties.
4. The design of the proposed development would provide a desirable environment for its occupants and visiting public as well as its neighbors through good aesthetic use of materials, texture, and color, and would remain aesthetically appealing and retain an appropriate level of maintenance.

Staff Response: The architecture and aesthetics of the proposed project are compatible with the businesses and residential around it and will set a high bar for building elevations that are appealing and would provide a desirable environment for diners and employees.

5. The proposed development would not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare or materially injurious to the properties or improvements in the vicinity.

Staff Response: The project would not be detrimental to public health, safety, or welfare, or materially injurious. The new circulation pattern will make for a safer layout to the parking lot.

6. The proposed development would not substantially depreciate property values in the vicinity.

Staff Response: This popular restaurant is a destination that people in the City are proud of, and it is part of why people would want to live here, so it would not depreciate property values.

General Plan Compatibility & Staff Recommendation

The project would implement some of the goals of the City's General Plan, as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable General Plan Implementing Goals and Policies</th>
<th>Consistency of Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Element</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.2 Economic viability. Preserve the economic viability and continuity of existing commercial and industrial businesses.</td>
<td>This project would continue the viability of a restaurant that is a successful component of the City's economic sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 4.1 Pride and identity. Enhance the sense of identity and increase the feeling of pride among Los Alamitos residents, business owners, employees, and visitors through excellent physical design and continual property maintenance and improvements.</td>
<td>These will be an improved well-designed building in the commercial area which will encourage neighboring property owners to make needed improvements their own buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space, Recreation, and Conservation Element</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 4.2 Construction activities. Encourage the use of best management practices during construction activities to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants as outlined by the SCAQMD.</td>
<td>BMP’s are required for the construction of this project in the conditions of approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

Staff recommends that the Commission proceed with the Public Hearing and receive any comments that the public and/or the Applicant’s representative may have, and then approve the Applicant’s project with the Conditions listed in the attached Resolution.

Attachments: Resolution No. PC 18-26, with Exhibit A - Site Plans
RESOLUTION NO. PC 18-26


WHEREAS, a completed application for a Site Plan Review was submitted by David Abbass, of DMA Builders representing the owner of the Katella Deli on October 16, 2018, requesting approval for a 1,758 addition to the 16,602 sq. ft. building, the full renovation of the exterior of the building in a modern architectural style, and a reconfiguration of the parking area at 4470 Katella Avenue in the Commercial Professional Office (C-O) Zoning District (APN 242-121-53); and,

WHEREAS, the verified application constitutes a request as required by Section 17.50.030 (Site Plan Review) of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed the application for Site Plan Review at a duly noticed public hearing on November 28, 2018, at which time it considered all of the evidence presented, both written and oral; and,

WHEREAS, at this public hearing the applicant, applicant’s representatives, and members of the public were provided the opportunity to present written and oral testimony.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS, CALIFORNIA, DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The Planning Commission of the City of Los Alamitos, California finds that the above recitals are true and correct.

SECTION 2. The Planning Commission hereby makes the following findings which is based on all of the evidence presented, both written and oral; the Staff report is incorporated by reference:

1. The design and layout of the proposed development are consistent with the development and design standards/guidelines of the applicable zoning district. This project is consistent with the standards of the Commercial Professional Office (C-O) Zoning District for a commercial addition.

2. The design and layout of the proposed development would not interfere with the use and enjoyment of neighboring existing or future developments, and
would not create traffic or pedestrian hazards. The project will add more parking, a sensible circulation pattern, fresh landscaping, and a new look. It will improve the traffic and safety, as well as the aesthetic environment for the neighborhood surrounding the business.

3. The design of the proposed development would maintain and enhance the attractive, harmonious, and orderly development contemplated by this chapter. The architectural detailing improves the look of the structure and will represent an attractive renovation to a commercial building in the City which will encourage other building owners in the area to upgrade their own properties.

4. The design of the proposed development would provide a desirable environment for its occupants and visiting public as well as its neighbors through good aesthetic use of materials, texture, and color, and would remain aesthetically appealing and retain an appropriate level of maintenance. The architecture and aesthetics of the proposed project are compatible with the businesses and residential around it and will set a high bar for building elevations that are appealing and would provide a desirable environment for diners and employees.

5. The proposed development would not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare or materially injurious to the properties or improvements in the vicinity. The project would not be detrimental to public health, safety, or welfare, or materially injurious. The new circulation pattern will make for a safer layout to the parking lot.

6. The proposed development would not substantially depreciate property values in the vicinity. This popular restaurant is a destination that people in the City are proud of, and it is part of why people would want to live here, so it would not depreciate property values.

SECTION 3. The Planning Commission hereby finds that the project is subject to a Class 1 Categorical Exemption, pursuant to Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) of the CEQA Guidelines, because the proposed addition will not result in an increase of more than 2,5000 square feet. Staff shall prepare a Notice of Exemption for the proposed project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

SECTION 4. Based upon such findings and determinations, the Planning Commission hereby approves Site Plan Review 18-05 subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval of this application is to add a 1,758 addition to the 16,602 sq. ft. building, the full renovation of the exterior of the building in a modern architectural style, and a reconfiguration of the parking area at 4470 Katella Avenue Avenue in the Commercial Professional Office (C-O) Zoning District
(APN 242-121-53) with such additions, revisions, changes or modifications as required by the Planning Commission pursuant to approval of a Site Plan Review, noted thereon, and on file in the Development Services Department. Subsequent submittals for this project shall be consistent with such plans shown in "Exhibit A," and in compliance with the applicable land use regulations of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code and any applicable state law. If any changes are proposed regarding the location or alteration of the plans dated August 6, 2018 (as amended during the hearing), a request for an amendment of this proposal shall be submitted to the Development Services Director. If the Development Services Director determines that the proposed change or changes are consistent with the provisions and spirit of intent of this approval action, and that such action would have been the same with the proposed change or changes as for the proposal approved herein, the amendment may be approved by the Development Services Director without requiring a public meeting.

2. The Applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City of Los Alamitos, its agents, officers, or employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the City or its agents, officers or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul an approval of the City, its legislative body, advisory agencies or administrative officers the subject application. The City will promptly notify the Applicant of any such claim, action or proceeding against the City and the Applicant will either undertake defense of the matter and pay the City's associated legal costs, or will advance funds to pay for defense of the matter by the City. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the City retains the right to settle or abandon the matter without the Applicant's consent, but should it do so, the City shall waive the indemnification herein, except the City's decision to settle or abandon a matter following an adverse judgment or failure to appeal, shall not cause a waiver of the indemnification rights herein.

3. The Applicant shall file an Acknowledgment of Conditions of Approval with the Community Development Department within 30 days of final approval of all resolutions. The property Applicant shall be required to record the Acknowledgment of these Conditions of Approval with the Office of the Orange County Recorder and proof of such recordation shall be submitted to the Development Services Department.

4. In case of violation of any of the conditions of approval or applicable law, the property owner and tenant will be issued a Notice of Correction if said violation is not remedied within a reasonable period of time and/or subsequent violations of the conditions of approval and/or City law occurs within ninety days of any Notice of Correction, the property owner shall be held responsible to reimburse the City for all Staff time directly attributable to enforcement of the conditions of approval, mitigation measures, and/or City law including but not limited to, revocation of the herein approvals.
5. Project plans for the project shall be subject to a complete code compliance review with the Development Services Department when the plans are submitted for plan check and shall comply with all applicable City of Los Alamitos ordinances, regulations, and policies prior to building permit issuance, including, but not limited to, the requirements established or authorized by Title 15, 16, and 17 of the City of Los Alamitos Municipal Code.

6. Approval of Site Plan Review 18-05 shall be valid for a period of twelve (12) months from the date the site plan was approved. If construction is commenced within this twelve (12) month period and construction is being pursued diligently toward completion, the approvals shall stay in full force and effect.

LANDSCAPE

7. A Landscape Irrigation Plan prepared by a licensed landscape architect shall be submitted to the Development Services Department prior to the issuance of building permits. The Irrigation Plan shall include an irrigation system layout with the location of controllers and points of connection with data on valve sizes and gallons per minute (G.P.M.), the size and location of sleeves and all spray heads, including the location of conventional systems and drip systems; an irrigation legend with complete specifications; irrigation notes and construction details of all assemblies and components; a recommended irrigation schedule, preferably on an annual basis; and a summary block on the initial page of submitted plans that will present the above information clearly and accurately. The City reserves the right to require subsequent checks, or approval of the landscape plans prior to issuance of a grading permit.

8. Landscaping shall comply with the City’s water conservation ordinances in accordance with Chapter 13.04 (Water Conservation) and Chapter 13.05 (Water Efficient Landscaping) of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code.

9. Trees shall be planted outside of any Sight Safety Triangle or be trimmed to eight feet from above the adjacent top of curb.

LIGHTING

10. All lighting structures shall be placed so as to confine direct rays to the subject property.

11. The Applicant shall provide an illuminated uniform address number on the Katella Avenue face of the building, or other location acceptable to the Development Services Director.
CONSTRUCTION BMPS

12. During construction, the Applicant will display a sign visible to the public from Katella Avenue with a contact number of the construction superintendent to address any questions or concerns about demolition, grading, and construction activities.

13. Hours and days of demolition, grading, and construction operations shall be prohibited between the hours of 8:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. on weekdays and Saturday. There shall be no construction activities on Sunday or a Federal holiday celebrated by the City of Los Alamitos without express approval by the Development Services Director.

14. All construction vehicles or equipment, fixed or mobile, operated within 1,000 feet of an existing dwelling shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers.

15. Replace backup audible warning devices with backup strobe lights or other warning devices during evening construction activity to the extent permitted by the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health.

16. Stock piling and/or vehicle-staging areas shall be placed as far as practical from residential homes.

17. Prior to demolition and construction, a perimeter security fence not exceeding seven feet in height, shall be installed around the project site. The fencing shall include a green screen material or approved equivalent. The fence/screen material shall be properly maintained and be free of rips, tears, fraying, graffiti, and any other damage or vandalism.

18. During construction the site shall be maintained and kept clear of all trash, weeds, and overgrown vegetation.

OTHER

19. A Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) is required to be processed for this project.

ENGINEERING

20. The Applicant shall submit Improvement Plans prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer for public works (off-site) improvements, and on-site improvements. Plan check fees shall be paid in advance.
21. An on-site grading and drainage plan shall be prepared and submitted to the City Engineer for approval. Plan shall be 24" x 36", with elevations to nearest 0.01 foot, minimum scale 1" = 20'. Plan shall be prepared by Registered Civil Engineer. Public works improvements may be shown on this plan. Grading plan check fees must be paid in advance.

22. Hydrologic and hydraulic calculations demonstrating adequate site drainage from a 10-year return frequency storm (25-year frequency in sump areas) prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer shall be submitted with the Grading Plan.

23. Driveway slope shall be a minimum slope of one (1) percent for asphalt and .5% for concrete.

24. If utility cuts in the street are excessive, the street must have a grid and overlay placed on it per the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

25. All existing off-site public improvements (sidewalk, curb and gutter, driveways, and street paving) at the development site which are in a damaged condition or demolished due to the proposed work shall be reconstructed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, and per OCPFRD Standard Plan.

26. A City Public Works permit shall be taken out for all work in public right-of-way prior to start of work. All work shall be done in accordance with APWA Standards and to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and must be completed before issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.

27. A bond or surety device shall be posted with the City in an amount and type sufficient to cover the amount of off-site and on-site work to be done, as approved by the City Engineer.

28. Pad certification by the Design Civil Engineer and Soil Engineer is required prior to the commencement of structural construction.

29. Final compaction report prepared by a qualified Soil Engineer shall be submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval prior to the commencement of structural construction.

PUBLIC WORKS

None.

RECREATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
30. Lexington Drive cannot be closed or encroached upon on February 22, 2019 or February 23, 2019 which are the scheduled “Race on the Base” event days of operation.

ROSSMOOR/LOS ALAMITOS SEWER DISTRICT

None.

BUILDING AND SAFETY DIVISION

31. The Applicant must comply with all current California Building Codes in effect at the time that the plans are submitted.

32. The Applicant shall submit three (3) sets of complete building plans to the Building and Safety Department for review.

33. Prior to obtaining grading permits, the Applicant shall submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for review and approval by the Building and Safety Division.

34. Provide asbestos report for demo permit and submit to AQMD if asbestos is found.

35. For demo and construction, project must recycle 60% of material and submit a waste management plan.

ORANGE COUNTY FIRE AUTHORITY (OCFA)

36. Plan Submittal: The applicant or responsible party shall submit the plan(s) listed below to the Orange County Fire Authority for review. Approval shall be obtained on each plan prior to the event specified. Prior to issuance of a building permit: Architectural (service codes PR200-PR285), when required by the OCFA "Plan Submittal Criteria Form"

SECTION 5. The Secretary of the Planning Commission shall forward a copy of this Resolution to the applicant and any person requesting the same, and Staff shall file a Notice of Exemption with the County Clerk.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 28th day of November, 2018, by the following vote:

________________________________________
Art DeBolt, Chair
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ATTEST:

Les Johnson, Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Michael Daudt, City Attorney

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
COUNTY OF ORANGE    ) ss
CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS )

I, Les Johnson, Planning Commission Secretary of the City of Los Alamitos, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of Planning Commission held on the 28th day of November 2018, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Les Johnson, Secretary
To: Chair DeBolt and Members of the Planning Commission

Via: Les Johnson, Development Services Director

From: Tom Oliver, Associate Planner

Subject: Consideration of Site Plan Review (SPR) 18-02
107 Apartment Unit Development in Two Buildings
3342 Cerritos Avenue

Summary: Consideration of a Site Plan Review for a development of a 107-unit residential apartment complex located at 3342 Cerritos Avenue on a 3.65-acre (net area) parcel in the Multiple Family (R-3) Zoning District (APN 242-222-11) (Applicant: Christopher Felix, Hutton Development Company representing the Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments, LLC). A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for the project.

Recommendation:
1. Open the Public hearing; and,
2. Take testimony; and,
3. Make the CEQA finding that the project is subject to a Mitigated Negative Declaration, which has been prepared for the proposed project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act; and, if appropriate,
CERRITOS AVENUE IN THE MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ZONE (R-3), APN 242-222-11 (APPLICANT: CHRISTOPHER FELIX, HUTTON DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, REPRESENTING THE LOS ALAMITOS LUXURY APARTMENTS, LLC).”

Applicant: Christopher Felix, Hutton Development Company representing the Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments, LLC

Project Location: 3342 Cerritos Avenue (APN 242-222-11)

Notice: On October 17, 2018, a Notice of Public Hearing was posted at City Hall, the Community Center, and the Los Alamitos Museum. The Notice was also published in the News Enterprise and mailed out to all property owners and tenants within 500 feet of the property on this date.

Environmental: Pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Initial Study was prepared which led to the preparation of a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for this project. The purpose of a MND is to identify potential effects on the environment of the project and to indicate the manner in which those potential significant effects can be avoided or mitigated. A primary function of the MND is to disclose and evaluate project impacts and inform decision makers for the project. In order to meet the 30-day circulation requirements, a notice regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated from October 17, 2018 to November 5, 2018.
Background

Christopher Felix from Hutton Development Company has submitted a Site Plan Review application for a luxury apartment project at 3342 Cerritos Avenue (former Monte Collins Backhoe & Equipment site). The applications seek approval for the construction and use of 107 apartment units in two three-story buildings and associated amenities and open space. The project design provides a parking level on the first floor with the 2nd and 3rd floors containing the apartment units. The architectural style incorporates Spanish Colonial/Revival characteristics. The units are proposed as studio, one-, two- and three-bedroom apartments that are proposed to range between 689 and 1,234 square feet in size. There are eight (8) floor plan styles, most of which are two bedrooms.

