

# Environmental Checklist Form

1. **Project Title:** Cambria Pines Specific Plan
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**  
City of Carson Community Development Dept.  
701 West Main Street  
Carson, California
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:**  
Mark Gross (310) 830-7600
4. **Project Location:** 228th and Main Streets
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**  
Comstock, Crosser & Associates Development Company  
321 12th Street  
Manhattan Beach, California
6. **General Plan Designation:** Industrial
7. **Zoning:** MH-D (Heavy Industrial, Design Review Overlay)

8. **Description of Project:**

The Cambria Pines Specific Plan proposes the development of 164 single-family detached homes on a 20.7 acre site (resulting in a density of 7.9 units per acre) located on 228th Street to the west of Main Street. The average lot size will be approximately 3,800 square feet. The dwelling units will be one- and two-stories and contain between 1,000 to 2,100 square feet. Each house will have a two-car garage and driveways (to meet the City's requirement for off-street parking spaces). The Cambria Pines Specific Plan seeks to promote home ownership by median income households, increasing the City's affordable housing stock. The architectural theme of The Cambria Pines Specific Plan will be New England/Cape Cod/Traditional. Landscaping will include landscaped buffers on the site's northern and eastern boundaries with grass, trees, and shrubs. Currently, the project site is designated for industrial uses and is primarily developed with functioning oil storage tanks. The purpose of this Specific Plan is to permit the development of a residential community. The Cambria Pines Specific Plan will establish specific design guidelines for development of the site and standards for the operation and maintenance of the community and the infrastructure necessary to support it. The Specific Plan seeks to ensure affordable housing opportunities are provided consistent with the City's adopted Housing Element.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

The project site is currently zoned MH-D (Heavy Industrial-Design Review Overlay). The existing land uses on the site include functioning oil storage tanks. The site is adjacent to single family residential uses on 228th Street and the other abutting streets to the west and south, and a variety of commercial uses on Main Street. The topography of the project site is generally flat. There are no significant ridges or slopes on the site, other than berms that have been graded to surround the 11 oil tanks on the project site. The majority of the site has been developed at one time or another for oil tanks and related uses. The vegetation and plant life on the site is limited. The site is primarily vacant and the only animal life would include small mammals, such as rodents.

10. Other agencies whose approval is required (i.e., permits, financing approval or participation agreement)

None

**Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Land Use and Planning
- Population and Housing
- Geological Problems
- Water
- Air Quality
- Transportation/Circulation
- Biological Resources
- Energy and Mineral Resources
- Hazards
- Noise
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- Public Services
- Utilities & Service Systems
- Aesthetics
- Cultural Resources
- Recreation

**Determination**

**On the basis of this initial evaluation:**

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

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A 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 significant effect(s) 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 the attached sheets, if the effect is a potentially significant impact or "Potentially significant unless mitigated." 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, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects: (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards; and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Mark Gross  
Signature

6/4/97  
Date

Mark Gross  
Printed Name

City of Carson  
For

## Evaluation of Environmental Factors

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. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to "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 Section XVII, "Earlier Analysis" may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analysis 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). Earlier analysis are discussed in Section XVII at the end of the checklist.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinance). References to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated. See the sample question below. A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
7. This is only a suggested form, and agencies are free to use different ones.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

Would the proposal result in potential impacts involving:

Landslide or mudslides?

*DISCUSSION: The project site is relatively level and is not susceptible to landslides or mudslides.*

**I. LAND USE AND PLANNING:** Would the proposal:

a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?

b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?

c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?

d) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands or impacts from incompatible land uses)?

e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?

*DISCUSSION: The project site will be developed with exterior lighting of the project's streets. All street lighting will be in compliance with applicable City of Carson standards; potential effect on adjacent land uses will be minimal. Although the change of use from industrial use to single-family residential use will constitute a change of use, the proposed change is consistent with the City's General Plan policies to increase opportunities for ownership of new single-family homes in the City of Carson.*

**II. POPULATION AND HOUSING:** Would the proposal:

a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?

b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact  
Unless  
Mitigation  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No  
Impact

c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?

