CHAPTER 2

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

INTRODUCTION

The environmental checklist provides a standard evaluation tool to identify a project's adverse environmental impacts. This checklist identifies and evaluates potential adverse environmental impacts that may be created by the proposed project.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Title:	2315 East Dominguez Renovation Project
Lead Agency Name:	City of Carson
Lead Agency Address:	701 E. Carson St., Carson, California 90745
Contact Person:	McKina Alexander, Assistant Planner
Contact Phone Number:	(310) 952-1761, extension 1317
Project Location:	2315 East Dominguez Street, Carson CA 90810
Project Sponsor's Name:	Terreno Realty Corporation
Project Sponsor's Address:	101 Montgomery Street, Suite 200 San Francisco, CA 94104
General Plan Designation:	Heavy Industrial
Zoning:	Manufacturing, Heavy (D Overlay)
Description of Project:	Terreno Realty Corporation is proposing to renovate an existing site in the City of Carson to prepare for a new tenant, which is likely to be Federal Express. These renovations would include patching and repairing the paving systems on the site, updating the building interior, repainting the main building, landscaping improvements, upgrading of the existing fence along the property line, providing ADA parking and access upgrades, and improving the façade along East Dominguez Street.
Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:	Land uses surrounding the proposed project site are primarily industrial with a few commercial properties.
Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:	None
Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan	Tribes that requested notice of projects within the City have been noticed per the requirements of AB52. The Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians requested consultation and the City discussed the project with Tribe representatives on March 27, 2019.

for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures for confidentiality, etc.?

City representatives discussed the details of the project with Mr. Salas and other members of the Tribe on March 27, 2019. Mr. Salas provided background on the historic uses of the area by the Tribe, particularly the use of the Alameda Corridor, and expressed concerns regarding grading of the site. The Tribe was informed that the proposed project will not result in grading of the site, as the site has already been graded and developed.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The following environmental impact areas have been assessed to determine their potential to be affected by the proposed project. As indicated by the checklist on the following pages, environmental topics marked with an "✓" may be adversely affected by the proposed project. An explanation relative to the determination of impacts can be found following the checklist for each area.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☐ Geology & Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology & Water Quality	☐ Land Use & Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise	☐ Population & Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities & Services Systems	☐ Wildfire	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☑ I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and that 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 significant effects 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.

July 3, 2019

Signature: Date:

Max Castillo

Printed Name

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 will 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, 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 (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).

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 Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the 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.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
I.	**AESTHETICS**. Except as provided in PRC §21099, would the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b)	Substantially damage to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c)	In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.	☐	☐	☐	☑
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☑	☐

1.1 Significance Criteria

The proposed project impacts on aesthetics will be considered significant if:

The project will block views from a scenic highway or corridor.

The project will adversely affect the visual continuity of the surrounding area.

The impacts on light and glare will be considered significant if the project adds lighting which would add glare to residential areas or sensitive receptors.

1.2 Setting and Impacts

1. a) and b). No Impact. There are no designated scenic resources or scenic vistas within the City of Carson (City of Carson, 2004). The nearest officially designated Scenic Highway to the Carson Area is Route 2 (Angeles Crest Scenic Byway) near La Canada/Flintridge, in the northeastern portion of Los Angeles County (Caltrans, 2019). It is approximately 25 miles north of Carson to the most southern portion of Route 2. Therefore, the project site is not visible from Route 2 due to the distance as well as the presence of numerous large buildings of downtown Los Angeles, and the intervening topography (hills and mountains) between downtown Los Angeles and the beginning of Route 2 near La Canada/Flintridge.

Route 110, the Arroyo Seco Historic Parkway, is a designated Historic Parkway, as it is the first freeway in California. The Historic Parkway is located in the City of Pasadena and runs approximately six miles north along Interstate 110 (Caltrans, 2019). It is approximately 18 miles north of the project site to the most southern portion of the Arroyo Seco Historic Parkway. Therefore, the project site is not visible from the historic portion of Route 110 due to the distance as well as the presence of numerous large buildings of downtown Los Angeles, and the intervening topography (hills and mountains) between downtown Los Angeles and the beginning of the Arroyo Seco Historic Parkway.

The nearest roadway, which is eligible for State Scenic Highway Designation, to the project site is Route 1 (Pacific Coast Highway at State Route 19 – Lakewood Boulevard, in Long Beach) in the southernmost portion of Los Angeles County. It is approximately six miles from the project site to the intersection of State Route 19, where Route 1 becomes eligible to become a State Scenic Highway. The project site is not visible from Route 1 at State Route 19 due to the distance, numerous structures, and topography between the two locations. There are no officially designated Scenic Highways or highways eligible for State Scenic Highway Designation in the vicinity of the Wilmington and Carson Operations. Because of the substantial distance between the proposed project and the aforementioned scenic highways, no significant adverse impacts to scenic highways are expected. In addition, there are no other scenic resources, such as trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within the vicinity of the proposed project so no impacts to these resources would occur.

1. c) No Impact. The proposed changes to the project site are minor modifications to an existing industrial site, and include repaving, updating building interiors, painting the office/warehouse building, minor landscaping improvements, and repair of the existing fence along the property line. These project components all aim to prepare the site for new tenancy by improving the site, including the overall aesthetic value of the property. Furthermore, the proposed changes are consistent with the City of Carson's zoning designation.

All construction and operational activities will take place within the boundaries of the existing property except repairing of the fence line, which may require equipment use

along the border of the property line. Construction activities are temporary in nature and all construction equipment will be removed following completion of construction activities. Operation of the facility would not significantly change the current aesthetic character of the facility, other than trailers would be temporarily parked on the site. The proposed use of the site would be compatible with the industrial uses north and south of the project site that support container/truck parking, as well as warehouses, e.g., XPO Logistics, NYK Logistics, and World Logistics. The piping associated with the pipe storage yard has been removed and repaving the site and installing new fencing, as well as new landscaping, would improve the aesthetic characteristics of the site. Thus, the proposed project is expected to have an aesthetic benefit and will not degrade or change the existing character of the site or its surroundings.

1. d) Less Than Significant. Modifications to project site are not anticipated to require additional lighting. All construction is expected to take place during daylight hours within the existing 2315 E. Dominguez Street property so no additional lighting would be required during construction. Additional outdoor light sources are not expected to be required as part of the facility modifications. However, should they be necessary, any new lighting would adhere to the City's Zoning Code Section 9147, Exterior Lighting, that requires light sources be shielded, oriented towards the project site and away from adjacent properties to avoid light spill, etc. Therefore, no significant impacts to light and glare are anticipated from the proposed project.

1.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to aesthetics and light and glare are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation or the project; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

II. AGRICULTURE and FOREST RESOURCES.

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

a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☑
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))?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☑
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?	☐	☐	☐	☑

2.1 Significance Criteria

Project-related impacts on agricultural resources will be considered significant if any of the following conditions are met:

> The proposed project conflicts with existing zoning or agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts.
>
> The proposed project will convert prime farmland, unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the farmland mapping and monitoring program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.
>
> The proposed project would involve changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.
>
> The proposed project would convert forest land to non-forest land or result in changes that could result in the conversion of forest land to non-forest land.

2.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

2. a), b) & e) No Impact. Land in the vicinity of the proposed project site is zoned for heavy industrial use and no agricultural uses occur in the area. The proposed site renovations will occur within the boundaries of the existing 2315 E. Dominguez Street property and no agricultural uses are located on or adjacent to the project site. Land uses surrounding the project site are industrial or commercial. The proposed project does not conflict with an existing agricultural zone or Williamson Act contract and does not include converting agricultural land for non-agricultural uses. The project is not expected to result in any impacts to agricultural resources.

2. c) & d) No Impact. Land in the vicinity of the project site is zoned for heavy industrial use. The project will occur within the boundaries of the existing 2315 E. Dominguez Street property and no forest or timber land uses are located within or adjacent to the project site. The surrounding land uses are industrial or commercial. The proposed project does not conflict with existing zoning for forest resources, does not include the loss of forest land or convert forest land to non-forest land. The project is not expected to result in any impacts to forest land resources.

2.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to agriculture and forest resources are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation of the project; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY.				
When available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a non-attainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	☐	☐	☑	☐
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☑	☐
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting substantial number of people?)	☐	☐	☐	☑

3.1 Significance Criteria

Impacts will be evaluated and compared to the significance criteria in Table 2-1. If impacts equal or exceed any of the criteria in Table 2-1, they will be considered significant.

TABLE 2-1

Air Quality Significance Thresholds

Mass Daily Thresholds[a]		
Pollutant	**Construction[b]**	**Operation[c]**
NO_x	100 lb/day	55 lb/day
VOC	75 lb/day	55 lb/day
PM10	150 lb/day	150 lb/day
PM2.5	55 lb/day	55 lb/day
SOx	150 lb/day	150 lb/day
CO	550 lb/day	550 lb/day
Lead	3 lb/day	3 lb/day
Toxic Air Contaminants, Odor, and GHG Thresholds		
TACs (including carcinogens and non-carcinogens)	Maximum Incremental Cancer Risk $\geq$ 10 in 1 million Chronic and Acute Hazard Index $\geq$ 1.0 (project increment) Cancer Burden $\geq$ 0.5 excess cancer cases (in areas $\geq$ 1 in 1 million)	
Odor	Project creates an odor nuisance pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 402	
Ambient Air Quality for Criteria Pollutants[d]		
NO_2 1-hour average annual average	In attainment; significant if project causes or contributes to an exceedance of any standard: 0.18 ppm (state) and 0.100 (federal)[e] 0.03 ppm (state) and 0.0534 ppm (federal)	
PM10 24-hour annual average	10.4 $\mu g/m^3$ (construction)[f] and 2.5 $\mu g/m^3$ (operation) 1.0 $\mu g/m^3$	
PM2.5 24-hour average	10.4 $\mu g/m^3$ (construction)[f] and 2.5 $\mu g/m^3$ (operation)	
SO_2 1-hour average 24-hour average	0.255 ppm (state) and 0.075 ppm (federal – 99th percentile) 0.04 ppm (state)	
Sulfate 24-hour average	25 $\mu g/m^3$ (state)	
CO 1-hour average 8-hour average	In attainment; significant if project causes or contributes to an exceedance of any standard: 20 ppm (state) and 35 ppm (federal) 9.0 ppm (state/federal)	
Lead 30-day average Rolling 3-month average Quarterly average	1.5 $\mu g/m^3$ (state) 0.15$\mu g/m^3$ (federal) 1.5$\mu g/m^3$ (federal)	

a) Source: SCAQMD CEQA Handbook (SCAQMD, 1993)
b) Construction thresholds apply to both the SCAB and Coachella Valley (Salton Sea and Mojave Desert Air Basin)
c) For Coachella Valley, the mass daily thresholds for operation are the same as the construction thresholds.
d) Ambient air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants based on SCAQMD Rule 1303, Table A-2 unless otherwise stated.
e) The federal threshold has not been adopted for general use yet by SCAQMD, but as it is a federal requirement for permits being issued for this project.
f) Ambient air quality threshold based on SCAQMD Rule 403.