Each home will have 1 or 2 baths, in-unit washer and dryers, private storage, and designated covered parking garage spaces. The building footprint would total 77,558 square feet and the total rentable area in buildings A & B will be 94,992 square feet.

The Applicant has provided the following project description:

"The Property at 3342 W. Cerritos Avenue in Los Alamitos, California ("Property") is currently vacant. The Applicant, Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments, LLC, an affiliated entity of Hutton Companies www.huttoncompanies.com, an Orange County based developer and investor in business since 1977, proposes a 107 unit luxury apartment community that is highly amenitized, fully staffed, with trained staff living onsite. Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments will offer a selection of
incredibly well-appointed studio/bachelor apartments, one bedroom, two bedroom, and three bedroom apartments in a courtyard style property. Residents will be treated to such amenities as a resort style pool and spa, BBQ areas, an outdoor loggia area with fire pits and seating, an outdoor dog washing station, a fitness center, organized resident events and activities, Parcel Pending (on site, 24/7 e commerce delivery for residents) https://parcelpending.com/, a fully equipped mail room, and a lounge.

Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments will serve today’s sophisticated residents with product and services not offered anywhere within the City Limits of Los Alamitos. Nearby properties with comparable finishes, quality, and resident services can be found at Aria in Cerritos http://www.livearia.com/ and The Residences at Bella Terra www.udr.com/orange-countyapartments/huntington-beach/the-residences-at-bella-terra/.

Further, on site staff will consist of Institute of Real Estate Management (IREM) (www.irem.org) trained and certified employees. Managers and Assistant Managers are educated professionals with “Certified Property Manager” (CPM) credentials. Leasing Consultants have “Accredited Residential Managers” (ARM) designation.

Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments prides itself on providing exceptional resident services. Hutton Companies is an active developer and investor that will oversee property management. Owners of the Property and longtime Los Alamitos residents and business people Monte Collins and Deborah Collins Slimmer will maintain an interest in this community.”

Discussion

Staff Concerns

Density and Design: The project density does not exceed the provisions of the R3 zoning district. However, the overall size and magnitude of the proposed project is greater than the existing and entitled development in proximity to the subject site. Building architectural style is generally positive and consistent with the existing and proposed residential projects west of and adjacent to the site. However, the building elevations lack any substantial articulation, projections or building shifts that, at a minimum, should be incorporated into the street frontage elevations. This can likely be achieved by increasing the depth of the existing projections. Consideration should also be given to incorporating other materials, such as wood, ornate or painted tile, and additional ornamental iron elements. The incorporation of these materials combined with greater articulation depth would increase aesthetic character and overall curb appeal as well as provide a more compatible design with the neighboring properties.

Circulation: Enhancement of the interior pedestrian circulation is needed in order to ensure ease of access to and from amenities and open space. In addition, strengthening pedestrian connectivity with the abutting streets, Cerritos Avenue and
Sausalito Street, is necessary in order to promote and encourage a walkable environment.

Sense of Arrival: Though vehicular connectivity with Cerritos Avenue and Sausalito Street is clear and distinct, a sense of arrival for pedestrians is lacking. Circulation improvements, as noted above, combined with architectural enhancements to the two entrance doors facing Sausalito Street and the door facing Cerritos Avenue should be provided, clearly representing and defining a pedestrian scale point of access.

Los Alamitos Municipal Code Section 17.50.050 provides allowance for the approving authority (Planning Commission) to impose conditions that are reasonable and necessary to ensure the project will be in compliance with the required findings of Section 17.50.040. Should the Planning Commission concur with staff concerns, conditions of approval have been added requiring the applicant to perform the minor redesign work and submit the new information to the Development Services Director for review and approval. The Commission may also desire to see the work, which could occur by either continuing the item or requiring the applicant to bring the elevations and site plan back to the Commission for final review prior to building permit submittal.

**Project Location**

The existing property is shown below. The property is a currently vacant parcel in the Old Town West neighborhood of the City that used to have buildings for the Monte Collins Backhoe business.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Site</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Multiple Family (R-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Multiple Family (R-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of Site</td>
<td>Planned Light Industrial (P-M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Site</td>
<td>Northern part – (R-3)</td>
<td>Northern - Commercial/Industrial Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern part – (P-M &amp; C-G)</td>
<td>Southern - Motel, offices, and car repair,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>across Chestnut Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Site</td>
<td>Multiple Family (R-3)</td>
<td>In progress Multi-Family Residential (Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walk – Olson Company)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Site</td>
<td>Multiple Family (R-3)</td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential across Sausalito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following are photos of the parcel and surrounding area:

Looking south, down Chestnut Street, showing Norms Automotive as the brown building in the left foreground and multi-family apartments (below).
Looking east from Northern property line, with R-3 zoned Douglas site (below):

Looking south from Northern property line, with R-3 zoned Douglas property and Cottonwood Church (now gone) on the left and right, respectively (below):
Environmental

The proposed project is a redevelopment of the 3.65-acre (net area) project site from its previous, demolished, industrial use to a residential use; 107 apartments in two buildings. Other project components include vehicular and pedestrian circulation improvements; parking and utility improvements; common landscape/open space areas; and various hardscape and landscape improvements. The proposed Site Plan Review is a “project” subject to environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act. In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City of Los Alamitos, as lead agency, prepared the environmental documentation for the proposed project to determine if approval of the discretionary actions requested and subsequent development would have a significant impact on the environment.

As defined by Section 15063 of the CEQA Guidelines, an Initial Study is prepared primarily to provide the public and the Planning Commission with information to use as the basis for determining whether an environmental impact report, negative declaration, or mitigated negative declaration (MND) would provide the necessary environmental documentation and clearance for the proposed project.

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND)
City Staff, using the Environmental Consulting firm PlaceWorks, completed an Initial Study (IS), which determined that while the project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be such an effect because the project Applicant agreed to make revisions on the project plans, including: incorporating mitigation measures, that would avoid or mitigate the effects to a point where it is clear the significant effects will not occur. Based on this, a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was prepared.

The IS/MND determined that there were possible significant effects in the following five categories:

- Biological Resources
- Hazards/Hazardous Materials
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise

Pursuant to Public Resource Code Section 21091 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15073 and 15105, the Initial Study/MND was available for a 30 day public review period from October 17, 2018 through November 5, 2018. During the comment period, the City received comments from three public agencies as follows:

1. Airport Land Use Commission
2. Orange County Fire Authority
3. Orange County Public Works

At the time that this report was drafted, the City had not received comments from the general public specific to the project environmental review. However, four comments were received with regard to the project in general, which all support the project and are attached to the report.
Response to Comments
In an attached addendum to the MND, entitled “Response to Comments,” you will find the Consultant’s (PlaceWorks) responses to the Agencies that sent the City letters concerning this MND.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)
Public Resource Code Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines 15091(d) require the City to prepare and adopt a MMRP for any project for which mitigation measures have been recommended to assure compliance with the adopted mitigation measures. Project-specific mitigation measures have been categorized in matrix format, as shown in Section 4, Table 23 of the IS/MND. 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.

The Planning Commission must approve the MND before it may approve any entitlements of the proposed project. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) should also be approved. If the Planning Commission elects to not to approve the MND and MMRP, the factual basis for a decision declining approval should be set out in an oral motion by the Commission. However, it is possible to find that the Mitigated Negative Declaration is adequate, approve it, and still not approve the project.

Site Plan Review (SPR 18-02)
Chapter 17.50.020 Applicability, in the Zoning Code, states:

“A commercial or industrial site development, tentative parcel map, residential development plan, conditional use permit, or the addition of square footage to an existing multiple-family residential, commercial, or industrial structure shall be subject to the site plan review process.”

This project qualifies as a residential development plan, which requires Site Plan Review (SPR) approval. A larger site plan is attached to this report as an exhibit of the approving resolution.

Analysis

- Development Standards
The project site is located in the Multiple-Family (R-3) Residential Zoning District. The R-3 zoning district identifies areas designed to provide multiple-family housing. Types of development allowed in the district are multiple dwelling structures of four or more units, as well as less intensive residential developments that are allowed in the R-1 and R-2 zoning districts, which includes single-family dwelling units. The maximum density allowed is up to thirty (30) dwelling units per acre. The R-3 zoning district is consistent with the “Multiple-Family Residential” land use designation of the General Plan. The table below identifies the development features that are required under Section
17.08.030 Table 2-03 (Residential Zoning Districts General Development Standards).
In addition to the requirements set forth below, there are specific requirements that are set forth elsewhere in the Los Alamitos Municipal Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standards</th>
<th>R-3</th>
<th>Subject Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>7,200 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Yes - 158,850 sq. ft. (net)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel width (ft.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner parcel</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Yes - 315 ft. south, 165 ft. north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner parcel</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yes - 315 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel depth (ft.)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes - 500 ft. west side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - 240 ft. east Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum density</td>
<td>30 du/ac</td>
<td>Yes - 29.32 du/ac (based upon 3.649 net acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Unit Density</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>Yes - 1,782 sq. ft. per unit (based upon 4.329 gross acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor/Studio Unit - Minimum dwelling area (gross floor area) (sq. ft.) (Not including garage)</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>Yes - 689 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bedroom - Minimum dwelling area (gross floor area) (sq. ft.) (Not including garage)</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>Yes - 738 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum height limit - Main Structures (ft.)</td>
<td>35 ft.</td>
<td>In excess of 30 feet setback an additional 5 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum story limit - Main Structures</td>
<td>3 stories, within 100 ft. of R-1, 2 stories</td>
<td>Yes - Buildings are 3 stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum height limit - Accessory Structures (ft.)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front yard setback</td>
<td>20 may vary, average setback of 20 ft. along an entire block face, no setback less than 15 ft.</td>
<td>Yes - 20 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side yard setback (each)</td>
<td>5', when entry is from interior side yard, entry must open upon an outer court. Minimum length of outer court wall is 15 ft. per dwelling unit and set back minimum of 15 ft. from side parcel line.</td>
<td>Yes - east common property line 34 ft., south common 10 ft., west common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street side yard setback (corner parcel)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes - Chestnut side 20 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear yard setback</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes - 20 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Setback (ft.) Entrance from:</td>
<td>10, 15 if main entrance faces side yard</td>
<td>N/A - All face internal driveways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage from Street (front)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N/A - All face internal driveways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage from Alleyway</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A – There is no alley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage from Street (side yard) (corner parcel)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N/A - All face internal driveways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Site Coverage</td>
<td>50% patio structure or pool used solely for general open space shall not be counted as coverage</td>
<td>Yes - 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Living Space per dwelling unit (common space)(sq. ft.)</td>
<td>200 feet per dwelling with a minimum of 25% of uncovered parcel area in one contiguous location, kept free and clear of structures</td>
<td>Yes - The property has over 200 square feet of landscaping per unit, 25% of which is contiguous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condo Minimum Private Open Space adjoining each dwelling unit (ft.) (no dimension less than 10 ft.)</td>
<td>Condo = 100</td>
<td>N/A - No condos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance between structures (ft.) on one parcel</td>
<td>No doors = 10 Doors = 15 ft. between structure walls adjacent to entry, minimum wall length of 15 ft. per entry parallel to structure wall</td>
<td>Yes – 34+ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance between structures when main structures face across a court</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage space</td>
<td>200 cubic feet/unit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Parking

The project represents a total of 243 parking spaces will be provided. The required minimum number of parking spaces for the project is 242 spaces (current parking requirements). Each unit has at least one (1) covered space provided within the first floor garage areas. There are a total of 109 spaces within the garage area that measure 10’ x 20’. There are a total of 134 spaces that are either covered or uncovered that measure 9’ x 19’.

The following table identifies the required parking spaces for the proposed project.

| R-3 Parking Requirements (per urgency Ordinance 2017-13) |
|---|---|---|
| Required Spaces | Two spaces for the first two bedrooms of each dwelling unit; plus one-half space for each bedroom or other room that can readily be used as in excess of the first two bedrooms |
| | One parking space for each studio unit |
| | required for proposed project |
| | 18 – studio units@ 1 space each = 18 spaces |
| | 8 – 1 bed units @ 2 spaces each = 16 spaces |
| | 68 – 2 bed units @ 2 spaces each = 132 spaces |
| | 15 – 3 bed units @ 2 ½ spaces each = 38 spaces |
| | 107 – Guest @ .33 spaces ea. = 36 spaces |
| | Total = 240 spaces |
| Proposed Project | 240 required |
| | 243 proposed |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-3 Parking Requirements (per urgency Ordinance 2017-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Spaces 10' x 20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other spaces 9' x 19'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the on-site parking, it should be noted that the existing on-street parking on the abutting streets (Sausalito Street & Chestnut Street) is typically at capacity. The project will result in the loss of approximately 8 on-street parking spaces along Sausalito Street but should gain 3 spaces on Chestnut due to the elimination of an existing driveway.

- **Circulation**

Vehicular access to the site will enter and exit via gated access on both Cerritos Avenue and Sausalito Street. No vehicular access will be provided via Chestnut Street. Perpendicular parking spaces are provided along the sides of a 24-foot wide main drive aisle. The garages are also served by 24-foot wide drive aisles, with first floor covered parking provided throughout the underside of both buildings. Six parking spaces will be provided outside of the Cerritos Avenue gate, which is intended to serve as parking for the leasing office. It should be noted that though the project will have gates, the design also represents that gates to the three garage entrances are proposed. Though aesthetically pleasing, it is of question as to the need for these gates and if they will in fact be used.

Pedestrian access/circulation primarily utilizes the drive aisles and a limited number of pedestrian pathways to access three resident stairways and a single elevator in the larger building (Building B) while the second building is served by two stairways and another elevator (Building A). Pathways are provided for pedestrian access and circulation to the pool, spa, bbq and open space areas. However, access to and from most of the units require residents and guests to navigate through the parking garage and/or parking lot drive aisles. Consideration should be given to provide a clear and distinct path of travel for internal circulation where practical.

In addition, the project design does not promote or encourage pedestrian connectivity with Cerritos Avenue nor Sausalito Street. A significant attraction to this location is the walkability of the area. With a number of local businesses, restaurants and award winning schools (most notably the proximity to Los Alamitos High School), it is anticipated that future residents of this project will desire convenient pedestrian connectivity to the abutting streets. Site and building design modifications should be considered will provide defined paths of travel between the stairwells and the abutting streets. Additionally, staff believes that architectural enhancements should be made that visually enhance these access points, both at the gate and at the building entrances.

At the request of the Planning Commission, the Traffic Commission considered the traffic impact analysis conducted for the subject project. Comments provided focused upon the analysis representing Los Alamitos Boulevard as three lanes versus the final
two-lane configuration and that the analysis did not account for the 3131 Katella Avenue property as office versus the previously entitled retail center. Commissioners also expressed concern over the loss of on-street parking and the potential for additional demand as a result of the project. Commissioners did acknowledge the project complying with the new parking requirements and that this would lessen the parking impact upon abutting and neighboring streets. In response to the comments, RK Engineering Group, Inc. (consultant who performed the projects' traffic impact study) recently provided a letter representing that the lane reduction on Los Alamitos Boulevard and the change in land use at 3131 Katella Avenue are negligible and do not significantly impact the results of the original traffic study. A copy of the letter is attached.