*DISCUSSION: The proposed project will result in an increase in the City resident population (approximately 3 persons/dwelling unit, or 495 new residents in the City). The increase represents less than 0.03% of the City's current population, an insignificant increase. The proposed project will address the City's long-term objectives to provide additional housing opportunities, satisfying an identified demand. The proposed project will increase the City's housing stock in response to existing demands for single-family detached homes.*

**III. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS:** Would the proposal result in or expose of people to potential impacts involving:

a) fault rupture?

b) Seismic ground shaking?

c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?

d) Seiche, tsunami or volcanic hazard?

e) Landslides or mudflows?

f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading or fill?

g) Subsidence of the land?

h) Expansive soils?

i) Unique geologic or physical features?

*DISCUSSION: A "Phase I Environmental Assessment" of the site was conducted by CET Environmental Services in March, 1996; the purpose of the Phase I Assessment was to identify potential soil contamination of any portion of the site and to recommend, if necessary, additional studies. A Phase II Environmental Assessment was completed by CET Environmental Services in May, 1996 and is on file with the City of Carson Community Development Department. A complete copy of the Phase I Assessment is provided as Attachment A to this Environmental Checklist. In addition, a full and complete copy of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board's (LA Region) for and treatment of contaminated soil is provided as Attachment B to this Environmental Checklist; all conditions required by the Board, as the lead agency for site remediation, will be completed to the satisfaction of the Board and, therefore, no impacts will occur. The remediation of the project site will be prepared and conducted consistent with the requirements of responsible state and local agencies.*

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact  
Unless  
Mitigation  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No  
Impact

*The following mitigation measures are applicable to both the parcel map and the tract map relative to the Cambria Pines Specific Plan and are proposed to minimize the risk of upset to the proposed project.*

- 1. Applicant will submit a work plan to the regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The applicant shall receive approval for the proposed project's remediation with the lead agency, the RWQCB.*
- 2. Applicant will obtain approval and acceptance of remediation by the RWQCB.*
- 3. All components of the applicant's remediation program shall be approved by the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal-EPA) requirements, and implemented prior to receipt of the City's Certificate of Occupancy for the proposed project.*

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

*The project site is currently developed with eleven (11) functioning oil tanks, as well as remnants of paved and unpaved parking areas. Approximately 20-25 percent of the project site is covered with impervious materials and a substantial additional portion of the site is covered with either crushed rock and gravel or asphalt; however, most of the site's covered surface is in poor condition. In total, more than 50 percent of the project site is covered with either impervious material or with soil that has been substantially compacted due to long-term use of the site. The proposed project will require the removal of existing site improvements. Following the proposed development, approximately 80 percent of the 20.2 acre site will be covered by impervious material (such as streets, homes, driveways, patios, etc.).*

*The proposed General Plan amendment, zone change and other requests leading to the subsequent development of the single-family homes will not result in a change in the site's topography. There are no known geologic features on the project site nor are any features suspected based on the development of other sites in the project area and the history of the development of the site. The proposed single-family home development will not substantially increase site-generated water run-off. All surface run-off will be collected in storm drains connected to the regional storm drainage system. There is no neighboring body of water. Although all of southern California is identified as a seismically active region, there are no known geologic hazards, including faults, present on the project site.*

**IV. WATER: Would the proposal result in:**

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Changes in currents or the course or direction of water movements?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Change in quantity of ground water, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or recharge capability? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Altered direction or rate of flow of   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
groundwater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Impacts to groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*DISCUSSION: There is no adjacent body of water that will be affected by the project. The proposed project will not significantly alter the amount of storm water run-off from the project site. At present, the site generates 35 cubic feet per second (CFS) of storm runoff; following the project's development, the storm runoff is projected to increase to 48 CFS. (NOTE: These calculations are based on formula provided by the Los Angeles County Flood Control District in their Hydrology Manual and described as the "rationale method"). On-site runoff will be collected in an on-site private drainage system to be connected to the existing LA County Flood Control system's box culvert abutting the site's northern property line. Storm water will still flow into local storm drains; there will no change. There are no water bodies within close proximity to the project site and the amount of runoff will be insignificant compared to cumulative runoff in the region.*