KEY: ppm = parts per million; $\mu g/m^3$ = microgram per cubic meter; lb/day = pounds per day; MT/yr CO2eq = metric tons per year of CO_2 equivalents, $\geq$ greater than or equal to, > = greater than

3.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

3. a) No Impact. The project is located in the South Coast Air Basin. The most recent air plan for the South Coast Air Basin is the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The 2016 AQMP demonstrates that the applicable ambient air quality standards can be achieved in the South Coast Air Basin within the timeframes required under federal law (SCAQMD, 2016). An inventory of existing emissions in the Basin is included in the baseline inventory in the AQMP. The AQMP identifies emission reductions from existing sources and air pollution control measures that are necessary in order to comply with the state and federal ambient air quality standards (SCAQMD, 2016). The control strategies in the AQMP are based on projections from the local general plans provided by the cities and counties in the district. Projects that are consistent with the local General Plans are consistent with the air quality related regional plans. The City of Carson General Plan designates the project site as heavy industrial. The proposed renovations to the site continue the use of the site for heavy industrial activities and are consistent with the Carson General Plan. Additionally, growth projections from local general plans adopted by cities in the District are some of the inputs used to develop the AQMP. As indicated in the Population and Housing section, the proposed project will not require additional employees. Therefore, the proposed project will not cause increases in the growth projections in the City of Carson General Plan, and is consistent with the AQMP. Further, as discussed in 3 b) and c) below, the proposed project will not exceed the SCAQMD-established regional significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants.

3. b) and c) **Less Than Significant. Construction Emissions:** Construction activities associated with the proposed project would result in emissions of carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM10), particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM2.5), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), nitrogen oxides (NOx) and sulfur oxides (SOx). Construction activities include remodeling the existing office/warehouse building, laying new asphalt on top of the existing base, and painting of the existing office/warehouse building.

Daily construction emissions were calculated for all construction activities. Construction emissions are the sum of the highest daily emissions from employee vehicles, fugitive dust sources, construction equipment, and transport activities for the construction period. The peak day is based on the day in which the highest emissions occur for each pollutant during construction activities. The proposed project construction emissions were calculated using California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2) for most construction and operation emissions and the Environmental Protection Agency Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors (AP-42) Section 11.19.2 for onsite asphalt/concrete recycling emissions.

CalEEMod is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies, land use planners, and environmental professionals to quantify potential criteria pollutant emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects. The model quantifies

direct emissions from construction and operation activities (including vehicle use), as well as indirect emissions, such as greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from energy use, solid waste disposal, vegetation planting and/or removal, and water use. Further, the model identifies mitigation measures to reduce criteria pollutant and GHG emissions along with calculating the benefits achieved from mitigation measures chosen by the user. The model requires land use inputs to calculate the construction and operational emissions associated with the project. The model does not quantify fugitive dust emission from crushing activities; therefore, AP-42 was used to calculate fugitive dust emission associated with the crushing activities.

The CalEEMod model was developed for the California Air Pollution Officers Association (CAPCOA) in collaboration with the California Air Districts. Default data (e.g., emission factors, trip lengths, meteorology, source inventory, etc.) have been provided by the various California Air Districts to account for local requirements and conditions. Therefore, CalEEMod is an acceptable model to estimate construction and operational emissions for the proposed project. All emission calculations are presented in Appendix A.

The construction emission estimates are based on the demolition of the existing asphalt/concrete (includes concrete/asphalt recycling), remodeling the existing office/warehouse building, and repaving the asphalt area. Construction is anticipated to last about 2 months. Construction emissions assumptions include the use of air compressors, concrete saws, crushing equipment, mixers, loaders, dozers, pavers, rollers, manlifts, excavators, and forklifts. The construction activities are expected to include a staff of up to 25 workers per day, 20 to 40 delivery trucks per day, and approximately 3 to 5 trucks to remove demolition materials during construction.

The construction emissions assume physical construction activities would occur during the calendar year 2019. Table 2-2 summarizes the emissions for the construction.

TABLE 2-2

Peak Construction Emissions[(1)]

Year of Activity	Peak Daily Emissions (lbs/day)					
	CO	**VOC**	**NOx**	**SOx**	**PM10**	**PM2.5**
Construction[(2)]	16.3	2.6	24.0	<0.1	4.8	2.1
SCAQMD Threshold	**550**	**75**	**100**	**150**	**150**	**55**
Threshold Exceeded? [(3)]	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

(1) See Appendix A for CalEEMod results.
(2) Includes compliance with applicable SCAQMD rules regarding control of particulate emissions.
(3) SCAQMD Threshold = threshold criteria for determining environmental significance of construction activities, as provided in the South Coast Air Quality Management District's 1993 Handbook for Air Quality Analysis, see Table 2-1.

Air quality impacts are expected to be reduced through compliance with SCAQMD rules and regulations. VOC emissions associated with the use of architectural coatings are

reduced by the use of coatings that are SCAQMD Rule 1113 compliant. Particulate matter emissions are reduced through compliance with dust control measures from SCAQMD Rule 403 which requires pre-watering of the site prior to earth-moving activities to minimize visible dust plume, limit vehicular traffic and speeds on dirt roads, provide track-out prevention devices, and other best available control measures applicable to all construction activities.

The onsite construction emissions were also compared to the SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds (SCAQMD, 2008) (see Table 2-3) for a five-acre project. Construction activities are expected to be limited to a maximum of about five acres during peak construction activities. The localized significance thresholds are used to determine whether or not a project may generate significant adverse air quality impacts to the local sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the proposed project. The project site is located in source receptor area 4 (South Coastal Los Angeles County). The estimated construction emissions associated with construction of the proposed project were compared to the localized significance thresholds for CO, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5 (see Table 2-3). In all cases, the construction emissions were below the localized significance thresholds (see Appendix A). Therefore, no significant localized air quality impacts are expected.

TABLE 2-3

Localized Emission Impacts Analysis

	On-site Source Emissions (lbs/day)					
Source/Activity	**CO**	**VOC**	**NOx**	**SOx**	**PM10**	**PM2.5**
Peak On-site Emissions	15.6	2.5	22.5	<0.1	4.6	2.1
Screening Value (1)	4,184	NA	141	NA	92	39
Significant?	-	No	No	-	No	No

(1) Screening values for LST analysis from SCAQMD Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology, Appendix C for SRA No. 4 for five-acre sites at 200 meters (October 2009).

The proposed project will comply with existing air quality rules and regulations that apply to construction activities including the following:

- Construction activities must comply with the SCAQMD's Rule 403 – Control of Fugitive Dust Emissions in order to minimize particulate matter emissions on adjacent areas.

- Architectural coatings during the construction phase shall comply with SCAQMD's Rule 1113 – Architectural Coatings in order to minimize VOC emissions.

Operational Emissions

The emissions related to the operation of the existing and proposed project include emissions from mobile sources and area sources (natural gas use, landscaping activities, etc.). Air emissions are generated by the existing office/warehouse building, as well as by the pipe laydown area. The existing operations include emissions from 10 workers (light duty trucks) and 15 delivery trucks (heavy-heavy duty trucks) on both the peak day and annual average day. The operational emissions for the proposed project were also estimated using CalEEMod for operating year 2019. The proposed project operations include emissions from three workers and up to 100 delivery vans, trailers and trucks on the peak day and three workers and 50 delivery vans, trailers and trucks on an annual average day. Criteria pollutant CEQA thresholds are based on peak day emissions and are present in Table 2-4. Annual emissions, which are based on an average day, are used for greenhouse gas emission analysis, and further discussed in Section VIII.

Table 2-4 reports the peak operational emissions for the existing as well as the proposed project. The difference between the existing emissions and the proposed project emissions during the operational phase are compared to the SCAQMD CEQA thresholds in Table 2-4. The estimated net increase in operational emissions associated with the proposed project is expected to be less than the SCAQMD CEQA thresholds so that no significant impacts on air quality are expected during the operation of the proposed project.

TABLE 2-4

Operational Emissions Increases

Activity	**Emissions (lbs/day, 24 hr/day)**					
	CO	**VOC**	**NOx**	**SOx**	**PM10**	**PM2.5**
Existing Emissions						
Existing Area Source Emissions	<0.1	0.4	<0.1	0.0	<0.1	<0.1
Existing Energy Emissions	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Existing Vehicle Emissions	0.9	<0.1	0.3	<0.1	0.2	<0.1
Total Existing Emissions	**0.9**	**0.4**	**0.3**	**<0.1**	**0.2**	**<0.1**
Proposed Project Emissions						
Proposed Area Source Emissions	<0.1	0.4	<0.1	0.0	<0.1	<0.1
Proposed Energy Emissions	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Proposed Vehicle Emissions	3.6	0.5	18.0	<0.1	0.8	0.3
Total Proposed Project Emissions	**-3.6**	**0.8**	**18.0**	**<0.1**	**0.8**	**0.3**
Net Project Emissions (Project Emissions – Existing Emissions)	**2.7**	**0.4**	**17.7**	**<0.1**	**0.6**	**0.3**
SCAQMD Threshold	550	55	55	150	150	55
Significant?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

See Appendix A for model results.

The proposed project will not change the land use of the proposed project. No new TAC emissions are expected to be created from the proposed project. As discussed in Section 17 below, the proposed project is expected to result in a reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). A reduction in VMT also results in a reduction in truck emissions, including TAC emissions and an overall reduction in health risk. Since emissions from activities at the site are not expected to change significantly; the proposed project is not expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial emissions. Further, the closest residential receptors (sensitive receptors) are located about 0.25 mile east of the project site, adjacent to the Alameda Corridor. Air quality impacts to sensitive receptors, as well as, impacts related to toxic air contaminants are expected to be less than significant.

Related projects could contribute to an existing or projected air quality exceedance because the South Coast Air Basin is currently in nonattainment for certain criteria pollutants. SCAQMD published the *White Paper on Potential Control Strategies to Address Cumulative Impacts from Air Pollution* on how to address cumulative impacts from air pollution. In this document, the SCAQMD clearly states the following (SCAQMD, 2003):

> "Projects that exceed the project-specific significance thresholds are considered by the SCAQMD to be cumulatively considerable. This is the reason project-specific and cumulative significance thresholds are the same. Conversely, projects that do not exceed the project-specific thresholds are generally not considered to be cumulatively significant."