• **Architecture**

The proposed development represents a Spanish Colonial/Revival architectural style and is generally in keeping with the style of the Olson Company units constructed for both Sausalito Walk and Oak Walk, which are west of and adjacent to the subject site. Here is a list of the architectural items/elements found on the structures:

- 360-degree architecture
- 2,000 GSF Spanish style loggia/shade structure in one of the courtyards
- Molding around windows
- Balconies.
- Decorative garage gates
- Decorative recesses on walls and tile elements at attic vents

- Concrete S-Tile Roofing
- Shed roofs at certain building projections
- Divided-light windows
- Tubular steel railings on balconies
- Decorative corbels on some balconies and projections
- **Landscaping**

LAMC Section 17.20.030 (Landscape Area Requirements) represents landscaping requirements that multi-family uses shall provide. The Applicant must maintain a minimum 15 percent of the site in landscaped areas. According to the site plan the front setback area, common area, and the yard areas of each building will include landscape areas that total approximately 40,769 square feet or 31% percent of the total site area, therefore meeting this requirement. This project will be required to comply with Chapter 13.05 “Water Efficient Landscaping,” and Chapter 13.04 “Water Conservation”, of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code. These would be included as conditions of approval.

- **Fencing and Walls**

There is currently an existing stretch of block wall for Oak Walk on the western property line. The chain link fences on the northernmost and south parcel lines will be replaced with wrought iron fencing and block pilasters, and the rest of the chain link fencing will be replaced with block walls.

- **Lighting**

The buildings will include exterior light fixtures located on all four sides of the structures. Staff has proposed a condition of approval requiring directing light only on the subject property. Lighting for the private driveway area will be required to be similar to the lighting placed in Oak Walk and Sausalito Walk, which is of a design that is reflective of the style of the street lighting design in the rest of Old Town West neighborhood.

- **Refuse and Recycling Storage Areas**
The Applicant will install garage-located refuse and recycling collection locations that will be served by Republic Services. The project design includes trash chutes in the common hallways of the residential units.

- **Miscellaneous Items**

The proposed development will include various amenities and features, such as a community pool & spa, barbeques, outdoor seating/lounge areas with outdoor fireplaces, a fitness center, and an indoor lounge area. In addition, each unit will have secure overhead storage spaces provided in proximity to the covered parking stalls. A bicycle storage room will also be provided.

**Findings**

In order to approve a Site Plan Review, the following findings must be affirmed (LAMC § 17.50.040):

A. **The design and layout of the proposed development are consistent with the development and design standards/guidelines of the applicable zoning district.**

   Staff Response: As presented in the plans dated October 11, 2018, the development meets, or will be conditioned to meet, all applicable zoning district requirements. Therefore, this project is consistent with the standards of the Multiple Family (R-3) Zoning District.

B. **The design and layout of the proposed development would not interfere with the use and enjoyment of neighboring existing or future developments, and would not create traffic or pedestrian hazards.**

   Staff Response: The design and layout of the proposed development would not interfere with the use and enjoyment of neighboring developments, as the immediately surrounding uses are multi-family residential, detached condos, or non-residential uses. The approved location is appropriate for the proposed development. The density is greater than the immediate surrounding development. However, when considering the project and conditions of approval relevant to building design, the buildings are of an architectural style that generally complements nearby homes and the three story building height is similar to the condominiums to be constructed adjacent to the subject site. The property is zoned for this type of development and the design of the proposed development would maintain and enhance the attractive, harmonious, and orderly development contemplated by this chapter.

C. **The design of the proposed development would maintain and enhance the attractive, harmonious, and orderly development contemplated by this chapter.**

   Staff Response: The design of the proposed development would enhance the attractive, harmonious, and orderly development of the property. As conditioned, the building design is expected to be in harmony with surrounding development and will improve upon the City’s architecture with a timeless residential building
design, extensive landscaping, and maintenance requirements under the Los Alamitos Municipal Code.

D. The design of the proposed development would provide a desirable environment for its occupants and visiting public as well as its neighbors through good aesthetic use of materials, texture, and color, and would remain aesthetically appealing and retain an appropriate level of maintenance.

Staff Response: The architecture and aesthetics of the proposed development are generally in keeping with the two recent projects to the west of the property. As conditioned, the building elevations will be appealing, would provide a desirable environment for residents and visitors, and is expected to blend well with the existing built environment.

E. The proposed development would not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare or materially injurious to the properties or improvements in the vicinity.

Staff Response: The proposed development provides for public health, safety, and welfare of the residential and business communities by providing more living options to the City rather than causing sprawl at the fringes of this metropolitan area. The building will meet all building code requirements. The mitigation measures identified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration would ensure the safety of the inhabitants of the project as well as other residents of Los Alamitos.

F. The proposed development would not substantially depreciate property values in the vicinity.

Staff Response: The proposed development would not depreciate property values in the vicinity, as the area is zoned for this type of use and it will improve the aesthetics of this residential neighborhood.

**General Plan Compatibility & Staff Recommendation**

The project would implement some of the goals of the City’s General Plan, and not meet others, as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable General Plan Implementing Goals and Policies</th>
<th>Project Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Element</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4: Neighborhoods and buildings that are well maintained and demonstrate a sense of pride and identity.</td>
<td>These will be new, well-designed buildings in the neighborhood which may encourage neighbors to make improvements to their own homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 4.1 Pride and identity. Enhance the sense of identity and increase the feeling of pride among Los Alamitos residents, business owners, employees, and visitors through excellent physical design and continual property maintenance and improvements.</td>
<td>This will be a new, well-designed building in the neighborhood which may encourage neighbors to make improvements to their own homes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy 4.4 Scale and Character. Ensure that all new development in residential neighborhoods is compatible with the scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Action 4.5 Development standards. Review development standards in residential zoning districts to provide specific guidance on maximum development intensity, minimum open space, and minimum setback standards to ensure that all new development in residential neighborhoods is compatible with the surrounding scale and character.

This project will be in the multi-family residential neighborhood and meets all development standards. The design of the project will add to the character of the neighborhood.

This project has been compared to the development standards of the multi-family residential zone and has been found to be compliant. Additionally, the density meets the requirements of the General Plan.

Open Space, Recreation, and Conservation Element

Goal 4: Air, water, and energy resources that are protected from pollution and overuse.

This residential infill project will take the place of sprawl that would be built on the fringes of this metropolitan area.

Action 4.2 Construction activities. Encourage the use of best management practices during construction activities to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants as outlined by the SCAQMD.

BMP's are required for the construction of this project in the conditions of approval.

Public Facilities and Safety Element

Policy 1.4 New development. New development shall pay its fair share of public facility and infrastructure improvements.

The proposed project will be required to pay traffic and school fees.

Action 4.5 Construction activity. Require that construction vehicles and equipment (fixed or mobile) be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers. Place stock piling and/or vehicle-staging areas as far as practical from residential homes. Replace backup audible warning devices with backup strobe lights or other warning devices during evening construction activity to the extent permitted by the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health.

These are BMP requirements that are a part of the conditions of approval for the project.

Growth Management Element

Policy 1.1 New development. New development shall pay its share of the costs of public facilities and services needed to serve the new residents.

Traffic fees will be required to be paid, utilities undergrounded, sidewalks and streets adjacent will be repaired or replaced as needed.

Policy 2.2 New development. New development shall pay its share of the costs associated with local and regional traffic mitigation.

Traffic fees will be required of this project.

While no specific policy actions of the Housing Element are fulfilled through this project, it does strive to offer a variety of housing products that differ from the average single-family home in the City. Here is a goal of the Housing Element:

Housing Strategy Area 4: Adequate Housing Supply

The City strives to ensure an adequate supply of housing is available to meet future and existing housing needs of all economic segments of the community.

Conclusion

Staff recommends that the Commission proceed with the Public Hearing and receive any comments that the public and/or the Applicant's representative may have, and then provide direction to Staff and Applicant on each of the entitlements. Staff concerns, as mentioned above, are summarized as follows:
• **Density and Design:** The project density does not exceed the provisions of the R3 zoning district. However, the overall size and magnitude of the proposed project is greater than the existing and entitled development in proximity to the subject site. Building architectural style is generally positive and consistent with the existing and proposed residential projects west of and adjacent to the site. However, the building elevations lack any substantial articulation, projections or building shifts that, at a minimum, should be incorporated into the street frontage elevations. This can likely be achieved by increasing the depth of the existing projections. Consideration should also be given to incorporating other materials, such as wood, ornate or painted tile, and additional ornamental iron elements. The incorporation of these materials combined with greater articulation depth would increase aesthetic character and overall curb appeal, as well as provide a more compatible design with the neighboring properties.

• **Circulation:** Enhancement of the interior pedestrian circulation is needed in order to ensure ease of access to and from amenities and open space. In addition, strengthening pedestrian connectivity with the abutting streets, Cerritos Avenue and Sausalito Street, is necessary in order to promote and encourage a walkable environment.

• **Sense of Arrival:** Though vehicular connectivity is clear and distinct, a sense of arrival for pedestrians is lacking. Circulation improvements, as noted above, combined with architectural enhancements to the two entrance doors facing Sausalito Street and the door facing Cerritos Avenue should be provided that clearly represents and defines a pedestrian scale point of access.

If the Planning Commission determines to support the project, the Commission should agree with the findings as represented in the attached draft resolutions. If the Commission does not agree with those draft findings, then Staff should be directed to return with a resolution incorporating those findings at a subsequent meeting.

**Attachments:**

1) Mitigated Negative Declaration Resolution No. PC 18-27 with Exhibit A Initial Study/MND/Responses
2) Site Plan Review Resolution No. PC 18-28 with Exhibit A (Conditions) & Exhibit B (Plans)
3) Letters and emails received
4) Letter from RK Engineering Group, Inc. — Addendum to traffic impact study
RESOLUTION NO. 18-27


WHEREAS, the City of Los Alamitos has prepared an Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the construction of 107 residential apartments in two structures on a 3.65-acre parcel located at 3342 Cerritos Avenue in the Multiple Family (R-3) Zoning District (APN 242-222-11); and,

WHEREAS, an Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration, attached hereto as Exhibit “A”, have been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the guidelines promulgated by the State Secretary of Resources, and the procedures for review as set forth in the 2007 City of Los Alamitos Guidelines for Implementation of the CEQA (Local CEQA Guidelines); and,

WHEREAS, it has been determined that the proposed project may potentially have significant effects on the environment, but revisions in the project proposal would mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effect would occur; and,

WHEREAS, notice regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the fifty residential condominiums in 11 structures was sent to neighboring property owners pursuant to the City’s CEQA Guidelines, concerning the review period commencing October 17, 2018; and,

WHEREAS, copies of the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration have been made available for a 20-day review period to pertinent agencies and interested members of the public, commencing on October 17, 2018; and,

WHEREAS, all written comment letters received within the 20-day public review period have been noted in the record, responded to by Staff, and none of the comments alter the conclusions in the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission considered the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”), attached hereto and incorporated herein as Section 4 of Exhibit “A,” at a duly noticed public hearing on November 28, 2018 at which hearing it considered all of the evidence presented, both written and oral.
NOW, THEREFORE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS, CALIFORNIA, DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The Planning Commission of the City of Los Alamitos, California finds that the above recitals are true and correct and are incorporated by reference herein.

SECTION 2. The Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the environmental documentation as well as the conditions cited in Exhibit "A," for the project prior to taking action. Based on the analysis contained in the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration and the accompanying environmental information, in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public resources Code Section 21000, et seq. ("CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15000, et seq.), and the City’s Local CEQA Guidelines, the Planning Commission hereby adopts the Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND") and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") (Exhibit "A"). In adopting the MND and MMRP, the Planning Commission finds as follows:

A. The Mitigated Negative Declaration and MMRP were prepared in accordance with all legal requirements, including all public notice and comment period requirements.

B. There is no substantial evidence of potentially significant environmental impacts and the Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared. The proposed subdivision will not cause any environmental damage as this is an infill project on property that already has been designated as an area for residential units and there are no fish or wildlife habitat on site. The site was previously graded and used for many years for industrial businesses.

C. The project is consistent with the General Plan objectives, policies and programs. The project proposes the development of 107 apartment units at a density of 30 dwelling units an acre, which is within the General Plan multi-family residential land use designation of 20-30 units per acre. The proposed design and improvements of the 107-unit residential apartment project are consistent with the applicable General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable General Plan Implementing Goals and Policies</th>
<th>Consistency of Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Element</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4: Neighborhoods and buildings that are well maintained and demonstrate a sense of pride and identity.</td>
<td>These will be new, well-designed buildings in the neighborhood which may encourage neighbors to make improvements their own homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 4.1 Pride and identity. Enhance the sense of identity and increase the feeling of pride among Los Alamitos residents, business owners, employees, and visitors through excellent physical design and continual property maintenance and improvements.</td>
<td>This will be a new, well-designed building in the neighborhood which may encourage neighbors to make improvements to their own homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 4.4 Scale and Character. Ensure that all new development in</td>
<td>This project will be in the multi-family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 4.5 Development standards. Review development standards in residential zoning districts to provide specific guidance on maximum development intensity, minimum open space, and minimum setback standards to ensure that all new development in residential neighborhoods is compatible with the surrounding scale and character.</th>
<th>This project has been compared to the development standards of the multi-family residential zone and has been found to be compliant. Additionally, the density meets the requirements of the General Plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space, Recreation, and Conservation Element</strong></td>
<td>This residential infill project will take the place of sprawl that would be built on the fringes of this metropolitan area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4: Air, water, and energy resources that are protected from pollution and overuse.</td>
<td>BMPs are required for the construction of this project in the conditions of approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Facilities and Safety Element</strong></td>
<td>The proposed project will be required to pay traffic and school fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.4 New development. New development shall pay its fair share of public facility and infrastructure improvements.</td>
<td>These are BMP requirements that are a part of the conditions of approval for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 4.2 Construction activities. Encourage the use of best management practices during construction activities to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants as outlined by the SCAQMD.</td>
<td>These are BMP requirements that are a part of the conditions of approval for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.1 New development. New development shall pay its share of the costs of public facilities and services needed to serve the new residents.</td>
<td>Traffic fees will be required to be paid, utilities undergrounded, sidewalks and streets adjacent will be repaired or replaced as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 2.2 New development. New development shall pay its share of the costs associated with local and regional traffic mitigation.</td>
<td>Traffic fees will be required of this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth Management Element</strong></td>
<td>This project moves the City's housing toward this goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Element</strong></td>
<td>This project moves the City's housing toward this goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Strategy Area 4: Adequate Housing Supply. The City strives to ensure an adequate supply of housing is available to meet future and existing housing needs of all economic segments of the community.</td>
<td>This project moves the City's housing toward this goal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. The project will not adversely affect the public health, safety and welfare. The proposed subdivision design and improvements will not adversely affect the public health of the citizens of the City of Los Alamitos as the project is the type of use which is planned for in this area; the residential apartment project will be compatible with the single-family and multi-family residential uses in the area. The mitigations required by the CEQA document will ensure the safety of the inhabitants of the project, and will contribute to the health of the community as a whole.

E. The project will not adversely affect the environment. The Mitigated Negative Declaration associated with this Resolution sets forth measures to mitigate any hazards foreseen for the project.
F. The City has complied with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) an Initial Study was prepared which led to the conclusion that a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) be prepared for this project. The purpose of a MND is to identify potential effects on the environment of the project and to indicate the manner in which those potential significant effects can be avoided or mitigated. A primary function of the MND is to disclose and evaluate project impacts and inform decision makers for the project. In order to meet the 20-day circulation requirements, a notice regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated from October 17, 2018 to November 5, 2018.

SECTION 3. Based on the entire record before the Planning Commission, including the written and oral record and the findings set forth in the Resolution, the Planning Commission hereby adopts the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Exhibit “A,” for the construction of 107 residential apartments in two structures, plus associated parking and amenities at 3342 Cerritos Avenue, APN 242-222-11, subject to the Mitigation Measures described in Exhibit “A.”