*The proposed residential uses will not increase the potential for contamination (resulting from non-point sources, such as vehicles on local streets, or from direct sources, such as the use of fertilizers on lawns and gardens). This project will represent an improvement in the surface water quality over previous conditions. There will be no topographical alterations to the site and therefore the direction and rate of flow of ground water will remain constant. The proposed project will not affect any local aquifer. There will be no effect by the project on the local sources of public water. There will be no additional risks of water hazard posed by the project. The project site is located in flood Zone C.*

V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Alter air movements, moisture or temperatures, or cause any change in climate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create objectional odors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*DISCUSSION: Preparation of the site will result in short-term exhaust emissions from demolition and grading equipment, fugitive dust emissions, and vehicle emissions. NOx emissions related to on-site grading can be reduced by use of electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel power generators (which will*



Potentially Significant Impact

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

result in a 97% reduction in NOx emissions during construction and grading); this reduction will be partially off-set by use of methanol or natural gas on-site mobile equipment instead of diesel fuel (which will result in a 29% increase in CO). PM10 emissions during construction can be mitigated by the following: (a) apply approved chemical soil stabilizers to all inactive grading areas (a 30-65% reduction in PM10); (b) enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply approved soil binders to exposed piles (a 30-74% reduction in PM10); (c) water active sites at least twice daily (a 34-68% reduction in PM10); (d) all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil or other loose material are to be covered and should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (a 7-14% reduction in PM10); and (e) suspend all excavating and grading operations when wind speeds exceed 25 miles per hour (an nonquantifiable reduction in PM10). Implementation of these measures will reduce potential short-term effects to less than significant levels established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. No long-term effects are anticipated as the residential uses on the project site will generate considerably less air emissions than was generated by the previous industrial uses on the project site. The following table provides an estimate of project-related emissions and reflects the reduction in emissions due to the implementation of SCAQMD suggested mitigation measures:

Proposed Project: 164 Single-Family Detached Homes	Emissions (pounds/day)			
	ROG	NOx	PM10	CO
<b>Unmitigated Construction</b>				
Construction Vehicles	1.20	1.72	0.13	19.36
Construction Equipment	38.50	565.62	40.04	123.86
PM10	0.00	0.00	1064.80	0.00
Total Construction Emissions	39.70	567.34	1104.97	143.22
Construction Thresholds of	75.00	100.00	150.00	550.00
Significant (before mitigation)	no	yes	yes	no
Total Emissions (reflecting reduction due to mitigation measures)	(no mitigation needed)	113.46	220.99	(no mitigation needed)
Significant (after mitigation)	no	yes	yes	no
<b>Unmitigated Operations Emissions</b>				
Mobile Sources	36.43	53.04	3.31	584.64
Energy	0.03	1.69	0.06	0.29
Total Operations Emissions	36.46	54.73	3.37	584.93
Operations Thresholds of	55.00	55.00	150.00	550.00
Significant	no	no	no	no

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

**NOTES:**  
 1. Assumes avg. of 1,600 sq.ft. per residential unit  
 2. Assumes 261 days of construction  
 3. Assumes grading of 20.2 acres  
 SOURCE: CEQA Air Quality Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District (1992)

*The proposed residential development will not create odors. Further, any existing odors emanating from currently permitted industrial uses on the project site will be eliminated. In addition, the project site will not be affected by odors resulting from off-site land uses in the general area; adjacent land uses must comply with applicable SCAQMD regulations that limit the generation of odors. The proposed residential development will not effect the climate in any way. The climate in the area is influenced by regional factors that will not be changed or altered by the proposed project.*

**VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION.** Would the proposal result in:

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Increase vehicle trip or traffic congestion?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?                          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

*DISCUSSION: The proposed residential use of the project site will result in an increase of 1,650 vehicle trips per day. The traffic associated with proposed Specific Plan will not have an impact at any of the intersections studied as part of this environmental review process; see a complete project-specific traffic study provided as Attachment C to this Environmental Checklist.*

Potentially Significant Impact

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

The proposed 164-unit development will not create any adverse impacts on the area's street system and will an insignificant number of peak-hour and daily trips, as shown in the following table.