Therefore, this analysis assumes that individual projects that do not generate operational or construction emissions that exceed the SCAQMD's recommended daily thresholds for project-specific impacts would also not cause a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the South Coast Air Basin is in nonattainment and, therefore, would not be considered to have a significant, adverse air quality impact. Alternatively, individual project-related construction and operational emissions that exceed SCAQMD thresholds for project-specific impacts would be considered cumulatively considerable. The project will not exceed the applicable SCAQMD regional thresholds for construction and operational-source emissions; therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively significant impact for construction or operational activity.

3. d) Less Than Significant. No emissions are expected during either the construction or operational phases that are expected to generate odors. Emissions are limited to construction equipment and mobile sources so that no significant odor impacts are expected.

3.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to air quality are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation or the project; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV.	**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	☑
e)	Conflicting with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☑
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☑

4.1 Significance Criteria

The impacts on biological resources will be considered significant if any of the following criteria apply:

> The project results in a loss of plant communities or animal habitat considered to be rare, threatened or endangered by federal, state or local agencies.
>
> The project interferes substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory wildlife species.
>
> The project adversely affects aquatic communities through construction or operation of the project.

4.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

4. a), b), c), d), e), and f) No Impact. The proposed project will be located in a heavy industrial area, entirely within the boundaries of the existing property. The property has been fully developed and is largely void of vegetation with the exception of some sparse landscape vegetation. The project will repave an existing paved site and landscape vegetation will be improved as part of the renovations to the site.

The proposed project is not expected to have a significant adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a special status species as habitat is nonexistent. The proposed project will not have an adverse effect, either directly or indirectly or through habitat modifications, on any sensitive biological species, riparian habitat, or other sensitive natural habitat. The project will not result in the addition or the elimination of water ponds that could be used by animals or migratory fowl. Further, the proposed project will not adversely affect federally protected wetlands as defined in §404 of the Clean Water Act, as no wetlands exist in the vicinity of the proposed project.

No significant plant or animal resources, locally designated species, natural communities, wetland habitats, or animal migration corridors would be adversely affected by the proposed project. There are no rare, endangered, or threatened species in the vicinity of the proposed project. The project would not impact any local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources or conflict with the provisions of a Habitat Conservation Plan or other similar plan. Because the area in and near the project site is devoid of native habitat, impacts to other, non-listed species are not expected. Based on the preceding discussion, no significant adverse impacts on biological resources are expected from the proposed project.

4.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to biological resources are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation or the project; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☑	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☑	☐

5.1 Significance Criteria

Impacts to cultural resources will be considered significant if:

The project results in the disturbance of a significant prehistoric or historic archaeological site or a property of historic or cultural significance to a community or ethnic or social group.

Unique paleontological resources are present that could be disturbed by construction of the proposed project.

The project would disturb human remains.

5.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

5 a) No Impact. CEQA Guidelines state that "generally, a resource shall be considered 'historically significant' if the resource meets the criteria for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources including the following:

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

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

C) 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;

D) Has yielded or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history" (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5).

Generally, resources (buildings, structures, equipment) that are less than 50 years old are excluded from listing in the National Register of Historic Places[1] unless they can be shown to be exceptionally important) (SCVTA/FTA, 2004). The buildings, structures, and equipment associated with the proposed project are not listed on registers of historic resources, and do not meet the eligibility criteria presented above (e.g., associated with historically important events or people, embodying distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction), and would not yield historically important information. The construction of the existing office/warehouse building was estimated to be completed in 1962 and is a non-descript cement block building representative of numerous other such structures in the project area. Improvements will be made to the existing office/warehouse building to improve the interior and exterior conditions (e.g., painting); however, the office/warehouse building will continue to be used and would not be demolished. The existing shed along the western boundary of the project site will be removed, but it does not qualify as an historic resource. The shed appears to have been used for truck loading activities by the previous tenants and is constructed of concrete with a metal roof which provides no historic value. No historic structures will be removed as a consequence of the project; therefore, no significant impacts to historic cultural resources are expected as a result of implementing the proposed project.

5. b) and c) Less Than Significant. No grading is required as the site has already been graded and developed. Construction activities will be limited to patching and repairing, and replacing the existing pavement and upgrades to existing office/warehouse buildings. Proposed project activities will occur in areas of the property where the ground surface has already been disturbed, and this past disturbance reduces the likelihood that previously unknown cultural resources will be encountered. Further, the proposed project site does not contain known archaeological resources and thus the proposed project also is not expected to impact any sites of archaeological value. The project will result in a change in tenants but is not expected to result in an impact on cultural resources. No human remains have been identified on or near the proposed project from previous grading. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to disturb any human remains since no grading is required.

[1] The eligibility criteria of the California Register criteria are modeled on those of the eligibility criteria of the National Register of Historic Places.

5.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to cultural resources are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation or the project; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. ENERGY.					
	Would the project:				
a)	Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operations?	☐	☐	☑	☐
b)	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☑	☐

6.1 Significance Criteria

The impacts to energy resources will be considered significant if any of the following criteria are met:

- The project conflicts with adopted energy conservation plans or standards.
- The project results in substantial depletion of existing energy resource supplies.
- An increase in demand for utilities impacts the current capacities of the electric and natural gas utilities.
- The project uses non-renewable resources in a wasteful and/or inefficient manner.

6.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

6. a) No Impact: The project will modernize the existing office/warehouse building but would not require the construction of any additional buildings. Any additional electricity that may be needed as part of construction activities associated with the proposed project would typically be supplied by the local electrical utility; however, the majority of construction equipment is diesel-powered and does not require electricity. Thus, electricity use during construction activities is not expected to increase.

Further, the project is only expected to require one guard at the site, so fewer employees will be employed at the site. Therefore, the use of electricity and natural gas is not expected to increase and may actually decrease due to the new tenant. The electricity demand will continue to be met by local suppliers and is expected to be limited to the operation of the office/warehouse building and gate. Thus, the electricity would not be

used in a wasteful or inefficient manner and the project would not have a significant impact on electricity or use electricity in a wasteful manner.

6. b) No Impact. The proposed project is not expected to conflict with any adopted energy conservation plan or existing energy standard. There is no known energy conservation plan or existing energy standard that would apply to the project site, as it involves the continued use of an industrial site for truck container parking. The City of Carson has developed a Climate Action Plan (City of Carson, 2017), which encourages increase energy efficiency and conservation. First, the project would result in a reduction of employees at the site and would be expected to result in a decrease in energy use at the site. The project would involve upgrades to an existing office/warehouse building which would be expected to result in a decrease in energy use, e.g., new light fixtures, and electrical systems will be installed which are more energy efficient. Additional landscaping is also proposed to be installed. No increase in energy is expected to be required for the proposed project; therefore, the project would not conflict with the City's Climate Action Plan, and energy impacts would be less than significant.

6.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to energy resources are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation or the project; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII.	**GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Would the project:				
a)	Directly or indirectly cause 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.	☐	☐	☑	☐
ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☑	☐
iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☑	☐
iv)	Landslides?	☐	☐	☑	☐
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☑	☐
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☑	☐
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☑
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☑
f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	☐	☐	☑	☐

7.1 Significance Criteria

The impacts on the geological environment will be considered significant if any of the following criteria apply:

Topographic alterations would result in significant changes, disruptions, displacement, excavation, compaction or over covering of large amounts of soil.

Unique geological resources (paleontological resources or unique outcrops) are present that could be disturbed by the construction of the proposed project.

Exposure of people or structures to major geologic hazards such as earthquake surface rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction or landslides.

Secondary seismic effects could occur which could damage facility structures, e.g., liquefaction.

Other geological hazards exist which could adversely affect the facility, e.g., landslides, mudslides.

7.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

7. a) Less Than Significant. The Los Angeles area is located within a seismically active region. The most significant potential geologic hazard at the project site is seismic shaking from future earthquakes generated by active or potentially active faults in the region. Seismic records have been available for the last 200 years, with improved instrumental seismic records available for the past 50 years. Based on past earthquake data, most of the earthquake epicenters occurred along the San Andreas, San Jacinto, Whittier-Elsinore and Newport-Inglewood faults (Jones and Hauksson, 1986). All of these faults are elements of the San Andreas fault system. Past experience indicates that there has not been any substantial damage, structural or otherwise, to the project site as a result of earthquakes. However, faults in the Los Angeles area are potential sources of strong ground shaking, including the following: 1) the San Andreas fault; 2) the Newport-Inglewood fault; 3) the Malibu-Santa Monica-Raymond Hills fault; 4) the Palos Verdes fault; 5) the Whittier-Elsinore fault; 6) the Sierra Madre fault; 7) the San Fernando fault; 8) the Elysian Park fault; and 9) the Torrance-Wilmington fault. The site is not located within the earthquake fault zones delineated as part of the Alquist-Priolo Special Study area for the Newport-Inglewood fault zone and is not expected to be subject to significant surface fault displacement. However, the site could be subject to seismic shaking due to future earthquakes.

In addition to the known surface faults, shallow-dipping concealed “blind” thrust faults have been postulated to underlie portions of the Los Angeles Basin. Because there exist few data to define the potential extent of rupture planes associated with these concealed thrust faults, the maximum earthquake that they might generate is largely unknown.

Based on the historical record, it is highly probable that earthquakes will affect the Los Angeles region in the future. Research shows that damaging earthquakes will occur on or near recognized faults which show evidence of recent geologic activity. The proximity of major faults to the project site increases the probability that an earthquake may adversely affect the site. There is the potential for damage to the facility in the event of an earthquake. Impacts of an earthquake could include structural failure, spill, etc.

TRC is proposing to make minor renovations to the site to upgrade the existing office/warehouse building, paving, fencing and landscaping to make improvements for a new tenant. The project will not result in the construction of any new buildings. Therefore, the project will not result in an increase in seismic hazards at the site. Additionally, the site is flat and would not be subject to slope instability or landslides.

7. b) Less Than Significant. The existing facility is currently paved; however, minor repaving and earthwork may be required to provide for new pavement. While erosion from wind or water could occur during construction activities, these impacts are expected to be extremely minor as very little soil will be exposed at any given time. Standard construction retention features will contain runoff. Further, the proposed project will be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 which requires various measures to control fugitive dust, (e.g., application of water during ground disturbing activities, measures to minimize soil/dust track out, etc.), and these measures will minimize wind erosion. The combination of these factors will minimize the potential for erosion. No unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures are anticipated to result from implementing the proposed project because no grading will be required No significant impacts on topography and soils are expected.