SECTION 4. The Secretary of the Planning Commission shall forward a copy of this Resolution to the applicant and any person requesting the same and shall certify as to the adoption of this Resolution. Staff shall file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 28th day of November 2018, by the following vote:

__________________________________________
Art DeBolt, Chair

ATTEST:

Les Johnson, Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________________________
Michael Daudt, City Attorney
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF ORANGE  
CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS 

I, Les Johnson, Planning Commission Secretary of the City of Los Alamitos, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of Planning Commission held on the 28th day of November 2018, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

________________________________________
Les Johnson, Secretary
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562.431.3538 ext. 303
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3 MacArthur Place, Suite 1100
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MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 21000 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAQS</td>
<td>ambient air quality standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Assembly Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM</td>
<td>asbestos-containing materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>average daily traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amsl</td>
<td>above mean sea level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQMP</td>
<td>air quality management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>aboveground storage tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAU</td>
<td>business as usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bgs</td>
<td>below ground surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP</td>
<td>best management practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA</td>
<td>Clean Air Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFE</td>
<td>corporate average fuel economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalARP</td>
<td>California Accidental Release Prevention Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalEEMA</td>
<td>California Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal/EPA</td>
<td>California Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAL FIRE</td>
<td>California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALGreen</td>
<td>California Green Building Standards Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal/OSHA</td>
<td>California Occupational Safety and Health Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalRecycle</td>
<td>California Department of Resources, Recycling, and Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARB</td>
<td>California Air Resources Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>California Building Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCAA</td>
<td>California Clean Air Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>California Code of Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDE</td>
<td>California Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFW</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERCLA</td>
<td>Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cfs</td>
<td>cubic feet per second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGS</td>
<td>California Geologic Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>congestion management program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNDDB</td>
<td>California Natural Diversity Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEL</td>
<td>community noise equivalent level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>carbon monoxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂eq</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>Ldn</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>RCRRA</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

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

1. Introduction

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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Source: Google Earth Pro, 2017
1. Introduction

This page intentionally left blank.
Figure 4 - Site Photographs
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- Looking east across project site.
- Looking south across project site.
- Looking east across project site.
- Looking west across project site.
- Key Map
- 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 2B – 2 bedrooms with 2 baths</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 2C – 2 bedrooms with 2 baths</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 3A – 3 bedrooms with 2 baths</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 3B – 3 bedrooms with 2 baths</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.3%</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 55 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 Carritos 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.
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Figure 6 - Conceptual Building Perspective: Main Entrance View from Cerritos Avenue
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Figure 7a - 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. Finiel
13. Plaster over Perimeter CMU Block Wall
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. CMU Block Wall
15. Stucco Fout

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

Source: KTGY, 2018
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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. Fintal
13. Plaster over Perimeter
    CMU Block Wall
14. Stucco Post

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

Source: KTGY, 2018
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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
   CMU Block Wall
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
   CMU Block Wall
14. Stucco Post

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

Scale (Feet)
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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
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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 (Estrella 2010).
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 trunk 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.
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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. 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).
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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
2.2 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 / Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions  ☐ Hazards / Hazardous Materials  ☐ Hydrology / Water Quality
☐ Land Use / Planning  ☐ Mineral Resources  ☐ Noise
☐ Population / Housing  ☐ Public Services  ☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation / Traffic  ☐ Tribal Cultural Resources  ☐ Utilities / 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] 10/16/18

[Printed Name] Les Johnson

[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.
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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>I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project, and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</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 Resource Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Environmental Checklist

<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><strong>III. AIR QUALITY.</strong> 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:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</strong> Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resource, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</strong> Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></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 18-1-1-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>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### X. LAND USE AND PLANNING
Would the project:

| a) Physically divide an established community? | 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>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>X</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>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| 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? |                                |                                  |                             | X         |
| 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? |                                |                                  |                             | X         |

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

| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinances, or applicable standards of other agencies? |                                |                                  | X              |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? |                                |                                  | X              |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? |                                |                                  | X              |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? |                                |                                  | X              |
| 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? |                                |                                  | X              |
| 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? |                                |                                  | X              |

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) Fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

### XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC
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 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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>X</td>
<td></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>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:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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 Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed waste water treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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) 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></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 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>
<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; cornices; 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.
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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.
offsites 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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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))?\(^5\)

**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 unhealthy 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 non attainment 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 area wide 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Comparison of Projected Construction Emissions and Regional Daily Criteria Values (pounds/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>VOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td>37.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>37.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Threshold?</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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>Comparison of Projected Operational Emissions and Local Daily Criteria Values (pounds/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>VOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Sources</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Threshold?</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>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Threshold?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</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.

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>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Threshold?</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 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>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Threshold?</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.

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.

c) 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/costing 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
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 Photographs). 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
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
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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 and will provide recommendations or preferences for treatment of the remains within 48 hours of accessing 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.
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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-Ingleside 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

---

5 Per the California Geologic Survey, active earthquake faults are faults where surface rupture has occurred within the last 11,000 years. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones are designated as earthquake zones of required investigation.
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.
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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 Photographs*, 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.

---

*October 2018*
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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 recompression 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.
3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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


Scientists have concluded that human activities are contributing to global climate change by adding large amounts of heat-trapping gases, known as greenhouse gases (GHGs), into the atmosphere. The primary source of these GHG is fossil fuel use. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has identified four major GHGs—water vapor, carbon dioxide (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 GHG 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 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).
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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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7</th>
<th>Yearly Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions (MTCO\textsubscript{2}e/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operation Phase</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averaged over 30 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual Emissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Proposed Screening Threshold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Threshold?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RK 2018a.
\(^1\) MTCO\textsubscript{2}e = metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents

As shown in the table, the Proposed Project would result in a net-increase of 1,551 metric tons of carbon dioxide-equivalent (MTCO\textsubscript{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\textsubscript{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)
3. Environmental Analysis

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
3. Environmental Analysis

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.


In 1999, and after upgrades to the two USTs onsite, OCHCA-EHD issued a Notice of Responsibility after detecting gasoline impacted soil in excavated 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
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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 SARWQB.
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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)\(^\text{10}\), 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 cu yd 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 SARWQCB 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

\(^{10}\) 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.
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 (Sheriff 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...
3. Environmental Analysis

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 Rossmoor 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>----------</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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Best Management Practices</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An adequate drainage system and stormwater management system to protect water quality</td>
<td>Water conservation practices, temporary stream crossings, clear water diversions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Storm Water Management Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>illicit connection/discharge, potable and irrigation water management, and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>proper management of the following operations: piling and grading,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dewatering, vehicle, and equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cleaning, fueling and maintenance, pile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waste Management and Controls (i.e., good housekeeping practices)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management of materials and wastes to avoid contamination of stormwater.</td>
<td>driving, concrete curing, concrete finishing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>demolition adjacent to water, material over water, and temporary batch plants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CASCA 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\textsuperscript{12} 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-permitees were required to develop and implement drainage area management plans (DAMP) for their jurisdictions, as well as local implementation plans (LIPs), which describe the co-permitees’ urban runoff management programs for their local jurisdictions, such as the City of Los Alamitos.

Under the City’s LIP, land development policies pertaining to hydromodification\textsuperscript{13} 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.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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 urbanisation 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/southeastercly 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.
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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
3. Environmental Analysis

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
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>

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The following describes potential impacts related to storm drainage systems and runoff.
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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 US 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 Weir 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, respectively, 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 3.9i, 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.
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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 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.

3.1 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
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collection 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 queuing 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...
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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.
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.c, 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
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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:
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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>OCFA Fire Stations Serving the City of Los Alamitos</th>
<th>Equipment and Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCFA Station No. 2 3642 Green Avenue Los Alamitos, CA</td>
<td>Equipment: 1 Paramedic Engine Personnel: 1 Fire Captain, 1 Engineer, 1 Firefighter/Paramedic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCFA Station No. 17 4991 Cermos Avenue Cypress, CA</td>
<td>Equipment: 1 Paramedic Engine, 1 Truck, Personnel: 2 Fire Captains, 2 Engineers, 3 Firefighters, 2 Firefighters/Paramedics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCFA Station No. 48 3131 Beverly Manor Road Seal Beach, CA</td>
<td>Equipment: 1 Paramedic Engine, 1 Patrol Vehicle Personnel: 1 Fire Captain, 1 Engineer, 2 Firefighters/Paramedics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
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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. SFPA’s 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.
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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 (Karret 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 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 multiistory 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 Estimated Project Student Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment 2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CDE 2018; Vlassic 2018; DeSiames 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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materials. Members of the system have access to the network's entire holdings including, 2.5 million books, 48,500 government publications, 75,000 magazines, 92,700 video/DVD materials, 50,000 cassette/CD books, 13,000 e-books, and 2,246 historical photos. (City of Los Alamitos 2014). The OCPL library closest to Los Alamitos residents (including future residents of the Proposed Project) is the Los Alamitos/Rossmoor Library in the City of Seal Beach.

Library service demand is population based—because the Proposed Project would result in population increase, the demands for library service (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.
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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 on-site 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
3. Environmental Analysis
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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>Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</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>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RK 2018c.

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.
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Table 13  Cumulative Projects Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Location/Address</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Village 605</td>
<td>3131 Katella Ave.</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>8,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Olympia Stapelakis</td>
<td>10742 Wainut St.</td>
<td>Condominiums</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mike Gamica &amp; Ron Wikstrom</td>
<td>10522 Wainut St.</td>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fairfield Inn &amp; Suites</td>
<td>SE Corner of Los Alamitos Blvd &amp; Sausalito Street</td>
<td>108 room hotel</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TTM 17830</td>
<td>NE Corner of Katella Ave. &amp; Enterprise Dr.</td>
<td>244 single-family homes</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>2,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,875 SF retail</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>3,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>subtotal</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>5,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7250 Carson Boulevard</td>
<td>Shopping Center Rates</td>
<td>Shopping center</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Residential Development</td>
<td>3311 Sausalito Street</td>
<td>Condominiums/townhomes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>812</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>16,397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RK 2018c.

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.
Figure 10 - Cumulative Projects Map
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1 = Village 605 - Retail Center
2 = Olympia Stagakis - 5 Condominiums
3 = Mike Garcia & Ron Wikstrom - 4 Unit Apartment
4 = Fairfield Inn & Suites - 108 Room Hotel
5 = TTM 17830 - Retail Commercial & Single Family Homes
6 = 2,432 TSF Convenience Store
7 = Residential Development - 50 Residential Condominiums
3. Environmental Analysis
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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>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 St</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>9.6</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>9.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Kafeila Avenue</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Boulevard/Cerritos Avenue</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Blvd/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>0.556</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 2018.
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 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 Operations: Background Without Project Traffic Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Street/Catalina Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Sausalito Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Katella Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Sausalito Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Boulevard/Cerritos Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Blvd/Sausalito Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Driveway 1/Cerritos Avenue (proposed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Driveway 2/Sausalito Street (proposed)</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 Operations: Background With Project Traffic Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Street/Catalina Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Sausalito Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Katella Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Sausalito Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Boulevard/Cerritos Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Blvd/Sausalito Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Driveway 1/Cerritos Avenue (proposed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Driveway 2/Sausalito Street (proposed)</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 17 Background Conditions: Project Traffic Contribution

<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></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>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 18 Intersection Operations: Opening Year (2020) Without Project 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 Street</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Katella Avenue</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Boulevard/Cerritos Avenue</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Blvd/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>A</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>VC 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>9.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street/Katella Avenue</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Cerritos Avenue</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Boulevard/Cerritos Avenue</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos Blvd/Sausalito Street</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Driveway 1/Cerritos Avenue (proposed)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Driveway 2/Sausalito Street (proposed)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RK 2018b.
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 TTS, 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...
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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.
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 OCFA’s 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
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 OPD, 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 or 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
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
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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:

1. **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; Juaneño 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:

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,
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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 onsite 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>Supplies</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>13,324</td>
<td>14,798</td>
<td>14,957</td>
<td>15,138</td>
<td>15,309</td>
<td>15,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imported Water</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>1,683</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>1,701</td>
<td>1,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,441</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,722</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,983</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,246</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,510</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,701</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Demands</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,440</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,722</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,983</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,246</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,510</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,701</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


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>Scenario</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Demand/Generation (in gallons per day per unit)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Demands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indoor Use</td>
<td>Outdoor Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>178.5</td>
<td>112.5</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
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consideration future development of the Project Site with residential uses and its associated population increase.

Furthermore, as noted in Section 1.3.8, Green Building and Sustainability, the Proposed Project would be
designed to include a number of green building practices/features that would help reduce water usage and
demand, including 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

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 GALGreen, 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.

c) 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.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 22</th>
<th>Capacity of Landfills Serving Los Alamitos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td>Maximum Permitted Capacity (cubic yards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank R. Bowman</td>
<td>266,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olinda Alpha</td>
<td>148,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Sobrante</td>
<td>164,930,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>599,730,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: CalRecycle 2016b; CalRecycle 2018c.

1 Average daily disposal is calculated based on 300 operating days per year. Each of the three facilities is open six days per week, Monday through Saturday, except certain holidays.

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 green waste 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 23 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR QUALITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 23</th>
<th>Mitigation Monitoring Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAZ-2</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsibility for Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-2</td>
<td>Project Applicant/Developer, Geotechnical/Soils Engineer, Site Assessment Specialist, and Construction Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAZ-3</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsibility for Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-3</td>
<td>Project Applicant/Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAZ-4</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Responsibility for Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-4</td>
<td>Project Applicant/Developer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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>NOISE</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 shade, 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>TRAF-1</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAF-2</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Response to Comments

The following is a list of agencies and organizations that submitted comments on the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments during the public review period, which extended from October 17 to November 5, 2018. Comment letters and specific comments are given letters and numbers for reference purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Reference</th>
<th>Commenting Agency/Person</th>
<th>Date of Comment</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Orange County Fire Authority</td>
<td>October 31, 2018</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Airport Land Use Commission</td>
<td>November 2, 2018</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Orange County Public Works</td>
<td>November 5, 2018</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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City of Los Alamitos
Attn: Tom Oliver
3191 Knottels Avenue
Los Alamitos, CA 90720

Ref: Notice of Public Hearing and Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration: Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments – 107 Units 3342 Cerritos Avenue, Los Alamitos

Dear Tom Oliver:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject document. The Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA) provides fire protection and emergency medical services response to the project area. Services include: structural fire protection, emergency medical and rescue services, education and hazardous material response. OCFA also participates in disaster planning as it relates to emergency operations, which includes high occupant areas and schools sites and may participate in community disaster drills planned by others. Resources are deployed based upon a regional service delivery system, assigning personnel and equipment to emergency incidents without regard to jurisdictional boundaries. The equipment used by the department has the versatility to respond to both urban and wildland emergency conditions.

We have the following comments regarding the subject document:

- Page 103
  - OCFA has 72 fire stations (first paragraph)
  - OCFA Station No.2 has 2 Firefighter/Paramedics (Table)
  - OCFA Station No.17 has 2 Firefighters (Table)
  - First Unit should arrive on-scene to medical aids and for fires within 7 minutes and 29 seconds 80 percent of the time.
  - The third bullet is redundant of the first bullet and should be removed. I have attached a chart to better describe our Standards of Cover for the project area. It would be my suggestion to remove the third bullet.

Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Required</th>
<th>Urban/Suburban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:07:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentration</th>
<th>Fire</th>
<th>EMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 engines, 2 trucks, 1 medic, 2 BC’s</td>
<td>2 engines, two medics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>29 personnel</td>
<td>8 personnel (4 Paramedics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>3 engines, 1 truck, 1 BC, 1 medic</td>
<td>1 medic engine or medic van with 1 unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>16 personnel</td>
<td>4 personnel (2 Paramedic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 engines</td>
<td>1 unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 personnel</td>
<td>2 personnel (2 EMT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We believe the project will have Less Than Significant Impact with the following Mitigation Measures:

- Prior to approval of any subdivision or comprehensive plan approval for a project, the designated site developer will be required to enter into a Secured Fire Protection Agreement with the Orange County Fire Authority.
  - This Agreement shall specify the developer’s pro-rata fair share funding of capital improvements necessary to establish adequate fire protection facilities and equipment, and/or personnel. Said agreement shall be reached as early as possible in the planning process, preferably for each phase or land use sector of the project, rather than on a parcel by parcel basis.