Project-Generated Vehicle Trips - Cambria Pines Specific Plan

Description	A.M. Peak Hour Trips			P.M. Peak Hour Trips			Daily Trips
	Enter	Exit	Total	Enter	Exit	Total	
Generation Factors - Detached Single-family Residential	0.16	0.64	0.80	0.70	0.30	1.00	10.00
Generation Forecasts - (164 dwelling units)	27	106	133	116	50	166	1,650

Source: Linscott, Law & Greenspan (October, 1996)

DISCUSSION: The proposed residential development will fully comply with applicable City requirements for on-site (resident) and off-site (guest/visitor) parking demands. The project will not result in a decrease in the LOS at any intersections beyond existing conditions, or those associated with ambient growth in the region; see response to 46.A and attached Figures 1 to 3. The proposed project will be served by two interior private streets; no existing streets will be affected by the proposed private streets and, as a result, the area's circulation pattern will be able to accommodate the project-related traffic. There are no waterborne, rail, or air traffic trips on or through the site. The decrease in site-generated traffic will reduce traffic hazards due to traffic movements/volumes.

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in impact to:

- a) Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals and birds)?
- b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)?
- c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?
- d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

- e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?

*DISCUSSION: There is only a very limited amount of introduced ornamental plant life on the project site. The proposed single-family residential development will also have introduced ornamental landscaping. No change is anticipated. There are no identified unique, rare, or endangered species on the site and since the project site has been developed since 1928, no reduction will occur. There are no identified endangered species in the area of the site that would be affected by the proposed project.*

*The only animals currently inhabiting the site are ground squirrels, field mice, rodents and vectors. These types of animals will continue to live in the area. In term of animal life, there are no identified unique, rare, or endangered species on the site. Since portions of the project site have been developed for more than 50 years, no reduction will occur. The current oil tanks are already a barrier to animal movement. There are no fish or wildlife habitat in the area of the project site.*

**VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES.**

Would the proposal:

- a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?
- b) Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?
- c) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of cultural value to the region and the residents of the State?

*DISCUSSION: There will be no additional amounts of energy required by the project, such as gas and electricity. The additional energy demands created by the project will not require the development of any new sources of energy as existing source can supply them easily. The following building design techniques will be incorporated into the construction of the residential units to ensure compliance with Title 24, California Energy Conservation Standards, and any additional City required conservation measures:*

- *Installation of certified insulating materials such as thermal insulation in walls and ceilings of the proposed single-family homes;*
- *Specifications for minimum piping insulation;*
- *Use of certified appliances and water and space heating systems;*
- *Use of building materials and techniques including finishing exterior walls with light-colored materials with high emissivity characteristics to reduce cooling loads and finishing interior walls with light-colored materials to reflect more light and thus increase lighting efficiency, glazing, lighting, and shading;*

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact  
Unless  
Mitigation  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No  
Impact

- *Installation of fluorescent and high-intensity-discharge (HID) lamps, which give the highest light output per watt of electricity consumed, wherever possible;*
- *Installation of high-efficiency lamps for all street lighting to reduce electrify consumption;*
- *Installation of occupant-controlled light switches and thermostats to permit individual adjustment of lighting, heating, and cooling, to avoid unnecessary energy consumption;*

*In addition, each residential unit will be pre-wired to permit re-charging of electric automobiles, a statewide program intended to reduce both energy consumption and the generation of auto-related pollutants.*

*Although the project will result in expenditures of non-renewable resources, such as oil and gas, during site preparation, the applicant proposes to "recycle" concrete and asphalt pavement for the construction of the new street system proposed as part of the single-family residential development. Therefore, the consumption of natural resources will be mitigated. While there will be use of natural resources, as cited above, it will not be a substantial depletion.*

IX. HAZARDS. Would the proposal involve:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including but not limited to oil, pesticides, chemical or radiation)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Exposure of people to existing hazards or potential health hazards?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Increase fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass or trees?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