No significant change in topography would occur that could substantially increase wind erosion or runoff. Relative to operational activities, no change in surface runoff is expected because once the construction is complete, surface conditions of the renovated facility will be similar to the surface conditions of the existing facility. Furthermore, compliance with applicable Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan regulations are required which would minimize water runoff (see Section 9a for further details). Thus, significant impact on soil erosion is not expected.

7. c) Less Than Significant. Soil liquefaction can accompany strong earth movement caused by earthquakes. Liquefaction is a mechanism of ground failure whereby earthquake-induced ground motion transforms loose, water-saturated granular material to a liquid state. Liquefaction would most likely occur in unconsolidated granular sediments that are water saturated less than 30 feet below ground surface (Tinsley et al., 1985). The pore water pressure can increase in certain soils during extended periods of ground shaking which can change the soil from a solid to liquid state. Structures that are built on soils subject to liquefaction can sink during an earthquake and be damaged since the soils cannot support their weight.

The California Division of Mines and Geology has prepared seismic hazard map zones for areas in California as required by the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act (Public Resources Code §§ 2690-2699.6). The proposed project site is located in the Long Beach Quadrangle and the area has been mapped for seismic hazards by the Division of Mines and Geology. The Hazard Map for the area shows that the facility is located within an area where there has been historic occurrence of liquefaction, or local geological, geotechnical and groundwater conditions that have a potential for permanent ground displacements in the event of an earthquake (California Division of Mines and Geology, Map of Seismic Hazard Zones, Long Beach Quadrangle, March 25, 1999). The project will not result in the construction of any new buildings so no increase in the potential for liquefaction impacts is expected.

In addition, the project site is not expected to experience a landslide or mudflow conditions since the topography of the project area is flat and located within a heavy industrial district with little loose soil. No other unique geological resources have been identified at the facility. Thus, the project is not expected to result in significant adverse impacts due to unstable geologic or soils conditions.

7. d) No Impact. The project will not result in the construction of any new buildings. Therefore, the proposed project will not create substantial risk to life or property as a result of expansive soils and; thus, would not result in significant adverse impacts due to expansive soils.

7. e) No Impact. Sanitary wastewater from the facility is discharged to the Los Angeles County Sanitation District sewer system so installation of alternative wastewater treatment systems is not included as part of the proposed project. Because wastewater associated with the proposed project will be discharged to an existing sewer system, the ability of soils to support septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems has no bearing on the proposed project.

7. f) Less Than Significant. No grading is required as the site has already been graded and developed. Construction activities will be limited to repaving the existing site and upgrades to the existing office/warehouse building. Proposed project activities will occur in areas of the property where the ground surface has already been disturbed, and this past disturbance reduces the likelihood that previously unknown paleontological resources will be encountered. Further, the proposed project site does not contain known paleontological resources and thus the proposed project also is not expected to impact any sites of paleontological value. The project will result in a change in tenants but is not expected to result in an impact on paleontological resources or other unique geological features.

7.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to geology and soils are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation or the project; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.				
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☑	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☑	☐

8.1 Significance Criteria

On September 28, 2010, the SCAQMD recommended interim screening level thresholds of 3,000 metric tons of CO_2 equivalent ($MTCO_2eq$) emissions (SCAQMD, 2008). Projects with incremental increases below this threshold will not be cumulatively considerable. These thresholds were developed as part of the SCAQMD GHG CEQA Significance Threshold Working Group. The working group was formed to assist the SCAQMD's efforts to develop a GHG significance threshold. The thresholds were developed to be consistent with CEQA requirements for developing significance thresholds; are supported by substantial evidence; and provide guidance to CEQA practitioners and lead agencies with regard to determining whether GHG emissions from a project are significant. The objective of the SCAQMD's interim GHG significance threshold is to achieve a GHG emission capture rate of 90 percent of GHG emissions from all land use types. The 3,000 $MTCO_2eq$ is appropriate as it was developed for all land use types and includes commercial warehousing, including truck/trailer parking facilities.

8.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

Global climate change refers to changes in average climatic conditions on earth as a whole, including temperature, wind patterns, precipitation and storms. Global warming, a related concept, is the observed increase in average temperature of the earth's surface and atmosphere. One identified cause of global warming is an increase of greenhouse gases (GHGs) in the atmosphere. The six major GHGs identified by the Kyoto Protocol are carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), and perfluorocarbons (PFCs). The GHGs absorb longwave radiant energy reflected by the earth, which warms the atmosphere. GHGs also radiate longwave radiation both upward to space and back down toward the surface of the earth.

The downward part of this longwave radiation absorbed by the atmosphere is known as the "greenhouse effect." Some studies indicate that the potential effects of global climate change may include rising surface temperatures, loss in snow pack, sea level rise, more extreme heat days per year, and more drought years.

California has committed to reducing its GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030, and to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. This commitment was enacted in AB 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, which adopted the 2020 target; in 2016's SB 32 (Pavley), which adopted the 2030 target; and in Executive Order S-3-05, which adopted the 2050 target.

To achieve these emission reduction goals, the California legislature has directed the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop a Scoping Plan setting forth regulatory measures that CARB will implement, along with other measures, to reduce the state's GHG emissions. One of the principal regulatory measures is CARB's Cap and Trade program, which requires industrial greenhouse gas sources to obtain "allowances" equal to their greenhouse gas emissions. The amount of available allowances is subject to a "cap" on total emissions statewide, which CARB will reduce each year. Regulated facilities will either have to reduce their emissions or purchase allowances on the open market, which will give them a financial incentive to reduce emissions and will ensure that total annual emissions from the industrial sector will not exceed the declining statewide cap.

California has also adopted the "Renewable Portfolio Standard" for electric power generation, which requires that at least 33 percent of the state's electric power must come from renewable sources by 2020, and at least 50 percent must come from renewables by 2030. To complement these efforts on electricity generation, the state has also committed to increasing the energy efficiency of existing buildings by 50 percent by 2050 in order to reduce energy demand.

California has adopted regulatory measures aimed at reducing GHG emissions from mobile sources. These measures include standards for motor vehicle emissions and the state's Low Carbon Fuel Standard, which set limits on the carbon intensity of transportation fuels. California has also adopted SB 375, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008, which requires regional transportation and land use planning agencies to develop coordinated plans, called "Sustainable Communities Strategies," to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector by promoting denser development and alternatives to driving.

8. a) and b) Less Than Significant. The GHG emissions for the existing and proposed project were estimated using CalEEMod (see Appendix A) for operating year 2019 and are summarized in Table 2-5. The GHG significance threshold is based on average annual average emissions, therefore, the GHG average annual emissions have been calculated and compared to the significance threshold. The estimated GHG emissions from activities associated the existing operations are 89.3 metric tons per year, which includes three workers and 15 delivery trucks on an annual average day. While trucks on

a peak day may hit 100, trucks on a low day may hit three. Throughout the year, the number of trucks on an average day are expected to be 50 and the GHG emissions are based on an average day. The estimated GHG emissions due to construction activities associated with the proposed project are estimated to be about 54.0 metric tons during the entire construction period; or 1.8 metric tons amortized over 30 years. The estimated GHG emissions due to operation of the project are expected to be about 390.4 metric tons per year, which includes 3 workers and 50 trucks on an annual average day. Combined with the 30-year amortized construction emissions of 1.8 metric tons per year, the GHG emissions from the proposed project are expected to be 392.2 metric tons per year. The net difference in GHG emissions between the existing operations and the proposed project is expected to be 302.9 metric tons per year. The GHG emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to exceed GHG significance thresholds of 3,000 metric tons of GHG emissions developed by SCAQMD. Therefore, no significant increase in GHG emissions and related climate change impacts are expected due to the proposed project.

TABLE 2-5

GHG Emissions Associated with the Proposed Project

ACTIVITY	GHG EMISSIONS (metric tons/year)
GHGs from Existing Operations	89.3
GHGs from Proposed Project	392.2
GHG Increase Associated with Proposed Project	302.9
CEQA Significance Threshold	3,000
Significant?	NO

See Appendix A for detailed emission calculations.

The City of Carson has developed a Climate Action Plan, which provides a number of measures to reduce GHG emissions. The largest source of GHG emissions in the City is from commercial energy use (City of Carson, 2017). As discussed in Section 6 – Energy above, the project would result in a reduction of employees at the site and would be expected to result in a decrease in energy use at the site. The project would involve upgrades to an existing office/warehouse building which would be expected to result in a decrease in energy use, e.g., new light fixtures, and electrical systems will be installed which are more energy efficient. Additional landscaping is also proposed to be installed which is consistent with Goal EE: F – Decrease Energy Demand Through Reducing Urban Heat Island Effect and Measure EE: I3 – Plant Trees for Shade and Carbon Sequestration, of the CAP (City of Carson, 2017). Therefore, the project would be consistent with the City's Climate Action Plan.

8.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to GHG emissions are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation or the project; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX.	**HAZARDS & 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?	☐	☐	☑	☐
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☑	☐
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d)	Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☑
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☑
f)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☑
g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☐	☑

9.1 Significance Criteria

The impacts associated with hazards will be considered significant if any of the following occur:

Non-compliance with any applicable design code or regulation.

Non-conformance to National Fire Protection Association standards.

Non-conformance to regulations or generally accepted industry practices related to operating policy and procedures concerning the design, construction, security, leak detection, spill containment or fire protection.

Exposure to hazardous chemicals in concentrations equal to or greater than the Emergency Response Planning Guideline (ERPG) 2 levels.

9.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

9. a) and b) Less Than Significant. Exposure to the public or the environment to hazardous materials can occur through transportation accidents; inappropriate disposal methods; improper handling of hazardous materials or hazardous wastes; and through emergency events, e.g., explosions or fires. The major types of public safety risks consist of impacts from toxic substance releases, fires and explosions. The project is not expected to result in an increase in the use of hazardous materials at the site.

The proposed project will replace a pipe storage yard/distribution facility with a truck trailer parking lot. The existing pipe storage yard likely stored small quantities of hazardous materials for cleaning, welding, etc. The proposed project will change the use of the site to temporarily store empty vans, trailers and trucks. The site would be used for empty trailers and truck parking and would not be used for truck maintenance activities or to fuel vehicles or trucks. The new tenant would continue to use materials that may be hazardous for routine cleaning activities (e.g., glass cleaner, furniture polish, toilet cleaners, etc.), but is not expected to bring in new hazardous materials. Therefore, there will be no change in the type of hazardous material used, stored, or the hazards associated with their use as a result of the proposed project.

The facility would be subject to fire codes, electrical codes, and other similar City safety design requirements. Adherence to applicable codes and requirements also minimizes potential hazards at the site.