- The project is subject to review by the City and the OCFA for various construction document plan checks for the applicable fire life safety codes and regulations. The project will be subject to the 2016 editions of the CBC, CFC and related codes.

- Structures of this size and occupancy are required to have automatic fire sprinkler systems designed per NFPA 13 as required in the 2016 CBC, CFC.
A water supply system to supply fire hydrants and automatic fire sprinkler systems is required. Fire flow and hydrant spacing shall meet the minimums identified in the codes. Please refer to the California Fire Code Appendix section. These tables are also located in OCFA Guideline B09, Attachment 23.

Fire apparatus and personnel access to and around structures shall meet the minimum development standards of the OCFA and California Fire Code requirements. Please reference Section 2 of the OCFA’s Guideline B-09 at www.ocfa.org.

If the project scope includes or requires the installation of traffic signals on public access ways, these improvements shall include the installation of optical preemption devices.

High rise provisions will be required for buildings or parking structures over 75’.

Any occupancy of any portion of the project will be after final approval has taken place.

In addition, we would like to point out that all standard conditions with regard to development, including water supply, built in fire protection systems, road grades and width, access, building materials, and the like will be applied to this project at the time of plan submittal. Thank you for providing us with this information. Please contact me at 714-573-6199 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Tamara Rivers
Management Analyst
Strategic Services Section
tamrivers@ocfa.org
714-573-6199
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A1-1 The commenter outlined a number of minor edits they requested be made to the fire protection impact analysis provided in impact question a) of Section 3.14, Public Services, of the Initial Study (pages 103 and 104). The following text has been revised in response to the commenter. Changes made to the Initial study are identified here in strikethrough text to indicate deletions and bold underlined text to signify additions.

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 6272 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 personnel and equipment for the three nearest fire stations to the project site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station No. and Address</th>
<th>Equipment and Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCFA Station No. 2</td>
<td>Equipment: 1 Paramedic Engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos, CA</td>
<td>Personnel: 1 Fire Captain, 1 Engineer, 12 Firefighters/Paramedics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCFA Station No. 17</td>
<td>Equipment: 1 Paramedic Engine, 1 Truck,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4991 Cerritos Avenue, Cypress, CA</td>
<td>Personnel: 2 Fire Captains, 2 Engineers, 32 Firefighters, 2 Firefighters/Paramedics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCFA Station No. 48</td>
<td>Equipment: 1 Paramedic Engine, 1 Patrol Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3131 Beverly Manor Road, Seal Beach, CA</td>
<td>Personnel: 1 Fire Captain, 1 Engineer, 2 Firefighters/Paramedics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 engine unit 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 (Rivers 2018).
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- 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).

A1-2 The Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA) provided a bullet list of mitigation measures and features that they feel are necessary to reduce impacts to fire and emergency services to less than significant levels. The detailed analysis of the proposed project’s impacts on fire protection and emergency services is detailed in Section 3.14, Public Services, of the Initial Study. As substantiated by the findings and conclusions provided in this section, impacts to fire protection and emergency services were found to be less than significant; therefore, no mitigation measures were identified or necessary as impacts were not determined to be significant.

However, in response to the commenter, the measures and features outlined in the bullet list are all fire safety features and elements that the proposed project will be required to incorporate into the project, or fire safety provisions that the project applicant/developer will be required to adhere to. These and all other necessary fire safety measures determined necessary by OCFA will be adhered to and implemented, as evidenced in Section 3.14 of the Initial Study. For example, as noted in Section 3.14 under impact question a) (pages 103 and 104), 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 permit process. 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.

Additionally, and in response to the specific request for the project applicant/developer to enter into a Secured Fire Protection Agreement with OCFA, the requirement for such an agreement was already noted on page 104 of the impact analysis. As noted on page 104, such an agreement would be added as a condition of approval as required by OCFA. Project applicant/developer compliance with this condition of approval would be ensured through the City’s development review and building plan check process.

A1-3 The commenter stated that all standard conditions with regard to development, including water supply, built-in fire protection systems, road grades and width, access, building materials, and the like will be applied to this project at the time of plan submittal. See response to Comment A1-2, above.
November 2, 2018

Tom Oliver, Associate Planner  
City of Los Alamitos  
3191 Katella Avenue  
Los Alamitos, CA 90720

Subject: MND for Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments

Dear Mr. Oliver:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments in the context of the Airport Land Use Commission's (ALUC) Airport Environ Land Use Plan for Joint Forces Training Base Los Alamitos. 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.

The proposed project is located within the Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 77 Notification Area for JFTB Los Alamitos. The MND should discuss whether the proposed project would penetrate the notification surface. Should any part of the proposed project penetrate the surface, the project proponent will need to file form 7460-1, Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration, for Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) review.

The proposed project is located within the FAR Part 77 conical surfaces for JFTB Los Alamitos. The MND should discuss whether the proposed project would penetrate these surfaces. We recommend that the MND discuss the FAR Part 77 imaginary surfaces in the context of the proposed building elevations above mean sea level (AMSL) using National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929 (NGVD29) and/or North American Vertical Datum 1988 (NAVD88).

With respect to noise impacts, the proposed project is located outside of the 60 dBA and 65 dBA CNEL noise contours for JFTB Los Alamitos and would not be subject to any special noise reduction requirements.
Response to Comments

We also recommend that the MND include a discussion as to whether heliports are part of the proposed project. Should the development of heliports occur within your jurisdiction, proposals to develop new heliports must be submitted through the City to the ALUC for review and action pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 21661.5. Proposed heliport projects must comply fully with the state permit procedure provided by law and with all conditions of approval imposed or recommended by FAA, by the ALUC for Orange County and by Caltrans/Division of Aeronautics. Please note that emergency/temporary landing sites do not need to be submitted to the ALUC for Orange County for consistency review.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the initial study. Please contact Lea Choum at (949) 252-5123 or via email at lea.choum@ocair.com should you have any questions related to the Airport Land Use Commission for Orange County.

Sincerely,

Kari A. Rigoni  
Executive Officer
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A2-1 The commenter stated that the project site lies within the Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 77 Notification Area for the Joint Forces Training Base Los Alamitos (JFTBLA) and that the Initial Study should discuss whether the proposed project's buildings would penetrate the FAR Part 77 notification surface. The proposed project's impact on JFTBLA air craft operations and the potential to penetrate the airports FAR Part 77 notification surface are discussed in detail under impact question c) of Section 3.16, Transportation/Traffic, of the Initial Study (page 124). As concluded in Section 3.16, 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. The proposed buildings would not penetrate the FAR Part 77 notification surface, as measured in the context of the proposed buildings elevations above mean sea level. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

A2-2 The commenter stated that the project site is located outside of the 60 dBA and 65 dBA CNEL noise contours for JFTBLA and therefore, the proposed project is not subject to any special noise reduction requirements. The analysis provided under impact question c) of Section 3.12, Noise, of the Initial Study (see page 100) concurs with the commenters statement. The City is also in agreement that the propose project is not subject to any special noise reduction requirements.

A2-3 The commenter requested that the Initial Study include a discussion as to whether heliports are part of the proposed project. As described in detail in Section 1.3, Project Description, of the Initial Study (pages 11 through 30), the proposed project includes construction of up to 107 luxury apartment units and associated site improvements. No helipads, heliports, or any other private air strip features or improvements are proposed.
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November 5, 2018

Tom Oliver
City of Los Alamitos
3191 Katella Avenue
Los Alamitos, CA 90720

Subject: Notice Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration - Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments

Dear Mr. Tom Oliver:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration - Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments project. We offer the following comments on behalf of Orange County Flood Control District (OCFCD):

OCF Infrastructure Programs/Flood Programs/Hydrology

1. The proposed construction of the Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments Project will increase the imperviousness of the area. Therefore, hydrologic and hydraulic analyses are needed to evaluate and compare quantitatively the runoff volumes, peak flow rate increases, adequacy of existing storm drains and off-site channels that will ultimately carry these discharges. The analyses are to ensure that post-project conditions along upstream or downstream of OCFCD drainage facilities, including Los Alamitos Channel (C01) and/or Coyote Creek Channel (A01), are not worsened as a result of the project. The studies will be reviewed and approved by the City of Los Alamitos (City) engineers.

2. According to FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM), Panel 11.24, the proposed project area is Zone X flood—areas of 0.2% annual chance flood and subject to inundation by a 100-year storm with average flood depths of less than 1 foot. The City, as the floodplain administrator for areas within their boundaries, is responsible for all FEMA requirements and that the City floodplain ordinances applicable to the proposed project are met.

3. Any work related to the proposed project within OCFCD right-of-way or easement will require an encroachment permit from the County Property Permit Section. In addition, all work within OCFCD right-of-way should be performed in a manner that will not adversely impact the hydraulic flow conditions, access and/or maintenance requirements of OCFCD facilities. Information regarding permit application is available on our website at: http://www.ocpublicworks.com/da.

Shane L. Stillby, Director

November 2018
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If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact either Penny Lew at (714) 647-3990 or Anna Brazzeki at (714) 647-3989 in OC Flood Programs/Hydrology & Floodplain Management or Cindy Salazer at (714) 667-8870 in OC Development Services.

Sincerely,

Richard Vuong, Manager, Planning Division
OC Public Works Service Area/OC Development Services
300 North Flower Street
Santa Ana, California 92702-4048
Richard.Vuong@ocpw.ocgov.com

cc: Penny Lew, OC Flood Programs/Hydrology & Floodplain Management
Anna Brazzeki, OC Flood Programs/Hydrology & Floodplain Management
A3. Response to Comments from Orange County Public Works, Richard Vuong, Manager, Planning Division, dated November 5, 2018.

A3-1 The commenter stated that the proposed project would crease the imperviousness of the project site and therefore, hydrologic and hydraulic analyses are needed to evaluate and compare quantitatively the runoff volumes, peak flow rate increases, and adequacy of existing storm drains and offsite channels that will ultimately carry the site’s discharges. The commenter also stated that the studies will be reviewed and approved by the City of Los Alamitos engineers.

In response to the commenter, a Preliminary Drainage Report and Water Quality Management Plan were prepared for the proposed project and included as Appendices F and G of the Initial Study. The technical reports were reviewed and approved by the City Engineer for use in preparation of the impact analysis provided in Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Initial Study. In part, these technical reports formed the basis for the analysis provided in Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Initial Study.

Additionally, the project applicant/developer will be required to prepare final design-level hydrologic and hydraulic studies for the grading and construction stage of the proposed project. These studies are required to be submitted to City Engineer for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits. Therefore, their preparation, review and approval will be ensured through the City’s development review and building plan check process.

A3-2 The commenter stated that according to FEMA flood insurance rate maps, the project site is in the Zone X shaded area of 0.2% annual chance flood and subject to inundation by a 100-year storm. The commenter also stated that the City is responsible for all FEMA requirements and that the City floodplain ordinances applicable to the proposed project are met. The City acknowledges that the project site is within Zone X, as noted under impact question 6) of Section 3.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Initial Study. Through its development review and building plan check process, the City will ensure that all floodplain ordinances applicable to the proposed project are met.

A3-3 The commenter stated that all work within or adjacent to any OCFCFD (Orange County Flood Control District) right-of-way for flood control facilities should be conducted in a manner not to adversely impact the facility; and that all work within OCFCFD’s right-of-way requires an encroachment permit. In response to the commenter, no work is proposed or will be conducted within the channel or OCFCFD’s right-of-way; therefore, no encroachment permit will be required. Furthermore, all project-related grading and construction activities will occur onsite and not occur within or encroach onto OCFCFD’s flood control facility. All construction-related activities will be conducted in a manner not to adversely impact the flood control facility.
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RESOLUTION NO. PC 18-28


WHEREAS, a completed application for a Site Plan Review was submitted by Christopher Felix, Hutton Development Company representing the Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments, LLC on March 6, 2018, requesting approval for a development of 107-units of residential apartments at 3342 Cerritos Avenue on a 3.65-acre parcel in the Multiple Family (R-3) Zoning District (APN 242-222-11); and,

WHEREAS, the verified application constitutes a request as required by Section 17.50.030 (Site Plan Review) and Section 17.08.020 Table 2-02 (Allowed Uses and Permit Requirements for Residential Zoning Districts) of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code; and,

WHEREAS, an Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration have been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the guidelines promulgated by the State Secretary of Resources, and the procedures for review as set forth in the 2007 City of Los Alamitos Guidelines for Implementation of the CEQA (Local CEQA Guidelines); and,

WHEREAS, a 20-day circulation period for the draft initial study/mitigated Negative Declaration of October 17, 2018 to November 5, 2018 had been duly noticed, and had elapsed, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed the application for Site Plan Review at a duly noticed public hearing on November 28, 2018, at which time it considered all of the evidence presented, both written and oral.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS, CALIFORNIA, DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The Planning Commission of the City of Los Alamitos, California finds that the above recitals are true and correct.

SECTION 2. The Planning Commission hereby makes the following findings which is based on all of the evidence presented, both written and oral; the Staff report is incorporated by reference:
A. The design and layout of the proposed development are consistent with the development and design standards/guidelines of the applicable zoning district. As presented in the plans dated October 11, 2018, the development meets, or will be conditioned to meet, all requirements. This project is consistent with the standards of the Multiple Family (R-3) Zoning District.

B. The design and layout of the proposed development would not interfere with the use and enjoyment of neighboring existing or future developments, and would not create traffic or pedestrian hazards. The design and layout of the residential apartments at 3342 Cerritos Avenue would not interfere with the use and enjoyment of neighboring residential developments, as the immediately surrounding uses are multi-family residential, or detached condos. The approved location is appropriate for 107 units in two buildings and would be constructed in an architectural style that complements nearby homes. The three stories is in harmony with the condominiums being built next door. The development’s owner will have regulations concerning maintenance and parking as required by the Los Alamitos Municipal Code. The property is zoned for this type of development and the design of the proposed development would maintain and enhance the attractive, harmonious, and orderly development contemplated by this chapter.

C. The design of the proposed development would maintain and enhance the attractive, harmonious, and orderly development contemplated by this chapter. The design of the 107 residential apartments would enhance the attractive, harmonious, and orderly development of the property. The design is in harmony with surrounding development and improves upon the City’s architecture with a timeless residential building design, extensive landscaping, and maintenance requirements under the Los Alamitos Municipal Code.

D. The design of the proposed development would provide a desirable environment for its occupants and visiting public as well as its neighbors through good aesthetic use of materials, texture, and color, and would remain aesthetically appealing and retain an appropriate level of maintenance. The architecture and aesthetics of the proposed project are in keeping with the two recent projects to the west of the property and will blend well with the existing built environment. The elevations proposed for the project are appealing and would provide a desirable environment for residents and visitors.

E. The proposed development would not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare or materially injurious to the properties or improvements in the vicinity. The 107 residential apartments provide for public health, safety, and welfare of the residential and business communities by
providing more living options to the City rather than causing sprawl at the fringes of this metropolitan area. The building will meet all building code requirements. The mitigation measures identified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration would ensure the safety of the inhabitants of the project as well as other residents of Los Alamitos.

F. The proposed development would not substantially depreciate property values in the vicinity. The 107 residential apartment units would not depreciate property values in the vicinity, as the area is zoned for this type of use and it will improve the aesthetics of this residential neighborhood.

G. Pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) an Initial Study was prepared which led to the conclusion that a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) be prepared for this project. The purpose of a MND is to identify potential effects on the environment of the project and to indicate the manner in which those potential significant effects can be avoided or mitigated. A primary function of the MND is to disclose and evaluate project impacts and inform decision makers for the project. In order to meet the 20-day circulation requirements, a notice regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated from October 17, 2018 to November 5, 2018.

SECTION 3. Based upon such findings and determinations, the Planning Commission hereby approves Site Plan Review SPR18-02, as represented by the plans and elevations in “Exhibit B” and subject to the conditions located in “Exhibit A.”

SECTION 4. The Secretary of the Planning Commission shall forward a copy of this Resolution to the applicant and any person requesting the same, and Staff shall file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 28th day of November, 2018, by the following vote:

ATTEST: Art DeBolt, Chair

Les Johnson, Secretary
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  )
COUNTY OF ORANGE    ) ss
CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS  )

I, Les Johnson, Planning Commission Secretary of the City of Los Alamitos, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of Planning Commission held on the 28th day of November, 2018, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

__________________________________________
Les Johnson, Secretary
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F. The proposed development would not substantially depreciate property values in the vicinity. The 107 residential apartment units would not depreciate property values in the vicinity, as the area is zoned for this type of use and it will improve the aesthetics of this residential neighborhood.
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PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 28th day of November, 2018, by the following vote:

ATTEST: ____________________________ Art DeBolt, Chair

Les Johnson, Secretary
APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Michael Daudt, City Attorney

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF ORANGE   ) ss
CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS )

I, Les Johnson, Planning Commission Secretary of the City of Los Alamitos, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of Planning Commission held on the 28th day of November, 2018, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Les Johnson, Secretary
1. Approval of this application is to build a 107-unit, residential apartment project in two structures at 3342 Cerritos Avenue (APN 242-222-11) with such additions, revisions, changes or modifications as required by the Planning Commission pursuant to approval of a Site Plan Review, noted thereon, and on file in the Development Services Department. Subsequent submittals for this project shall be consistent with such plans and in compliance with the applicable land use regulations of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code and any applicable state law. If any changes are proposed regarding the location or alteration of the plans dated October 11, 2018 (as amended during the hearing), a request for an amendment of this approval must be submitted to the Development Services Director. If the Development Services Director determines that the proposed change or changes are consistent with the provisions and spirit of intent of this approval action, and that such action would have been the same with the proposed change or changes as for the proposal approved herein, the amendment may be approved by the Development Services Director without requiring a public meeting.

2. The Applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City of Los Alamitos, its agents, officers, or employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the City or its agents, officers or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul an approval of the City, its legislative body, advisory agencies or administrative officers the subject application. The City will promptly notify the Applicant of any such claim, action or proceeding against the City and the Applicant will either undertake defense of the matter and pay the City’s associated legal costs, or will advance funds to pay for defense of the matter by the City. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the City retains the right to settle or abandon the matter without the Applicant’s consent, but should it do so, the City shall waive the indemnification herein, except the City’s decision to settle or abandon a matter following an adverse judgment or failure to appeal, shall not cause a waiver of the indemnification rights herein.

3. The Applicant shall file an Acknowledgment of Conditions of Approval with the Community Development Department within 30 days of final approval of all resolutions. The property Applicant shall be required to record the Acknowledgment of these Conditions of Approval with the Office of the Orange County Recorder and proof of such recordation shall be submitted to the Development Services Department.
4. In case of violation of any of the conditions of approval or applicable law, the property owner and tenant will be issued a Notice of Correction if said violation is not remedied within a reasonable period of time and/or subsequent violations of the conditions of approval and/or City law occurs within ninety days of any Notice of Correction, the property owner shall be held responsible to reimburse the City for all Staff time directly attributable to enforcement of the conditions of approval, mitigation measures, and/or City law including but not limited to, revocation of the herein approvals.

5. Project plans for the multifamily development shall be subject to a complete code compliance review with the Development Services Department when the building plans are submitted for plan check and shall comply with all applicable City of Los Alamitos ordinances, regulations, and policies prior to building permit issuance, including, but not limited to, the requirements established or authorized by Title 15, 16, and 17 of the City of Los Alamitos Municipal Code.

6. Approval of Site Plan Review 18-02 shall be valid for a period of twelve (12) months from the date the site plan was approved. If construction is commenced within this twelve (12) month period and construction is being pursued diligently toward completion, the approvals shall stay in full force and effect. The director may, upon receipt in writing from the applicant before the expiration date, grant an extension of time up to twelve (12) months maximum. If an extension of time is not granted, the site plan review approval shall expire and a new application shall be made.

7. Failure to satisfy and/or comply with the conditions herein may result in a recommendation to the Planning Commission and/or City Council for revocation of this approval.

8. The applicant shall be required to comply with the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act of 1990, including the Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California 1997.

9. The applicant shall comply with applicable City, County, and/or State regulations.

FEES

10. The applicant and applicant’s successors in interest shall be responsible for payment of all applicable fees.

California Government Section 66020(d)(1) requires that the project applicant be notified of all fees, dedications, reservations and other exactions imposed on the development for purposes of defraying all or a portion of the cost of public facilities related to development. Fees for regulatory approvals, including planning processing fees, building permit fees are not included under this noticing requirement.
Pursuant to Government Code Section 66020(d)(1), the applicant is hereby notified that fees, dedications, reservations and other exactions imposed upon the development, which are subject to notification, are as follows:

Fees: n/a
Dedications: n/a
Reservations: n/a
Other Exactions: n/a

The applicant may appeal the imposition or amount of the fees described above within ninety (90) days following the adoption of this resolution and pursuant to the procedures set forth in the Government Code.

LANDSCAPE

11. A Landscape Irrigation Plan prepared by a licensed landscape architect shall be submitted to the Development Services Department prior to the issuance of building permits. The Irrigation Plan shall include an irrigation system layout with the location of controllers and points of connection with data on valve sizes and gallons per minute (G.P.M.), the size and location of sleeves and all spray heads, including the location of conventional systems and drip systems; an irrigation legend with complete specifications; irrigation notes and construction details of all assemblies and components; a recommended irrigation schedule, preferably on an annual basis; and a summary block on the initial page of submitted plans that will present the above information clearly and accurately. The City reserves the right to require subsequent checks, or approval of the landscape plans prior to issuance of a grading permit.

12. Landscaping shall comply with the City's water conservation ordinances in accordance with Chapter 13.04 (Water Conservation) and Chapter 13.05 (Water Efficient Landscaping) of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code.

13. Trees shall be planted outside of any Sight Safety Triangle or be trimmed to eight feet from above the adjacent top of curb.

LIGHTING

14. Prior to permit issuance, Applicant shall submit a lighting and photometric plan to the Development Services Department to the satisfaction of the Development Services Director.

15. The Applicant shall provide adequate exterior lighting for each residential unit that maintains performance standards as described in Chapter 8.48 Lighting Performance Standards in the Los Alamitos Municipal Code. All lighting structures shall be placed so as to confine direct rays to the subject property.
16. The Applicant shall provide an illuminated uniform address number near the entryway of each unit, or other location acceptable to the Development Services Director.

UTILITIES

17. The Applicant shall submit detailed plans showing the proposed location of utilities and mechanical equipment to the Development Services Department for review and approval prior to the Building and Safety Division Plan check.

18. All utility service lines shall be placed underground — and in particular the power lines and poles crossing to this parcel from the alley across Sausalito Street — with the exception of the transmission lines along Cerritos Avenue.

19. All utility meters, when not enclosed in a cabinet, shall be screened from view from any place on or off site, by either plant materials or decorative screen, while allowing sufficient access for reading. Each unit shall be separately metered.

CONSTRUCTION

20. All applicable conditions herein must appear on and be noted on the final working drawing prior to the issuance of a building permit.

21. The applicant shall hand deliver a construction schedule to the adjacent tenants in the area to properly inform them of future construction including the name and 24 hour contact information for a project manager for noise, dust, and other complaints.

22. During construction, the Applicant will display a signs visible to the public from Sausalito Street and Cerritos Avenue with a contact number of the construction superintendent to address any questions or concerns about demolition, grading, and construction activities.

23. Hours and days of demolition, grading, and construction operations shall be prohibited between the hours of 8:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. on weekdays and Saturday. There shall be no construction activities on Sunday or a Federal holiday celebrated by the City of Los Alamitos without express approval by the Development Services Director.

24. All construction vehicles or equipment, fixed or mobile, operated within 1,000 feet of an existing dwelling shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers.

25. Replace backup audible warning devices with backup strobe lights or other warning devices during evening construction activity to the extent permitted by the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health.
26. Stockpiling and/or vehicle-staging areas shall be placed as far as practical from residential homes.

27. The Applicant shall have rodent and pest controls on site during demolition and grading activities to mitigate impacts to the surrounding properties and neighborhood.

28. Prior to demolition and construction, a perimeter security fence not exceeding seven feet in height, shall be installed around the project site. The fencing shall include a green screen material or approved equivalent. The fence/screen material shall be properly maintained and be free of rips, tears, fraying, graffiti, and any other damage or vandalism.

29. During construction the site shall be maintained and kept clear of all trash, weeds, and overgrown vegetation.

TRASH

30. The applicant shall provide, as a minimum, trash enclosures to hold a minimum twelve (12) standard dumpsters for solid waste and recycling, with five (5) foot by eight (8) foot clear interior dimension for each dumpster. Enclosures shall have an interior six-inch curb bumper. This area shall accommodate receptacles sufficient to the satisfaction of the trash company, Republic Services.

OTHER

31. The units shall be constructed with a minimum of 200 cubic feet of storage space for each unit (LAMC 17.08.030, Table 2-03).

32. All air conditioner units shall be installed in accordance with LAMC 17.16.100.D.

33. A Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) is required to be processed for this project.

34. The common open space area improvements shall be reviewed and approved by the Development Services Department prior to issuance of building permits.

ENGINEERING

35. The Applicant shall submit Improvement Plans prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer for public works (off-site) improvements, and on-site improvements. Plan check fees shall be paid in advance.

36. An on-site grading and drainage plan shall be prepared and submitted to the City Engineer for approval. Plan shall be 24" x 36", with elevations to nearest 0.01
foot, minimum scale 1" = 20'. Plan shall be prepared by Registered Civil Engineer. Public works improvements may be shown on this plan. Grading plan check fees must be paid in advance.

37. Hydrologic and hydraulic calculations demonstrating adequate site drainage from a 10-year return frequency storm (25-year frequency in sump areas) prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer shall be submitted with the Grading Plan.

38. Driveway slope shall be a minimum slope of one (1) percent for asphalt and .5% for concrete.

39. If utility cuts in the street are excessive, the street must have a grid and overlay placed on it per the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

40. All existing off-site public improvements (sidewalk, curb and gutter, driveways, and street paving) at the development site which are in a damaged condition or demolished due to the proposed work shall be reconstructed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, and per OCPFRD Standard Plan.

41. A City Public Works permit shall be taken out for all work in public right-of-way prior to start of work. All work shall be done in accordance with APWA Standards and to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and must be completed before issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.

42. Pad certification by the Design Civil Engineer and Soil Engineer is required prior to the commencement of structural construction.

43. Final compaction report prepared by a qualified Soil Engineer shall be submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval prior to the commencement of structural construction.

44. Prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits or prior to recordation upon subdivision of land if determined applicable by the City Building Official, the applicant shall submit to the City for review and approval a Final Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) that:

- Addresses Site Design BMPs (Best Management Practices) such as minimizing impervious areas, maximizing permeability, minimizing directly connected impervious areas, creating reduced or “zero discharge” areas, and conserving natural areas.

- Incorporates the applicable Routine Source Control BMPs as defined in the DAMP.

- Incorporates Treatment Control BMPs as defined in the DAMP.
• Generally describes the long-term operation and maintenance requirements for the Treatment Control BMPs.

• Identifies the entity that will be responsible for long-term operation and maintenance of the Treatment Control BMPs.

• Describes the mechanism for funding the long-term operation and maintenance of the Treatment Control BMPs.

45. Remove existing 36 foot drive and 27 feet of red curb on Chestnut St and replace with full height curb and sidewalk.

46. Provide a right turn deceleration lane for eastbound Cerritos Ave traffic entering the project site per the satisfaction of the Traffic Engineer. This may require the relocation of the large Edison pole west of said entrance.

47. Provide new sidewalk on Sausalito St for the entire length of the project and add 30 feet of red curb on both side of driveway entrance.

48. The Applicant shall add a deceleration lane prior to the Cerritos Avenue entrance.

PUBLIC WORKS

49. The Applicant shall install new sidewalk on Sausalito Street, in front of the entire subject parcel to match the current Olson project next door.

50. The Applicant shall install a sidewalk along Cerritos Avenue to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

51. The Applicant shall remove the existing drive approach (curb cut) to the property on Chestnut Street and replace with a new curb and gutter per City standards.

52. If a utility cut is made in the streets surrounding the parcel, the Applicant shall replace the asphalt entirely to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

53. The Applicant shall provide sidewalks and gutters with the latest handicap accessibility features required by state and federal law.

ROSSMOOR/LOS ALAMITOS SEWER DISTRICT

54. OCSD Trunk Sewer – Orange County Sanitation District (OCSD) owns and operates an existing 27-inch diameter trunk sewer in Chestnut Street between Cerritos Avenue and Sausalito Street and in Sausalito Street between Chestnut Street and Oak Street (not shown on the attached schematic); however, OCSD
does not allow direct connections into its trunk system. The Developer can verify this with OCSD staff.

55. RLAASD Easement Requirements – If the Developer wishes to have RLAASD operate and maintain all 8-inch diameter mainline sewers located within private streets, an easement for those purposes must be granted to the District. The easement language shall read as follows: “A Sewer Easement in favor of the ROSSMOOR-LOS ALAMITOS AREA SEWER DISTRICT, a county water district, organized under the laws of the State of California, with the perpetual right to construct and maintain underground sanitary sewers, including the right of ingress and egress, and underground appurtenances thereto, over, across, and under said easement.” The easement must be granted either by separate instrument or, in the case of a Public Utility Easement, it must be granted on the Tract Map prior to the District’s approval of the sewer improvement plans. If the easement is granted on the Tract Map, the Los Alamitos City Engineer or another appropriate City staff member, must provide written notification to the RLAASD when that action has been taken. Such written notification shall include a digital PDF copy of the recorded Tract Map.

56. Sewer Operation and Maintenance Responsibilities if No Easement is Granted – If the Developer does not wish to dedicate an easement to the District, only those portions of the system, which fall within public right-of-way (i.e., in Chestnut Street or Sausalito Street) will be operated, maintained, repaired and/or replaced (when necessary) by the District. All other off-site portions of the system will be part of a private system, which the Developer or future property owners will be fully responsible for operating, maintaining, repairing and replacing (when needed).

57. Responsibility for Operation, Maintenance and Replacement of Sewer Laterals – RLAASD will only be responsible for operating, maintaining, repairing and replacing (when necessary) the portions of the mainline sewer dedicated to the District (i.e., the mainline sewers in public right-of-way or in easements dedicated to the RLAASD). The Developer (or future property owners) will be fully responsible for operating, maintaining, repairing and replacing all sewer laterals (from the point of connection to the main line) serving the 107 apartments.

58. Connection Subject to Verification of Hydraulic Capacity – As previously noted, connection to any RLAASD sewer is subject to first verifying the sewer has sufficient hydraulic capacity to handle increased flows from the 107 new residential units. To initiate that process, the Developer must first deposit Preliminary Engineering fees with the District (see next item). Additionally, the Developer’s Engineer must submit the following items for review by the District Engineer:

a. Preliminary engineering plans depicting the proposed location of all sewers to be dedicated to the District;

b. A Preliminary opinion of probable construction costs for all portions of the sewer system to be dedicated to the District; and
c. Calculations estimating the flows, which will be generated from the 107 new apartments.