9. c) No Impact. The project site is not located within a one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school site. The closest school to the site is the Dominguez Elementary School, located at 21250 South Santa Fe Avenue, approximately 0.72 mile east of the project site. Since the proposed project will not create emissions of acutely hazardous materials, or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within

one-quarter of a mile of an existing or proposed school, no potential hazards impacts are expected to affect schools.

9. d) No Impact. Government Code §65962.5 refers to a list of facilities which may be subject to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) corrective action program. The project site and surrounding areas have been used for heavy industrial activities for a number of years. The project site does not include any sites identified on a hazardous site list compiled pursuant to California Government Code §65962.5.[2] The nearest sites included on a hazardous site list are at the following addresses:

- Nalco Champion- Carson Plant, 2111 East Dominguez Street (approximately 0.25 mile from project site). Nalco conducted manufacturing of specialized chemicals used in water treatment, pollution control, and oil production and refining. EnviroStor indicates that DTSC issued a Corrective Action Consent Agreement to the facility in December 2015. The site has been conducting remediation activities for volatile organic compounds in soil. DTSC has issued no further action determinations for portions of the site and is proposing to deed restrict the site to prohibit residential development for other portions of the site.
- Soule Steel Company, 2160 East Dominguez Street (approximately 0.25 mile from project site). Soule Steel manufactured light steel items (e.g., fencing posts) resulting in lead, motor oil and zinc soil contamination. The site was remediated in 1986 with the removal of the contaminated soil.
- Western Tube and Conduit Corporation, 2001 East Dominguez Street (approximately 0.31 mile from project site). Western Tube was a metal working facility that expanded to include other operations. VOC in soil gas and groundwater were detected after site investigations were complete under a Corrective Action Consent Agreement with DTSC. The site continues to conduct groundwater monitoring; however, the groundwater is not used for drinking water. A Land Use Covenant has been placed on portions of the site to prohibit residential development.
- Shell Oil Products – Carson Terminal, 20945 South Wilmington Avenue (approximately 0.6 mile from project site). The site has been used for petroleum refining and storage of various petroleum products resulting in soil and groundwater contamination. Corrective action for the site has been conducted under a Cleanup and Abatement Order with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), who continues to oversee the corrective actions at the site.
- Rainbow LLC, 21119 Wilmington Avenue (approximately 0.6 mile from project site). Rainbow was used for tanker truck cleaning, truck parking, containerization, vehicle staging and vehicle maintenance activities. These activities have resulted in VOC, petroleum hydrocarbon, and toxaphene contamination of groundwater and soil. Corrective action at the site continues under the review of DTSC.

[2] California Department of Toxic Substances Control, EnviroStor data base. Available at: https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=2315+East+Dominguez+Street

- Eco Services Operations Corp, 20720 Wilmington Avenue (approximately 0.38 mile from project site). The site has been used to regenerate spent sulfuric acid, among other activities. Cleanup of the site is being conducted under the jurisdiction of the U.S. EPA.

The above sites have been the subject of regulatory review, clean-up, and remediation. The project site will have no impact on these sites or any remediation activities at these sites and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

9. e) No Impact. The proposed project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public or private use airport. The closest airport to the project site is the Long Beach Airport located about 2.84 miles east of the site. All construction and operation activities will occur within the confines of the existing site. No additional residents or workers would be exposed to excessive noise due to airport operations due to the proposed project. Therefore, no safety hazards impacts are expected from the proposed project on any airport.

9. f) No Impact. The proposed project will not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evaluation plan. Vans, trailers and trucks would be parked onsite and would not block street access nor emergency access. Vans, trailer and truck parking will be within the identified parking spaces so that access/egress to/from the project site will be maintained. Therefore, no significant impacts on emergency response or evacuation plans are expected.

9. g) No Impact. The proposed project will not increase the existing risk of wildland fires. The proposed project site is located within an existing developed area of the City of Carson. The site is surrounded by industrial and commercial uses. No wildlands are located in the immediate or surrounding area. For these reasons, the project would not expose people or structures to wildland fires. Therefore, no potential significant adverse impacts resulting from wildland fire hazards are expected from the proposed project.

9.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to hazards and hazardous materials are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation or the project; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.					
Would the project:					
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b)	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:				
i)	result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite;	☐	☐	☑	☐
ii)	substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	☐	☐	☑	☐
iii)	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;	☐	☐	☑	☐
iv)	impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☑	☐
d)	In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	☑
e)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☐	☑

10.1 Significance Criteria

Potential impacts on water resources will be considered significant if any of the following criteria apply:

Water Quality:

The project will cause degradation or depletion of ground water resources substantially affecting current or future uses.

The project will cause the degradation of surface water substantially affecting current or future uses.

The project will result in a violation of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements.

The capacities of existing or proposed wastewater treatment facilities and the sanitary sewer system are not sufficient to meet the needs of the project.

The project results in substantial increases in the area of impervious surfaces, such that interference with groundwater recharge efforts occurs.

The project results in alterations to the course or flow of floodwaters.

Water Demand:

The existing water supply does not have the capacity to meet the increased demands of the project, or the project would use a substantial amount of potable water.

The project increases demand for water by more than 300,000 gallons per day.

10.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

10. a) Water Quality Standards and Waste Discharge Requirements

No Impact. Wastewater discharges from the site are limited to sanitary wastewater discharges and stormwater runoff. The wastewater discharges associated with the existing office/warehouse building is not expected to change due to the proposed new tenant. Sanitary wastewater will continue to be discharged directly to the Los Angeles County Sanitation District (LACSD) sanitary sewer. The existing building will be renovated with upgrades to the building interior (e.g., electrical and plumbing) and landscape improvements. During operation, one employee is expected to be at the site on a 24-hour basis, while the previous tenant had approximately 10 employees. Therefore, the proposed project will not increase sanitary wastewater discharged from the site.

The project site is currently paved and rain water runoff generally drains from the north to the south of the facility via sheet flow. Urban runoff from the project site discharges into storm drains and flows to the Los Angeles River, which ultimately discharges to the Los Angeles Harbor/Pacific Ocean. Contaminated runoff can have harmful effects on drinking water, recreational water, and fish and wildlife. Urban runoff can include a wide array of environmental pollutants depending on the site conditions and magnitude of rain events. Major pollutants typically found in runoff from urban areas include sediments, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, heavy metals, petroleum hydrocarbons, pathogens, and bacteria.

Short-term water quality impacts can occur during construction activities including earthwork when there would be the potential for erosion and siltation and the transport of pollutants off-site. The proposed project would disturb more than one acre of land surface and would, therefore, be required to obtain coverage under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) storm water program. To minimize water quality impacts during construction, the site would be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) consistent with the General Permit for Stormwater Discharge Associated with Construction Activity (Construction Activity General Permit). The project applicant is required to submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) prior to construction activities and develop and implement an SWPPP and monitoring plan. The SWPPP identifies Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would meet or exceed measures required by the Construction Activity General Permit to control construction-related pollutants. Implementation of BMPs would minimize the potential for water quality impacts during construction activities to less than significant.

The existing site at 2315 E. Dominguez Street is currently paved. The construction activities associated with the project will include removal of the existing concrete, crushing the existing concrete to provide a base for the new concrete, and replacement with new concrete. Therefore, the paved area at the site is not expected to increase, stormwater runoff would be essentially the same as the existing conditions, and the project would not result in an increase in stormwater runoff. Therefore, the project is not expected to impact the storm drain system or result in an increase in pollutants from the site. Therefore, the impacts of stormwater runoff on water quality would be less than significant.

10. b) Ground Water Supplies

No Impact. The City receives its water from the Central and West Coast ground water basins managed by the Water Replenishment District of Southern California (WRD) and from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). The existing site will be renovated with upgrades to the building interior (e.g., electrical and plumbing) and landscape improvements. During operation, one employee is expected to be at the site on a 24-hour basis, while the previous tenant had approximately 10 employees. Water will also be used for landscape vegetation. While the proposed project will improve the landscaping, it will not increase the landscape area so that no increase in water use is expected for landscape maintenance. Therefore, the proposed project will

not increase water demand or result in an impact on the local groundwater table or result in an impact on ground water recharge.

10. c) Surface Water

Less Than Significant. The proposed site and surrounding area discharges storm water runoff to the Los Angeles River. The Los Angeles River and the Dominguez Channel are the major drainages that flow into the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor complex. Sediments and contaminants are transported into the harbor with the flows from the Los Angeles River and, to a lesser degree, the Dominguez Channel.

The proposed project would not result in a change to the drainage pattern of the site. The storm water drainage would remain north to south and be discharged into the existing storm drain system. No increase in storm water is expected as the site is currently paved and no increase in area that is paved would occur. The project will replace the existing pavement with new pavement. No new storm drain connection would be required for the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to result in a substantial increase in stormwater runoff.

10. d) Flooding

No Impact. The project site is not located within the 100-year hazard flood zone area. The Flood Insurance Rate Map for the project site shows that it is in Zone X, 0.2 percent chance flood (areas with 1.0 percent annual chance flood with average depths of less than 1 foot or with drainage areas less than one square mile).[3] The proposed project does not include the construction of any structures, including residential structures; therefore, the project would not place housing or any other structures within a 100-year flood hazard area and would not impede or redirect flood flows.

According to the City's Standardized Emergency Management System Multi-Hazard Functional Plan, the City is not subject to inundation associated with dam failure (City of Carson, 2004). There are no dams within or adjacent to the City. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to flooding due to dam failure.

There are no open ponds or embayments at the site, so the potential for seiching is considered to be less than significant. The proposed project site is located approximately 4.5 miles from both the Los Angeles Harbor and Long Beach Harbor which are constructed with breakwaters that protect the port areas so the potential for a tsunami to adversely affect the site is considered less than significant.

10. e) Water Quality Control Plan or Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan

No Impact. The existing site will be renovated with upgrades to the building interior (e.g., electrical and plumbing) and landscape improvements. During operation, one

[3] FEMA, Flood Insurance Rate Map 06037C1955f, accessed January 17, 2019. https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search#searchresultsanchor.

employee is expected to be at the site on a 24-hour basis, while the previous tenant had approximately 10 employees. Water will also be used for landscape vegetation. While the proposed project will improve the landscaping, it will not increase the landscape area so that no increase in water use is expected. Therefore, the proposed project will not increase water demand or result in an impact on the local groundwater table or result in an impact on ground water recharge.

As discussed in 10 a above, wastewater discharges associated with the existing building is not expected to change due to the proposed new tenant. Sanitary wastewater will continue to be discharged directly to the Los Angeles County Sanitation District (LACSD) sanitary sewer. Further, as discussed in 10c above, the project would not result in an increase in storm water runoff. Therefore, the project is not expected to conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan.

10.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to hydrology and water quality are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation or the project; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI.	**LAND USE AND PLANNING.** Would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b)	Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☑

11.1 Significance Criteria

Land use and planning impacts will be considered significant if the project conflicts with the land use and zoning designations established by the City or County.

11.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

11. a) No Impact. Implementation of the proposed project includes minor renovations to the site to upgrade the existing office/warehouse building, paving, fencing and landscaping to make improvements for a new tenant. The project would occur entirely within the boundaries of the existing facility, which is in a heavy industrial area. The overall character of the site would remain the same and the facility would simply change from a pipe storage and distribution facility to a truck/trailer storage facility. No new land will be acquired for the project and no zoning and/or land use changes are required. As no established communities are located on or adjacent to the property, the proposed project would not disrupt or physically divide an established community.

11. b) No Impact. The proposed project site is designated as heavy industrial by the City of Carson General Plan and is zoned as heavy manufacturing with a D overlay (City of Carson, 2018). The City of Carson uses a D overlay to indicate that the designated area will require special standards of design, architectural quality, style, and compatibility, landscape treatment, and functional integration of neighboring developments. As such, special consideration will be taken to ensure the land use is kept consistent with its zoning designation (i.e., heavy industrial). Since the proposed project is consistent with existing zoning and land use requirements, it would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the proposed project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

11. c) No Impact. The proposed project would occur entirely within the boundaries of the existing heavily industrialized property, except for upgrades to the fence, which would occur along the property line. No applicable habitat or natural community conservation plans exist in or near the proposed project site, and, therefore, the project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation or natural community conservation plan.

11.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to land use are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation or the project; therefore, no land use mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☑
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?	☐	☐	☐	☑

12.1 Significance Criteria

Project-related impacts on mineral resources will be considered significant if any of the following conditions are met:

> The project would result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.
>
> The proposed project results 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.

12.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

12. a) and b) No Impact. The proposed project would make minor renovations to the site to upgrade the existing office/warehouse building, paving, fencing and landscaping to make improvements for a new tenant. Implementation of the proposed project would occur entirely within the boundaries of the existing property, except for repairs to the fence, which would occur along the property line. There are no known mineral resources at the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will not be located on a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. Furthermore, because there are no known mineral resources at the project site, the proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

12.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to mineral resources are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation or the project; therefore, no mineral resource mitigation measures are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE. Would the project:					
a)	Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☑	☐
b)	Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☑	☐
c)	For a project located withinthe vicinity of a private airstrip or 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 and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☑

13.1 Significance Criteria

Carson's Municipal Code, Ordinance No. 95-1068, limits construction noise (periods of 21 days or more) to 65 decibels at single family residential areas and 70 dBA at multi-family residential areas in the daytime (7 a.m. to 8 p.m.). Construction during evening hours are limited to 55 dBA at single family residential areas and 60 dBA at multi-family residential areas during the evening hours (8 p.m. to 7 a.m.) and all day Sunday and legal holidays.

Impacts on noise during operation will be considered significant if project operational noise levels exceed any of the local noise ordinances at the site boundary or, if the noise threshold is currently exceeded, ambient CNEL noise levels would be increased by 3.0 dBA or more at a noise sensitive receptor.

Sound level variations of less than 3 dBA are generally not detectable by the typical human ear. Therefore, project-generated noise level increase of 3 dBA or less are not considered to be significant.

13.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

13. a) and b) Less Than Significant. Construction activities associated with the proposed project will generate noise from heavy construction equipment and construction-related traffic. Noise levels associated with construction activities have been estimated based on information provided by the applicant for the construction requirements and schedule. The initial phase of construction would involve removing the existing concrete, crushing the existing concrete to provide a base for the new concrete, followed by re-paving of the site, and improvements to the existing office/warehouse building. The types of construction equipment that are expected to be used are shown in Table 2-6. Most of the construction noise sources will be located at or near ground level, so the noise levels are expected to attenuate. Typical sound levels for construction equipment are presented in Table 2-6.

TABLE 2-6

Estimated Noise Levels from Construction Noise Sources

CONSTRUCTION PHASE	EQUIPMENT	TYPICAL NOISE LEVEL (decibels)(1)
Demolition	Truck	84
Demolition	Saws	76
Demolition	Excavators	80
Demolition	Rubber Tired Dozer	85
Building Renovation	Aerial Lifts	85
Building Renovation	Trucks	84
Paving	Concrete Mixers	85
Paving	Pavers/Paving Equipment	85
Paving	Roller	85
Paving	Tractor/Loaders/Backhoes	80
Paving	Trucks	84
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	80
Architectural Coating	Trucks	84

(1) Federal Transit Administration, 2018. Levels are in dBA at 50-foot reference distance.

The estimated noise level during construction activities at the project site are expected to be an average of about 80 dBA at 50 feet from the center of construction activity. The project site is located in a heavy industrial area and is surrounded by heavy industrial uses. Using an estimated six dBA reduction for every doubling distance, the noise levels would drop off to about 62 dBA or less at about 400 feet from the sources for the proposed project. The closest residential area is approximately 0.25 mile or about 1,370 feet from the project site and is physically separated from the project site by the Alameda Corridor, and other heavy industrial uses. Noise from construction equipment associated with the project at the closest residential area is expected to be about 53 dBA, or less than existing ambient noise levels. The noise levels from the construction equipment would

be within the allowable noise levels established by the local noise ordinances for residential areas, which are about 65 dBA. Ambient noise levels at the closest residential area are estimated to be 72 to 73 dBA and are dominated by truck and rail traffic along Alameda Street (City of Carson, 2004). The addition of the construction noise would not result in an increase in noise at the closest residential area.[4] Most of the construction noise sources will be located near ground level, so the noise levels are expected to attenuate further than analyzed herein. Noise attenuation due to existing structures has not been included in the analysis.

Based on the above evaluation of noise from construction equipment, noise levels at the closest residential area are not expected to increase during construction activities, i.e., background noise levels in residential areas generally are in the range of 55-65 dBA. As calculated above, construction noise at 3,000 feet from the construction site is expected to be about 46 dBA. The noise levels from the construction equipment are expected to be within the allowable noise levels established by the local noise ordinance for residential areas, which is 65 dBA. Therefore, noise impacts associated with the project construction activities are expected to be less than significant.

Once constructed, the project is not expected to produce noise in excess of current operations. The project will not add new noise sources to the site. The site will be used for overflow parking and is not expected to generate noise in excess of the noise generated by the pipe storage and distribution facility. The project will require one full-time employee to guard the facility so that there will be fewer employees at the site. The site will be used for overflow parking which generally does not generate noise other than from travel on local roads.

The average number of vans, trailers and trucks to/from the site is not expected to substantially change. The pipe storage yard operated with 10 employees and generated 5 to 15 truck trips per day for delivery activities. The pipe storage yard is estimated to generate approximately 666 - 916 vehicle miles traveled per day (see Table 2-7 for further details).

The modernized facility is expected to be used for overflow parking and require one employee (assume three over a 24-hour period) and generate an average of 50 vans, trailers and trucks per day. During a peak day, e.g., holiday season, the new tenant is expected to generate up to 100 trips per day with trips to the existing Federal Express distribution centers at 1725 Charles Willard St. (2.6 miles) and 17210 South Main St. (5.7 miles). The new facility is expected to generate approximately 260 to 470 vehicle miles traveled per day. Since noise is measured on a logarithmic scale, a doubling of traffic volumes (i.e., 100 percent increase) would be needed to cause a traffic noise-related increase of 3 dBA. A traffic increase of about 42 percent must occur to result in a noise level increase of about 1.5 dBA. Therefore, on an average day, the project could result in an increase of approximately 35 vehicles. On a peak day, the project could result in an increase of 85 vans, trailers or trucks on a daily basis. As discussed in Section 17 –

[4] The total sound level was calculated using the following formula: $T_{sl}=10\log_{10}(10^{Bsl/10} + 10^{Csl/10})$ where T_{sl} = the total sound level (dBA); B_{sl} = baseline sound level (dBA); and C_{sl} = construction sound level (dBA).

Transportation, below, collector streets such as East Dominguez typically transport 2,000 to 5,000 vehicles per day. The proposed project would result in a peak increase of 85 vehicles on a peak day or an approximately four percent increase in traffic. A four percent increase in traffic is well below a 100 percent increase in traffic. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a noticeable increase (3 dBA) in noise.

13. c) No Impact. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public or private use airport. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the area to noise related to airports.

13.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to noise are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation or the project; therefore, no noise mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g. through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Displace a substantial number of existing people or housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☑

14.1 Significance Criteria

The impacts of the proposed project on population and housing will be considered significant if the following criteria are exceeded:

The demand for temporary or permanent housing exceeds the existing supply.

The proposed project produces additional population, housing or employment inconsistent with adopted plans either in terms of overall amount or location.

14.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

14. a), and b) No Impact. Construction activities at the proposed project site will not involve the relocation of individuals, impact housing or commercial facilities, or change the distribution of the population because the proposed project will occur within the boundaries of an existing industrial site. Construction work is expected to be largely minor and will require approximately 25 temporary workers (depending on the construction phase). The existing labor pool in the southern California area is large enough to meet this demand (e.g., over 4.5 million workers in Los Angeles County)[5]. Additionally, once the proposed project is complete, operation activities are only expected to require one guard as a permanent employee, which would be fewer employees than were employed by the previous tenants. Since all potential impacts will occur at an existing industrial facility, no people or housing would be displaced due to the project. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to have a significant adverse impact on population, population distribution, or housing.

[5]Based on 2017 Bureau of Labor Statistics https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_31084.htm#00-0000

14.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to population and housing are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation or the project; therefore, no population and housing mitigation measures are required.

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

15.1 Significance Criteria

Impacts on public services will be considered significant if the project results in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response time or other performance objectives.

15.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

15. a) No Impact. Fire Services: There are four Los Angeles County Fire Department stations that serve the Carson area: 1) Station 127 at 2049 E. 223rd Street; 2) Station 10 at 1860 E. Del Amo; 3) Station 36 at 127 W. 223rd Street; and, 4) Station 116 at 755 E. Victoria. The closest station to the project site is Station 10 at 1960 E. Del Amo Boulevard, approximately 0.7 miles northwest of the project site.

The proposed project would replace the pipe yard and storage facility with a truck trailer parking area. Implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with the land uses and the area is surrounded with other truck parking, container storage, and warehouse uses. The project is not expected to result in an increase in demand for fire

services. The proposed project would be required to comply with Los Angeles County Fire Department requirements for emergency access, fire water flow, fire protection standards, fire lands and other site/building standards. Adherence to these existing regulations would ensure that the project impacts on fire services are less than significant.