59. Preliminary Engineering Fees – Per Section 1.3.2 of the RLAASD Standard Specifications, Preliminary Engineering fees will be calculated as follows: 4% of the estimated construction costs of all sewer improvements to be dedicated to the District. In calculating this fee, the District Engineer will review the Developer’s Engineer’s opinion of probable construction costs for reasonableness and make appropriate adjustments to that cost, if necessary, prior to calculating the Preliminary Engineering fee. Preliminary Engineering fees will be used to determine hydraulic sufficiency of the existing sewers in Chestnut Street and/or Cerritos Avenue and will also be used to initiate the plan check process.

60. Final Engineering and Inspection Fee – Per Section 1.3.4 of the District’s Standard Specifications, Final Engineering and Inspection fees will be assessed as follows: 6% of the estimated construction costs of all sewer improvements to be dedicated to the District (the original 4% Preliminary Engineering fee will be credited against the 6% Final Engineering and Inspection fee). Minimum fees, per District Ordinance No. 38 dated December 9, 1991, adjusted to current year per the Consumer Price Index (CPI), shall apply. Ordinance No. 38 specifies 1991 plan checking and inspection rates of $105/hour and $840/day, respectively (according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the CPI has increased by 82% since 1991, thus resulting in current applicable plan check and inspection rates of $191/hour and $1,529/day, respectively). Final Engineering and Inspection fees will be used to complete the plan checking process, review any proposed easements and provide field inspection of the sewers to be dedicated to the District. Additional fees may be collected if and when District costs to perform the required engineering and inspection services exceed the original amounts deposited by the Developer.

61. Connection Charges and Permit Fees – Prior to approval of the above-noted plans, the Developer must also pay all connections charges ($250/unit; (107 units) x ($250/unit) = $26,750) and the District permit fee (a flat $10 fee).

62. Construction Must Conform with Approved Plans or be Subject to Removal and Replacement – All improvements will be subject to inspection by the District and must be constructed in strict conformance with the District approved sewer improvement plans. Any sewer construction work not conforming with District standards may be subject to removal and replacement at the Developer’s expense.

BUILDING AND SAFETY DIVISION

63. The Applicant must comply with all current California Building Codes in effect at the time that the plans are submitted.
64. The Applicant shall submit three (3) sets of complete building plans and two (2) sets of structural calculations to the Building and Safety Department for review.

65. Prior to obtaining grading permits, the Applicant shall submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for review and approval by the Building and Safety Division.

66. For demo and construction, project must recycle 65% of material and submit a waste management plan.

67. The Applicant shall provide a soils report from a geotechnical engineer at the time of building plan submittal.

LOS ALAMITOS POLICE DEPARTMENT

68. In any area that is restricted by gates or similar construction, the Property Owner shall provide keys/codes/or other necessary means to access the parking lot(s) and community areas, as well as provide access to front doors of the structures (but not individual units).

ORANGE COUNTY FIRE AUTHORITY (OCFA)

69. Plan Submittal: The applicant or responsible party shall submit the plan(s) listed below to the Orange County Fire Authority for review. Approval shall be obtained on each plan prior to the event specified.

Prior to issuance of a grading permit, or a building permit if a grading permit is not required:

- fire master plan (service code PR145)

Prior to issuance of a building permit:

- architectural (service codes PR200-PR285), when required by the OCFA “Plan Submittal Criteria Form”
- underground piping for private hydrants and fire sprinkler systems (service code PR470-PR475)
- fire sprinkler system (service codes PR400-PR465)

Prior to concealing interior construction:

- sprinkler monitoring system (service code PR500)
- fire alarm system (service code PR500-PR520)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

70. 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.

71. 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.

72. 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.

73. 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.

74. 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.
75.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 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.

76. 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 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.

77. 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.

78. 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.

79. 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.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project consists of building A and building B, which contain 107 residential apartment units. The three-story buildings are two levels of residential over an on-grade parking garage. Project is located at the intersection of Cerritos Avenue and Chestnut Street in the City of Los Alamos, California.

Proposed project includes amenities such as programmed courtyards to include a pool, barbeques, and a loggia shade structure located within the open space. The style embodies a contemporary look and feel inspired by Mediterranean Architecture.

PROJECT DATA

- Proposed Date: 12 April 2022
- Description: 3342 CERRITOS AVENUE, LOS ALAMITOS, CA

- Site Plan
- A1.0 Site Plan
- A1.1 Site Coverage Plan
- C1.0 Conceptual Grading Plan
- LC1 Landscape Conceptual Plan
- LC2 Landscape Conceptual Plan
- LC3 Landscape Conceptual Plan
- EP.1 Photometric Site Plan
- A3.0a Building Plans - Plan A
- A3.0b Building Plans - Plan B
- A3.1a Building Plans - Plan A
- A3.1b Building Plans - Plan B

PERSPECTIVE - MAIN ENTRANCE VIEW FROM CERRITOS AVENUE
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4. Metal Railing
5. Single Hung Vinyl Windows
6. Stucco Trim
7. Corbel
8. Decorative Recess
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10. Decorative Tile Element
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12. Finial

*Roof Structure for the housing of air conditioners, elevators, stairways, tanks, ventilating fans and similar equipment.
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To: City of Los Alamitos  
Tom Oliver  
3191 Katella Avenue  
Los Alamitos, CA 90720

Dear Tom,

My name is Michael Mandas. I live in Rossmoor and have a physical therapy practice in Los Alamitos. The name of my company is Los Alamitos Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy at 5152 Katella Avenue Suite 106.

I am familiar with the plans for a new development called Los Alamitos Luxury Apartment Homes at 3342 Cerritos Avenue in the city of Los Alamitos, and I would like to lend my support to this project.

I know as an employer, I find it hard to retain high wage employees due to the housing limits in this area. I see where this new project could make it easier for employers like myself to retain our higher wage employees. As it is right now, I’ve lost employees to Irvine and south Orange County because they can find work and housing that meets their needs and there purchasing power.

Right now Los Alamitos does not have housing projects that compete for higher wage millennial employees. I believe the city of Los Alamitos will benefit by this project as it attracts higher wage employees who will spend time and money in the city.

This project would also add attractiveness to the city in a stretch of land that was unsightly.

In closing, I can see where the above mentioned project could be beneficial to many business owners in the city. It could also help the city gain revenue via the home owners in this project, and it provides an attractive housing project that adds to the attractiveness of this small community. I strongly urge the approval of this project.

Sincerely,

Michael Mandas, Physical Therapist and business owner.
Hello!

I just want to show my support for the project on 3342 Cerritos Ave in Los Alamitos. I believe it's a good project to bring more business for small business owners such as my office. I'm looking forward to having more future patients from that area since I'm on Cerritos Ave as well. Thanks.

Sincerely,
Janice Hong, DDS
JJ Family Dental
Les,
good day, my name is Brent Bacher I was born in Long Beach and have lived in Los Alamitos right behind the high school on Myra Ave.. I attended Jefferson elementary, then Pine and then onto Los Alamitos High School. After high school I attended and graduated college from Cal Ply San Luis Obispo in 1994. I returned back home to the Los Alamitos area, where in 2003 I bought my home in Rossmoor and started to raise my family. Today I have a wife and two healthy children, I certainly love the Los Alamitos and the Rossmoor community and im proud to raise our family here. on the flip side, I have noticed the deserted area that is on the former land where Monte Collins Truck and Tractor business stood for over 40 years and where the church one stood for a brief amount of time. I take my son to Los Alamitos High School and see on a daily the basis the deserted area. unfortunately it does not look good. I was excited to hear about a luxury apartment building that would occupy this area. I'm hoping this is on schedule and I know it will add value to our city.

thx for your consideration.
Brent Bacher
Hello Mr. Johnson,

I was pleasantly surprised to see a proposal on the City’s website for a 107 unit luxury apartment development on Cerritos Ave where the previously closed backhoe company was located, as well as a condominium project on Sausalito. The City of Los Alamitos would only benefit from these projects in the form of increased revenue, increased sales tax, more customers for local companies, restaurants, etc.

The last thing we need is another dirt lot sitting vacant for years like the old Toyota dealership on Los Alamitos boulevard, which is finally be developed into a hotel I understand, or the old vacant 76 gas station at Cerritos/Los Alamitos Bl next to the High School.

Los Alamitos Boulevard has already been given a face lift in the form of a beautification project, now it’s time to increase housing and bring in more revenue.

I hope these projects are given approval to move forward.

Sincerely,
Eric Miller

Sent from my iPad
Just wanted to make sure you also received this email.

Les Johnson
Development Services Director
3191 Katella Ave.
Los Alamitos, CA 90720
562-431-3538 Ex 300

-----Original Message-----
From: Emil Jorge <ejorge@me.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 18, 2018 10:30 AM
To: Les Johnson <LJohnson@cityoflosalamitos.org>
Subject: Luxury Apartments

Mr. Johnson,

My name is Emil Jorge, I am a past Chairman of the Los Alamitos Parks, Recreation and Cultural Arts Commission, past President of Casa Youth Shelter, past Chairman of the Los Alamitos Chamber of Commerce. I'm sorry I haven't had a chance to welcome you to our neighborhood in person! I hope you are enjoying our little town. I like to say, we are a small but mighty city!

I wanted to take a moment to show my support for the Los Alamitos Luxury Apartment project. This will be a great addition to our community and provide some much needed revenue to keep the wheels turning in our little town. I like the fact that it is owned by a local and active community member that will be motivated to maintain the property to reflect the high standards we have come to expect as residents of Los Alamitos.

I look forward to seeing this project break ground in the near future and thank you for your dedication to our City!

Sincerely,

Emil Jorge
Sparta Graphics
10744 Noel St.
Los Alamitos, CA 90720
714-828-5484 x100
Les Johnson

From: Bill Phillips <billp@playitagainsportslosalamitos.com>
Sent: Monday, November 19, 2018 4:04 PM
To: Les Johnson
Cc: Tom Oliver
Subject: 107 Unit Apartment Community at 3342 Cerritos Ave

Les,

I’m writing to express my thoughts on the proposed project reference above.

As a small business owner and active member of the community, as well as a Los Alamitos resident since 1998, I along with many others in my circle are enthusiastic about the addition of the Luxury Apartment Complex to our community, and we completely support it.

Los Alamitos families are extremely active in organized sports, and our business caters to this market. More families living in town has an immediate and positive impact on our continued growth.

From a tax revenue perspective, the addition of this new community will have a direct impact on our community as well. The city is in need of additional revenue sources, and this project will without a doubt stimulate the local economy in a positive way.

Last, the area surrounding the new development is in need of a facelift. I believe the competition for renters will encourage property managers & landlords to upgrade, enhance and beautify the existing properties.

If you have any questions, or would like me to elaborate further, please do not hesitate to contact me via email.

Thanks for your time,

Bill Phillips
Play It Again Sports - Los Alamitos
GameDayGearShop Custom Uniforms & Apparel
714-220-2400 ext 0
4141 Katella Ave.
Los Alamitos, CA 90720
www.PlayItAgainSportsLosAlamitos.com
Les Johnson  
Planning Department  
City of Los Alamitos  
3191 Katella Avenue  
Los Alamitos CA 90720

Subject: Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments  
Proposed 107 unit Apartment Community  
3342 Cerritos Ave  
Los Alamitos CA 90720

Dear Mr. Les Johnson,

I've been a resident of Los Alamitos (Rossmoor) for over 50 years and have been following the progressive apartment development with the prime target being the Medical Community. With this in mind, Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments housing will add corresponding quality and value to the community.

Other benefits include the:

1. People investing in the city  
2. Increased tax assessments  
3. Productive property vs. Raw land  
4. Sales taxes – Restaurants/Hardware stores etc.  
5. New development – current Fire/Construction and Parking Codes  
6. Reduction on construction and commercial traffic

The Collins & Slimmers have asked I write a letter and express my opinion; which I’m only pleased to do, on such a project with as many benefits to the community.

Sincerely,

Clement W. Morin

CC: Tom Oliver – Planning Department
Another email in support of LALA.

Les Johnson
Development Services Director
City of Los Alamitos
(562) 431-3538 x300

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Monica Wissuchek" <mwissuchek@verizon.net>
Date: November 20, 2018 at 4:29:31 PM PST
To: <Johnson@cityoflosalamitos.org>
Cc: <djhissuchek@gmail.com>
Subject: Proposed 107-unit luxury apartment community

Dear Mr. Johnson,

We were excited to hear about the plans for the land use at 3342 Cerritos Ave., Los Alamitos CA 90720 for. We support the development of the Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments and think that it is a good use of that parcel of land. It will provide much needed housing and revenue for the city and the school district, and it also addresses the traffic flow and parking needs of a high density area. We hope that the planning commission will move forward and approve the plans in the near future.

Thank you for your work in Los Al!

Monica and DJ Wissuchek
18312 Newport Ave.
Los Alamitos, CA 90720
562-678-7514
November 19, 2018

Mr. Jordan Reynolds
HUTTON COMPANIES
2520 North Santiago Boulevard
Orange, CA 92867

Subject: Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments Traffic Impact Study, City of Los Alamitos – Addendum Letter (11.19.18)

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

RK ENGINEERING GROUP, INC. (RK) would like to provide this addendum letter to the Los Alamitos Luxury Apartments Traffic Impact Study, prepared by RK, May 2018 (hereinafter referred to as Traffic Study). This purpose of this letter is to provide additional analysis and discussion of traffic and parking related issues bought up at the November 14, 2018 Los Alamitos Traffic Commission hearing.

1. Los Alamitos Boulevard Roadway Improvement Project

The City of Los Alamitos has recently made several roadway improvements to Los Alamitos Boulevard, between Katella Avenue and Cerritos Avenue, which were not analyzed in the Traffic Study, as they were completed after the Traffic Study was submitted. The improvements were done at the discretion of Los Alamitos City Council and include adding a raised center median and reducing the number of travel lanes from 3-lanes in each direction to 2-lanes in each direction on Los Alamitos Boulevard, between Cerritos Avenue and Florista Street.

RK has prepared a focused traffic analysis to review the potential impacts of the improvements. The City has also prepared the Addendum to the Traffic Impact Operations Analysis Proposed Los Alamitos Boulevard Median Improvement Project, LLC (February 2018) to address potential traffic impacts associated with roadway improvement project.

The Los Alamitos Improvements are not expected to cause new or more severe impacts and the findings of the Traffic Study still adequately assess all potential adverse effects from the project.
The Los Alamitos Boulevard roadway improvements affect the following two study area intersections:

- Los Alamitos Boulevard at Cerritos Avenue
- Los Alamitos Boulevard at Sausalito Street

The changes in lane geometry and level of service as a result of the Los Alamitos Boulevard roadway improvements are shown in Table 1.

**TABLE 1**

Intersection Level of Service Analysis  
Opening Year (2020) With Project Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Intersection Approach Lane(s)^2</th>
<th>V/C Ratio^4</th>
<th>Level of Service^5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Los Alamitos Blvd at Cerritos Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Traffic Study Configuration</td>
<td>2.0 2.5 0.5</td>
<td>1.0 2.5 0.5</td>
<td>1.0 2.0 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improvements</td>
<td>2.0 2.5 0.5</td>
<td>1.0 2.0 1.0</td>
<td>1.0 2.0 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Los Alamitos Blvd at Sausalito Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Traffic Study Configuration</td>
<td>1.0 2.5 0.5</td>
<td>1.0 2.5 0.5</td>
<td>0.0 1! 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improvements</td>
<td>1.0 2.0 1.0</td>
<td>1.0 2.0 1.0*</td>
<td>0.0 1! 0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Defacto right turn lane

As shown in Table 1, the Los Alamitos Boulevard roadway improvements do not significantly change the level of service operations and findings of the traffic study at the study area intersections.

For the intersection of Los Alamitos Boulevard at Cerritos Avenue, level of service remains at LOS C, which is acceptable in the Los Alamitos General Plan.

For the intersection of Los Alamitos Boulevard at Sausalito Avenue, level of service is shown to degrade from LOS A to LOS C in the AM peak hour and LOS B to LOS C in the PM Peak hour.
While the roadway improvements have slightly decreased the capacity of Los Alamitos Boulevard, overall traffic operations are still within the acceptable limits under the future cumulative conditions (worst-case). Therefore, no significant impacts are expected to result from the Los Alamitos Improvements and the findings of the Traffic Study still adequately assess all potential adverse effects from the project.

2. **Village 605 Project**

It was brought to RK’s attention that the Village 605 project will no longer be developed as a retail/commercial center and will instead consist of office land uses. A concern was raised by the Traffic Commission as to whether the office land use would generate higher peak hour traffic than the retail center, and thereby contribute to a potential significant cumulative impact.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>Ped. Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generation Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 602: Retail Office Centre (19,000 SF)</td>
<td>3,012</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 602: Shopping Centre (19,000 SF)</td>
<td>2,795</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 602: Fast-Food Restaurant (7,000 SF)</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 602: High-Traffic Restaurant (19,000 SF)</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 602: Fast-Food with Drive-Thru (7,000 SF)</td>
<td>3,143</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Office Buildings (19,000 SF)</td>
<td>1,765</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 602: Retail (21,400 SF)</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 602: Shopping Centre (21,400 SF)</td>
<td>3,065</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 602: Fast-Food Restaurant (7,000 SF)</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 602: High-Traffic Restaurant (19,000 SF)</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 602: Fast-Food with Drive-Thru (7,000 SF)</td>
<td>3,540</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Trip Generation</strong></td>
<td>10,470</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Project Trip Generation</strong> (Proposed Project - Existing Use)</td>
<td>8,659</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Village 605 Traffic Impact Analysis, LLG, October 12, 2016. Table 5-1, Page 21.
As shown in Table 2, the Traffic Impact Analysis for the Village 605 project, prepared by LLG (October 2016) compares existing office uses to proposed retail uses. The result is a net increase in trips during both AM and PM peak hours from the retail uses. Retail is shown to generate 166 additional trips in the AM peak hour, 267 additional trips in the PM peak hour and 8,689 additional trips over a 24-hour period.

Therefore, the cumulative project list used in the Traffic Study, which assumes retail uses for Village 605, is conservative and no additional impacts would be expected to result from the change in use for project Village 605.

3. **School Peak Hour Traffic**

A concern was raised by the Traffic Commission as to why the Traffic Study did not analyze the afternoon peak pick-up time period for school traffic. There are two primary reasons why the afternoon school traffic conditions are not analyzed. First, the proposed residential land uses have a different afternoon peak periods compared to the school. Residential uses typically experience peak trip generation from 4 PM to 6 PM, while a school typically experiences peak afternoon trip generation from 2 PM to 3 PM. Second, the major arterial roadways adjacent to the site typically experience the highest volume of traffic and congestion from 4 PM to 6 PM, thus level of service is worse at these times.

While neighborhood congestion may occur during school pick up times, the project would not generate enough traffic during these times to trigger significant impacts.

4. **Red Curb Removal on Chestnut Street**

The project will remove the existing driveway, curb cuts, and red painted curb on Chestnut Street that previously served the driveway access to the property. Approximately 12 feet of red curb will be removed south of the driveway, 15 feet of red curb will be removed north of the driveway and the total amount of on-street parking gained will be approximately 63 feet.

The removal of the red curb and driveway will provide sufficient space for approximately three (3) new on-street parking spaces along Chestnut Street.
5. **SCAG Transit Priority Area**

The project site is located within a Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) designated Transit Priority Area and High Quality Transit Area. In the 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategies, SCAG recommends increasing the amount of high quality housing and employment opportunities in this area to take advantage of accessible transit options.

It should be noted that the Los Alamitos Luxury Apartment Traffic Impact Study was thoroughly scoped and reviewed by the City of Los Alamitos Engineering and Planning Departments and reviewed by the City’s CEQA consultant. All potential impacts were found to be adequately addressed per City of Los Alamitos and State of California standards.

RK Engineering Group, Inc. is please to assist the HUTTON COMPANIES and the CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS with this project. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact us at (949) 474-0809.

Sincerely,
RK ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.

![Signature]

Bryan Estrada, AICP, PTP
Senior Associate
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Attachment A
Level of Service Calculation Worksheets
LOS ALAMITOS LUXURY APARTMENTS TIS
OPENING YEAR PLUS CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT CONDITION
AM PEAK HOUR

Level Of Service Computation Report
ICU 1 (Loss as Cycle Length %) Method (Future Volume Alternative)

Intersection #6 Los Alamitos Boulevard / Cerritos Avenue

| Cycle (sec): | 100 | Critical Vol./Cap.(X): | 0.752 |
| Loss Time (sec): | 5 | Average Delay (sec/veh): | xxxxxx |
| Optimal Cycle: | 44 | Level Of Service: | C |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach:</th>
<th>North Bound</th>
<th>South Bound</th>
<th>East Bound</th>
<th>West Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control:</th>
<th>Protected</th>
<th>Protected</th>
<th>Protected</th>
<th>Protected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rights:</td>
<td>Include</td>
<td>Include</td>
<td>Include</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Green:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y+R:</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanes:</td>
<td>2 0 2 1 0</td>
<td>1 0 2 0 1</td>
<td>1 0 2 0 1</td>
<td>1 0 2 0 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume Module:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Vol:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Adj:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Base:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added Vol:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reroute:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Fut:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Adj:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHF Adj:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHF Volume:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Vol:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLF Adj:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Volume:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Saturation Flow Module:
| Sat/Lane: | 1900 1900 1900 | 1900 1900 1900 | 1900 1900 1900 | 1900 1900 1900 |
| Adjustment: | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Lanes: | 2.00 2.03 0.97 | 1.00 2.00 1.00 | 1.00 2.00 1.00 | 1.00 2.00 1.00 |
| Final Sat: | 3400 3453 1647 | 1700 3400 1955 | 1700 3400 1955 | 1700 3400 1955 |

Capacity Analysis Module:
| Vol/Sat: | 0.07 0.22 0.22 | 0.07 0.22 0.22 | 0.07 0.22 0.22 | 0.07 0.22 0.22 |
| Crit Moves: | **** | **** | **** | **** |

Traffix 8.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to RK ENGINEERING GROUP
**Level Of Service Computation Report**

**Intersection #6 Los Alamitos Boulevard / Cerritos Avenue**

**Cycle (sec):** 100  
**Critical Vol./Cap.(X):** 0.753

**Loss Time (sec):** 5  
**Average Delay (sec/veh):** xxxxxx

**Optimal Cycle:** 44  
**Level Of Service:** C

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>North Bound</th>
<th>South Bound</th>
<th>East Bound</th>
<th>West Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movement</td>
<td>L - T - R</td>
<td>L - T - R</td>
<td>L - T - R</td>
<td>L - T - R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Protected</td>
<td>Protected</td>
<td>Protected</td>
<td>Protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights</td>
<td>Include</td>
<td>Include</td>
<td>Include</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Green</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y+R:</td>
<td>4.0 4.0 4.0</td>
<td>4.0 4.0 4.0</td>
<td>4.0 4.0 4.0</td>
<td>4.0 4.0 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanes:</td>
<td>2 0 2 1 0</td>
<td>1 0 2 0 1</td>
<td>1 0 2 0 1</td>
<td>1 0 2 0 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Volume Module:**

| Base Vol: | 263 890 | 313 89 635 57 | 157 847 209 | 216 994 157 |
| Growth Adj: | 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 |
| Initial Base: | 268 908 | 319 91 648 58 | 160 864 213 | 220 1014 160 |
| Added Vol: | 2 54 | 1 0 97 6 3 6 1 2 10 0 |
| Beroute: | 25 0 | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 |
| Initial Fut: | 295 962 | 320 91 745 64 | 163 870 214 | 222 1024 160 |
| User Adj: | 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 |
| PHF Adj: | 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 |
| PHF Volume: | 295 962 | 320 91 745 64 | 163 870 214 | 222 1024 160 |
| Reduct Vol: | 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 |
| Reduced Vol: | 295 962 | 320 91 745 64 | 163 870 214 | 222 1024 160 |
| PCE Adj: | 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 |
| MLP Adj: | 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 |
| Final Volume: | 295 962 | 320 91 745 64 | 163 870 214 | 222 1024 160 |

---

**Saturation Flow Module:**

| Sat/Lane: | 1900 1900 | 1900 1900 | 1900 1900 | 1900 1900 |
| Adjustment: | 0.89 0.89 | 0.89 0.89 1.03 | 0.89 0.89 1.03 | 0.89 0.89 1.03 |
| Lanes: | 2.00 2.25 0.75 | 1.00 2.00 1.00 | 1.00 2.00 1.00 | 1.00 2.00 1.00 |
| Final Sat.: | 3400 3826 1274 | 1700 3400 1955 | 1700 3400 1955 | 1700 3400 1955 |

---

**Capacity Analysis Module:**

| Vol/Sat: | 0.09 0.25 0.25 0.05 0.22 0.03 | 0.10 0.26 0.11 0.13 0.30 0.08 |
| Crit Moves: | **** | **** | **** | **** |

---

Traffic 8.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to RK ENGINEERING GROUP
LOS ALAMITOS LUXURY APARTMENTS TIS
OPENING YEAR PLUS CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT CONDITION
AM PEAK HOUR

Level Of Service Computation Report

ICU 1 (Loss as Cycle Length %) Method (Future Volume Alternative)

Intersection #7 Los Alamitos Boulevard / Sausalito Street

Cycle (sec): 100
Loss Time (sec): 5
Optimal Cycle: 33
Critical Vol./Cap.(X): 0.659
Average Delay (sec/veh): xxxxxx
Level Of Service: B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>North Bound</th>
<th>South Bound</th>
<th>East Bound</th>
<th>West Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movement</td>
<td>L - T - R</td>
<td>L - T - R</td>
<td>L - T - R</td>
<td>L - T - R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Green:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y+R:</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanes:</td>
<td>1 0 2 0 1</td>
<td>1 0 2 0 1</td>
<td>1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>1 0 1 0 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Volume Module:

| Base Vol: | 72 1114 32 | 84 998 59 | 104 26 42 | 45 8 43 |
| Growth Adj: | 1.02 1.02 1.02 | 1.02 1.02 1.02 | 1.02 1.02 1.02 | 1.02 1.02 1.02 |
| Initial Base: | 73 1136 33 | 86 1018 60 | 106 27 49 | 46 8 44 |
| Added Vol: | 2 63 0 | 0 34 2 | 9 1 8 | 11 0 0 |
| Reroute: | 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 | 46 0 0 | 0 0 0 |
| Initial Fut: | 75 1199 33 | 86 1052 62 | 163 28 51 | 57 8 44 |
| User Adj: | 1.00 1.00 1.00 | 1.00 1.00 1.00 | 1.00 1.00 1.00 | 1.00 1.00 1.00 |
| PHF Adj: | 1.00 1.00 1.00 | 1.00 1.00 1.00 | 1.00 1.00 1.00 | 1.00 1.00 1.00 |
| PHF Volume: | 75 1199 33 | 86 1052 62 | 163 28 51 | 57 8 44 |
| Reduced Vol: | 75 1199 33 | 86 1052 62 | 163 28 51 | 57 8 44 |
| PCN Adj: | 1.00 1.00 1.00 | 1.00 1.00 1.00 | 1.00 1.00 1.00 | 1.00 1.00 1.00 |
| MLP Adj: | 1.00 1.00 1.00 | 1.00 1.00 1.00 | 1.00 1.00 1.00 | 1.00 1.00 1.00 |
| Final Volume: | 75 1199 33 | 86 1052 62 | 163 28 51 | 57 8 44 |

Saturation Flow Module:

| Sat./Lane: | 1900 1900 | 1900 1900 | 1900 1900 | 1900 1900 |
| Adjustment: | 0.89 0.89 1.00 | 0.89 0.89 1.00 | 0.89 0.89 1.00 | 0.89 0.89 1.00 |
| Lanes: | 1.00 2.00 1.00 | 1.00 2.00 1.00 | 0.68 0.68 1.00 | 0.53 0.53 0.70 |
| Final Sat.: | 1700 3400 1900 | 1700 3400 1900 | 1148 194 358 | 888 127 685 |

Capacity Analysis Module:

| Vol/Sat: | 0.04 0.35 0.02 | 0.05 0.31 0.03 | 0.14 0.14 0.14 | 0.06 0.06 0.06 |
| Crit Moves: | **** | **** | **** | **** |

Traffix 8.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to RK ENGINEERING GROUP
LOS ALAMITOS LUXURY APARTMENTS TIS
OPENING YEAR PLUS CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT CONDITION
PM PEAK HOUR

Level Of Service Computation Report

LCU 1(Loss as Cycle Length %) Method (Future Volume Alternative)

Intersection #7 Los Alamitos Boulevard / Sausalito Street

Cycle (sec): 100  Critical Vol./Cap.(X): 0.734
Loss Time (sec): 5  Average Delay (sec/veh): xxxxxx
Optimal Cycle: 41  Level Of Service: C

Approach: North Bound  South Bound  East Bound  West Bound
Movement:  L - T - R  L - T - R  L - T - R  L - T - R

Control:  Protect.  Protect.  Split Phase  Split Phase
          Include      Include                  Include
Min. Green: 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
Y+R: 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0
Lanes: 1 0 2 0 1 1 0 2 0 1 0 0 1 0 0

Volume Module:
Base Vol: 35 1241 7 105 913 31 80 19 24 71 17 128
Growth Adj: 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02 1.02
Initial Base: 36 1266 7 107 931 32 82 19 24 72 17 131
Added Vol: 7 52 0 0 92 8 5 0 4 16 1 0
Reroute: 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
Initial Fut: 43 1318 7 107 1023 40 112 19 28 88 18 131
User Adj: 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00
PHF Adj: 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00
PHF Volume: 43 1318 7 107 1023 40 112 19 28 88 18 131
Reduc Vol: 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
Reduced Vol: 43 1318 7 107 1023 40 112 19 28 88 18 131
PCE Adj: 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00
MLF Adj: 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00
Final Volume: 43 1318 7 107 1023 40 112 19 28 88 18 131

Saturation Flow Module:
Sat./Lanes: 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900
Adjustment: 0.89 0.89 1.00 0.89 0.89 1.00 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89
Lanes: 1.00 2.00 1.00 1.00 2.00 1.00 0.70 0.12 0.18 0.37 0.08 0.55
Final Sat.: 1700 3400 1900 1700 3400 1900 1190 207 304 633 131 935

Capacity Analysis Module:
Vol./Sat: 0.03 0.39 0.00 0.06 0.30 0.02 0.09 0.09 0.09 0.14 0.14 0.14
Crit Moves: **** **** **** ****

Traffic 8.0.0715 (c) 2008 Dowling Assoc. Licensed to RK ENGINEERING GROUP
Attachment B
Photographs
Chestnut Street Red Curb and Driveway to be Removed

Photo #1
Chestnut Street Red Curb and Driveway to be Removed

Photo #2
Chestnut Street Red Curb and Driveway to be Removed

Photo #3