Police Services: The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department is the responding agency for law enforcement needs in the vicinity of the project site. Because sheriff units are in the field, response times vary depending on the location of the nearest unit. The closest Sheriff station to the project site is located at 21356 South Avalon Boulevard, approximately 2.3 miles west of the project site.

The project is not anticipated to increase response times to the project site or vicinity. Entry and exit to the site will be monitored by a guard. Security fencing will be upgraded around the facility and access to the site will be controlled. The project is not expected to result in an increase in the number of workers at the site. The project would not result in the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities in the City. Thus, no additional or altered police protection will be required for the project site.

Schools, Parks and Other Public Facilities: Since the proposed project is not expected to require additional staffing during operations, an increase in the local population is not expected. Therefore, no impacts are expected to schools, parks, or other public facilities as a result of implementing the proposed project.

15.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to public services are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation or the project; therefore, no public services mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. RECREATION. Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☑

16.1 Significance Criteria

The impacts to recreation will be considered significant if:

The project results in an increased demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities.

The project adversely effects existing recreational opportunities.

16.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

16. a) No Impact. As previously concluded in Section 13 of this document, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to increase the local population. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks, or other recreational facilities and it will not adversely affect existing recreational opportunities. Due to the heavy industrialization of the area, there are no other recreational opportunities at or in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project.

16. b) No Impact. Implementation of the proposed project does not include new recreational facilities or require expansion of existing recreational facilities and, thus, will not have an adverse physical effect on recreation.

16.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to recreation are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation or the project; therefore, no recreation mitigation measures are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII.	**TRANSPORTATION.** Would the project:				
a)	Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☑	☐
b)	Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3 subdivision(b)?	☐	☐	☑	☐
c)	Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☑

17.1 Significance Criteria

The impacts on transportation/traffic will be considered significant if any of the following criteria apply:

Peak period levels on major arterials are disrupted to a point where level of service (LOS) is reduced to E or F for more than one month.

An intersection's volume to capacity ratio increases by 0.02 (two percent) or more when the LOS is already E or F for existing or projected conditions.

A major roadway is closed to all through traffic, and no alternate route is available.

There is an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

The demand for parking facilities is substantially increased.

Water borne, rail car or air traffic is substantially altered.

Traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians are substantially increased.

17.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

17. a) No Impact. The Congestion Management Program (CMP) was created statewide and has been implemented locally by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. The purpose of the Congestion Management Plan (CMP) is to develop a coordinated approach to managing and decreasing traffic congestion by linking the various transportation, land use, and air quality planning programs throughout the County. The CMP requires traffic studies be prepared if a project adds 50 two-way trips during the morning or evening peak hours. As discussed in 17 b) below, the project will renovate and upgrade and existing industrial facility and is not expected to result in an increase in traffic; therefore, it would not conflict with a congestion management plan, or any other plan ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system. Further the project would not conflict with any bicycle or pedestrian facilities at it would be located within the confines on an existing heavy industrial area.

17. b) Less Than Significant. The project will renovate the existing property at 2315 East Dominguez Street to prepare the site for a new tenant, which is expected to be Federal Express. Federal Express currently operates two warehouse facilities in the City of Carson (1725 Charles Willard St. and 17210 South Main St.). Roadways that will be utilized in the future by the new tenant are expected to be similar to the roadways used by the pipe storage and distribution facility, and include East Dominguez Street and Wilmington Avenue.

Wilmington Avenue: This north-south roadway currently is divided, four to six lanes in the project area. Wilmington Avenue is classified as a major highway (100 foot right-of-way) on the City of Carson General Plan Circulation Element. Major highways function to connect traffic from collectors to the major freeway system, as well as provide access to adjacent land uses and can move 25,000 vehicles per day or more. Wilmington Avenue is also classified as a designated truck route in the City's Circulation Element.

Del Amo Boulevard: This east-west roadway is divided, four to six lanes in the project area. Del Amo is classified as a major highway (100 foot right-of-way) on the City of Carson General Plan Circulation Element. Major highways function to connect traffic from collectors to the major freeway system, as well as provide access to adjacent land uses and can move 25,000 vehicles per day or more. Del Amo Boulevard is also classified as a designated truck route in the City's Circulation Element.

East Dominguez Street: This east-west roadway currently is two to four lanes in the study area. East Dominguez is classified as a collector road (66 to 84 foot right-of-way) on the City of Carson General Plan Circulation Element. Collector

streets collect vehicles from the local street system and transport them to the arterial system and typically carry 2,000 to 5,000 vehicles per day.

209th Street/Fordyce Avenue: These are local streets that provide vehicular access to property abutting the public right-of-way and can be used to access the north entrance to the project site.

The pipe storage and distribution facility generated 10 employee trips per day and generated 5 to 15 truck trips per day for delivery activities. The estimated employee trips, truck trips, and vehicle miles travelled for the existing site as well as for the new tenant is shown in Table 2-7. The pipe storage yard generates approximately 666 - 916 vehicle miles traveled per day.

TABLE 2-7

Existing Facility and Modernized Facility Vehicle Trips

	Existing Facility (average)	Existing Facility (peak)	Modernized Facility (average)	Modernized Facility (peak)
Employee Vehicles	10	10	3	3
Miles per Employee Trip	16.6(1)	16.6	16.6	16.6
Employee Vehicle Miles Traveled	166	166	50	50
Truck Trips	10	15	50	100
Miles per Truck Trip	50(2)	50	4.2(3)	4.2
Average Truck Vehicle Miles Traveled	500	750	210	420
Total Miles Traveled(4)	666	916	260	470

(1) Default CalEEMod assumption for home to work travel in the South Coast Air Basin.
(2) Estimated delivery distance for pipe material in Southern California.
(3) Average distance to 1725 Charles Willard and 17210 South Main St.
(4) Employee vehicle miles plus truck miles traveled.

The modernized facility is expected to be used for overflow parking and require one employee (assume three over a 24-hour period) and generate an average of 50 vans trailers or trucks per day. During a peak day, e.g., holiday season, the new tenant is expected to generate up to 100 trips per day with trips to the existing Federal Express distribution centers at 1725 Charles Willard St. (2.6 miles) and 17210 South Main St. (5.7 miles). The new facility is expected to generate approximately 260-470 vehicle miles traveled per day. Therefore, the project is expected to result in a reduction in vehicle miles traveled.

Traffic to/from the modernized facility would continue to use East Dominguez or 209th Street for entrance/exit. Federal Express operates its distribution facilities 24 hours per day. The project site would be used to park empty vans/trailers/trucks 24 hours per day. Therefore, traffic is expected to be spread throughout the day resulting in an average of

two vehicles per hour or a peak of approximately four vans, trailers or trucks per hour. As shown in Table 2-8, traffic would be spread throughout the days with peak trips between 10 pm and 6 am.

TABLE 2-8

Estimated Hourly Traffic Volumes

Hours	Total Vehicle Flow	
	Arrive	Depart
00:01 – 01:00	10	6
01:01 - 02:00	7	10
02:01 – 03:00	15	9
03:01 – 04:00	8	12
04:01 – 05:00	8	7
05:01 – 06:00	6	4
06:01 – 07:00	5	2
07:01 – 08:00	5	3
08:01 – 09:00	2	1
09:01 – 10:00	0	0
10:01 – 11:00	1	1
11:01 – 12:00	1	1
12:01 – 13:00	1	1
13:01 – 14:00	1	1
14:01 – 15:00	1	1
15:01 – 16:00	1	1
16:01 – 17:00	1	3
17:01 – 18:00	3	4
18:01 – 19:00	1	3
19:01 – 20:00	2	3
20:01 – 21:00	3	5
21:01 – 22:00	4	5
22:01 – 23:00	6	10
23:01 – 24:00	7	8
Total	100	100

Further, the traffic is expected to be the same magnitude as the existing facility so that the level of service (LOS) at any of the local intersections would not be affected or result in a change due to the project. The level of service (using the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) methodology) compares the volume of traffic using the intersection to the capacity of the intersection. The peak traffic hours for the area are from 7:00 am to 9:00 am in the morning and 4:00 pm and 6:00 pm in the evening. Therefore, the project is not expected to result in impacts to traffic because: (1) the level of traffic generated by the new tenants will be the same or less than the pipe storage/distribution yard; and (2)

traffic generated by the new tenants is expected to be spread throughout the day and would generally avoid peak traffic hours. Therefore, the project is not expected to conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy that would impact the performance of a circulation system, including intersections, streets, and highways and freeways. The project would also not impact pedestrian or bike traffic/routes or mass transit. Therefore, the project would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3 subdivision(b).

17. c) and d) No Impact. The proposed project is not expected to increase traffic hazards or create incompatible uses at or adjacent to the project site. The project site is an industrial area and is generally bordered by similar uses. The project would provide temporary parking for empty truck trailers. The proposed project does not include construction of roadways that could include design hazards. The site will be stripped for parking and truck trailers will be required to park in marked stalls. Emergency access will be maintained through the continued use of the three existing entrances/exits. No significant impacts on emergency response or evacuation plans are expected.

17.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to transportation and traffic are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation or the project; therefore, no transportation and traffic mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.				
a) 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:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resourced Code section 5020.1(k), or	☐	☐	☐	☑
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	☐	☐	☐	☑

18.1 Significance Criteria

The proposed project impacts to tribal resources will be considered significant if:

The project results in the disturbance of a significant prehistoric or historic archaeological site or a property of tribal cultural significance to a community or ethnic or social group or a California Native American tribe.

Unique objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe are present that could be disturbed by construction of the proposed project.

18.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

The State CEQA Guidelines were amended in July 2015 to include evaluation of impacts on tribal cultural resources. Tribal cultural resources include sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe (Public Resources Code 21074). Assembly Bill (AB) 52 specifies that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change to a Tribal Cultural Resource (TCR) may result in a significant effect on the environment. AB52 requires tribes interested in development projects within a traditionally and culturally affiliated geographic area to notify a lead agency of such interest and to request notification of future projects subject to CEQA prior to determining if a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report is required for a project. The lead agency is then required to notify the tribe within 14 days of deeming a development application subject to CEQA complete to notify the requesting tribe as an invitation to consult on the project. AB52 identifies examples of mitigation measures that will avoid or minimize impacts to a TCR and applies to projects that have a notice of preparation or a notice of intent to adopt a negative declaration/mitigated negative declaration circulated on or after July 1, 2015.

In compliance with PRC Section 21080.3.1(b), the City has provided formal notification to California Native American tribal representatives that have previously requested notification from the City regarding project within the geographic area traditionally and culturally affliated with the tribe. The City sent notification letters to the Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, Gabrieleno/Tongva Nation, Gabrieleno Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council, Gabrieleno-Tongva Tribe, Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, and Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians (hereinafter referred to as the "Tribes") to participate in the AB52 CEQA consultation process for projects within the City. Mr. Andrew Salas from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation responded and requested formal consultation under AB52 for the proposed project. City representatives discussed the details of the project with Mr. Salas and other members of the Tribe on March 27, 2019. Mr. Salas provided background on the historic uses of the area by the Tribe, particularly the use of the Alameda Corridor, and expressed concerns regarding grading of the site. The Tribe was informed that the proposed project will not result in grading of the site, as the site has already been graded and developed.

18. a) No Impact. As discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources, resources (buildings, structures, equipment) that are less than 50 years old are excluded from listing in the National Register of Historic Places unless they can be shown to be exceptionally important. The project will renovate and existing office/warehouse building and will result in the demolition of the existing shed. The existing shed along the western boundary of the project site will be removed, but it does not provide any historic value. The shed is a non-descript cement building with a metal roof and is representative of numerous other such structures in the project area. Improvements will be made to the offices within the existing office/warehouse building to improve the interior and exterior conditions (e.g., painting); however, the building will continue to be used and would not be demolished. No historic structures will be removed as a consequence of the proposed

project, therefore, no significant impacts to historic cultural resources are expected as a result of implementing the proposed project.

18. b) No Impact. The proposed project will not result in grading of the site, as the site has already been graded and developed. Construction activities will be limited to repaving the existing site and upgrades to existing office/warehouse building. Proposed project activities will occur in areas of the property where the ground surface has already been disturbed, and this past disturbance reduces the likelihood that previously unknown tribal cultural resources will be encountered. The project will result in a change in tenants but is not expected to result in an impact on tribal cultural resources. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to impact tribal cultural resources.

18.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation or the project; therefore, no tribal cultural resources mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☐	☑
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☑

19.1 Significance Criteria

The impacts to utilities/service systems will be considered significant if any of the following criteria are met:

> The capacities of existing or proposed wastewater treatment facilities and the sanitary sewer system are not sufficient to meet the needs of the project.

The existing water supply does not have the capacity to meet the increased demands of the project, or the project would use a substantial amount of potable water.

The project increases demand for water by more than 300,000 gallons per day.

The generation and disposal of hazardous and non-hazardous waste exceeds the capacity of designated landfills.

19.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

19. a) No Impact. The proposed project includes the modernization of an existing industrial facility. The water use and wastewater discharge associated with the existing building is not expected to change due to the project. As discussed in 10 b) above, during operation, one employee is expected to be at the site (a total of 3 per day), while the previous tenant had approximately 10 employees. Water will also be used for landscape vegetation. While the proposed project will improve the landscaping, it will not increase the landscape area so that no increase in water use is expected for landscape maintenance. Therefore, the proposed project will not increase water demand or result in an impact on water supply systems.

As discussed in 10 a) above, sanitary wastewater will continue to be discharged directly to the sanitary sewer where it would be treated to applicable standards prior to discharge. Only one employee is expected to be at the project site. Therefore, no significant impacts on or wastewater treatment facilities and no expansion of existing facilities or construction of new facilities are expected from the project.

As discussed in 10 a) and c) above, the existing site at 2315 E. Dominguez Street is currently paved. The paved area at the site is not expected to increase or change, stormwater runoff would be essentially the same as the existing conditions, and the project would not result in an increase in stormwater runoff. Therefore, the project is not expected to impact the storm drainage facilities.

As discussed in 6 a) above, the project will modernize an existing office/warehouse building but would not require any additional buildings. The project is only expected to require one guard at the site, so fewer employees will be employed at the site. Therefore, the use of electricity and natural gas is not expected to increase and may actually decrease due to the new tenant. The electricity and natural gas demand will continue to be met by local suppliers and is expected to be limited to the operation of the office/warehouse building and gate. Further, the project site is already served by the various utilities, e.g., water, wastewater, stormwater drainage, electricity, and natural gas. Thus, the project would not result in an impact to water, wastewater, stormwater, electricity, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities and no upgrades would be required to any of these utilities.

19. b) No Impact. As discussed in 9 b), the water use associated with the project site is not expected to change due to the upgrades to the site. The proposed project will not add employees, equipment or processes that increase water usage; therefore, no increase in water demand is expected at the site.

19. c) No Impact. As discussed in 10 a) above, sanitary wastewater will continue to be discharged directly to the sanitary sewer where it would be treated to applicable standards prior to discharge. Only one employee is expected to be at the project site. Therefore, no significant impacts on or wastewater treatment facilities and no expansion of existing facilities or construction of new facilities are expected from the project.

19. d) No Impact. The City of Carson currently provides residential and commercial waste collection services through Waste Management Inc. Solid waste is taken to Waste Management's transfer station at 321 West Francisco Street in Carson where it is sorted. Non-recyclable materials are transported to the El Sobrante Landfill in Riverside County which has a capacity to process up to 70,000 tons of waste per week. Waste can also be taken to the Azusa Land Reclamation Management Facility in the City of Azusa. The project will result in a decrease in the employees working at the site and, therefore, not expected to result in any increase in solid waste generated by the site. Further, the parking of truck trailers is not expected to generate any solid waste. Therefore, the project will not result in any the generation of solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste goals.

19. e). No Impact. The project would comply with applicable City requirements, as well as federal, state, and local statutes on solid waste disposal, including the California Integrated Waste Management Act and City recycling programs. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

19.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to utilities and service systems are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation or the project; therefore, no utilities and service system mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evaluation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread or a wildfire?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☐	☑

20.1 Significance Criteria

The impacts to wildfires will be considered significant if:

The project results in new structures located within or adjacent to lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones

The project adversely effects emergency response or emergency evacuation plans.

20.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

20. a), b), c), and d) No Impact. The proposed project will not increase the existing risk of wildland fires. The proposed project site is located within an existing developed area

of the City of Carson. The site is surrounded by industrial and commercial uses. No wildlands are located in the immediate or surrounding area and the site is not within or near lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. For these reasons, the project would not expose people or structures to wild fires, would not impair and adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan for wild fires, would not exposure project occupants to pollutants from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire and would not exposure people or structures to flooding or landslides as a result of post-fire slope or drainage changes. Therefore, no potential significant adverse impacts resulting from wildfires are expected from the proposed project.

19.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to wildfires are expected to occur as a result of the construction or operation or the project; therefore, no wildfire mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)	☐	☐	☑	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☑

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

21. a) No Impact. The proposed project does not have the potential to adversely affect the environment, reduce or eliminate any plant or animal species or destroy prehistoric records of the past. The proposed project is located at a site that is part of an existing industrial facility, which has been previously disturbed, graded and developed, and this project, as proposed, will not extend into environmentally sensitive areas but will remain within the confines of an existing heavy industrial facility that is devoid of native biological resources. The project will result in repaving and renovation of an existing site and no new buildings will be constructed.

The construction of the existing office/warehouse building was estimated to be completed in 1962 and is a non-descript cement block building representative of numerous other such structures in the project area. Improvements will be made to the offices within the existing office/warehouse building; however, the building will continue to be used and would not be demolished. The existing shed along the western boundary of the project site will be removed, but it does not qualify as an historic resource. The shed appears to have been used for truck loading activities by the previous tenants and is constructed of concrete with a metal roof which provides no historic value. No historic structures will be removed as a consequence of the project; therefore, no significant impacts to historic cultural resources are expected as a result of implementing the proposed project.

No grading is required as the site has already been graded and developed. Construction activities will be limited to repaving the existing site and upgrades to existing warehouse/office building. Proposed project activities will occur in areas of the property where the ground surface has already been disturbed, and this past disturbance reduces the likelihood that previously unknown cultural resources will be encountered. The project will result in a change in tenants but is not expected to result in an impact on cultural resources. For additional information, see Section 4.0 – Biological Resources and Section 5.0 – Cultural Resources.

21. b) and c) Less Than Significant. The project involves the repaving and modernization of an existing industrial site to house a new tenant. The renovation activities and new tenant is not expected to result in an increase in personnel or substantially different operations. The potential increase in emissions is well below the SCAQMD's CEQA thresholds. The proposed project is expected to result in a reduction in vehicle miles traveled. CEQA Guidelines indicate that cumulative impacts of a project shall be discussed when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable, as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15065(c). Cumulatively considerable impacts are defined as impacts that exceed project-specific significance thresholds. Since project impacts do not exceed the applicable significance thresholds, they are not considered to be cumulatively considerable. As a result, the project is not expected to create significant adverse impacts. Therefore, the project is not expected to result in significant adverse cumulative impacts pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a)(2).

REFERENCES

California Division of Mines and Geology, 1999. Long Beach Quadrangle, March 25, 1999.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), 2019. California Scenic Highway Mapping System, Los Angeles, County. Available at: ww.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/index.htm

Carson, City of, 2004. City of Carson General Plan. October, 2004

Carson, City of, 2017. Climate Action Plan. South Bay Cities Council of Governments, December, 2017. Available at: http://ci.carson.ca.us/content/files/pdfs/planning/CAP.pdf

Federal Transit Administration (FTA), 2018. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, September 2018. FTA Report No.l 0123. Available at: - https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/research-innovation/118131/transit-noise-and-vibration-impact-assessment-manual-fta-report-no-0123_0.pdfVA-90-1003-06.

Jones, L.M. and E. Hauksson, 1986. Evaluation of Earthquake Potential in Southern California. In Future Directions Evaluating Earthquake Hazards in Southern California, ed. W.M. Brown, III, W.J. Kockelman, and J.I. Ziony. U.S. Geological Survey Open File Report 86-401.

Los Angeles, City of, 2006. L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide, City of Los Angeles. http://www.environmentla.org/programs/Thresholds/Complete%20Threshold%20Guide%202006.pdf

SCAQMD, 1993. CEQA Air Quality Handbook, SCAQMD, May 1993.

SCAQMD, 2003. White Paper on Potential Control Strategies to Address Cumulative Impacts from Air Pollution. August 2003. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/Agendas/Environmental-Justice/cumulative-impacts-working-group/cumulative-impacts-white-paper.pdf

SCAQMD, 2008. Interim GHG Significance Thresholds, December 5, 2009. http://www.aqmd.gov/hb/2008/December/081231a.htm

Tinsley, J.C ., T.L Youd, D.M. Perkins, and A.T.F. Chen, 1985. Evaluating Liquefaction Potential. In Evaluating Earthquake Hazards in the Los Angeles Region – An Earth-Science Perspective, ed. J.I. Ziony. U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper No. 1360.