*DISCUSSION: The proposed single-family residential uses will reduce the risk of explosion that could occur from industrial uses currently on the project site. The new residential uses proposed for the site will replace industrial uses that are not compatible with the residential uses in the area; therefore, the project will reduce the risk of upset by removing a potentially hazardous condition.*

*The proposed residential development will replace industrial uses on the project site, reducing existing risks to human health. The proposed residential development will not introduce noise, odor, or dust that could*

Potentially Significant Impact

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

pose a potential health hazard. All existing on-site oil wells and tanks will be removed; in addition, all on-site contaminated soils will be removed and/or remediated as required by applicable local, state and federal laws and guidelines. Compliance with applicable laws and guidelines will result in no significant risks to human health following site remediation. Responsible agencies for review of the site remediation to ensure compliance with applicable state and federal laws and guidelines include: the California Regional Water Quality Control Board; the California Department of Health Services; the County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services; the California Department of Conservation (Division of Oil and Gas and Geothermal Resources); Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (Waste Management Division); and the Los Angeles County Fire Department.

X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

- a) Increase in existing noise levels?
- b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?

**DISCUSSION:** There will be a short-term increase in noise levels during demolition of the existing building on the site and general site preparation and construction. This is a short-term impact that will be mitigated by applicable City codes and ordinances that limit construction hours to 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. weekdays. Construction is estimated to require 261 weekdays. As a result, the impact will be less than significant on adjacent residential uses. No long-term affects are anticipated as the residential uses at the site will generate considerably less noise than was generated by the industrial uses previously operating at the site.

The project is not anticipated to result in extreme noise levels. The proposed residential uses will generate noise levels comparable to the existing residential uses east and northeast of the project site. The noise generated by the adjacent industrial uses may generate noise levels in excess of the City's adopted maximum permissible noise levels for residential areas. The City of Carson Noise Element specifies the following noise standards for residential locations:

Exterior CNEL should not exceed 65 dB  
Interior CNEL should not exceed 45 dB

The City's adopted Noise Ordinance standard for a residential zoned property located adjacent to a non-residential zoned property are as follows:

1. Exterior noise level which may not be exceeded for a cumulative period of more than 30 minutes in any hour, L50, is 50 dBA;
2. Exterior noise level which may not be exceeded for a cumulative period of more than 15 minutes in any hour, L25, is 55 dBA;
3. Exterior noise level which may not be exceeded for a cumulative period of more than 5 minutes in any hour, L8, is 60 dBA;
4. Exterior noise level which may not be exceeded for a cumulative period of more than 1 minute in any hour, L2, is 65 dBA; and

Potentially Significant Impact

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

5. Exterior noise level which may not be exceeded for any period of time, Lmax, is 70 dBA.

The predominant sources of noise associated with the project are generated by traffic on Main Street. Traffic on Main Street currently generate a CNEL as high as 72 dBA along the eastern property line bordering the arterial. Future traffic will also generate a CNEL of 72 dBA at the same location. The traffic noise currently exceeds the exterior CNEL standard of 65 dBA, and will continue to exceed the standard in the future. The project would generate approximately 166 vehicle movements during the peak traffic hour. The additional vehicles would not generate an increase in the exterior CNEL along the site's property lines.

The following mitigation measures are recommended for compliance with the noise standards:

1. A continuous block noise wall with a minimum height of 6 feet is required along the residential boundaries of the project site. As described in the Specific Plan, the boundary block wall will be located 5 feet west of Main Street right-of-way and adjacent to the proposed landscaped buffer. This wall will extend perpendicular to the property line along the east and west property line to prevent traffic noise from flanking around the ends of the wall.
2. Residences located adjacent to Main Street would require sound rated windows and doors to meet the interior noise standard.
4. The actual wall heights, wall location, and sound ratings for windows and doors should be determined as part of the final engineering design of the project.
5. Additionally, several design and performance standards are incorporated into the Specific Plan to ensure noise compatibility between the proposed single-family residential uses and the existing adjacent industrial uses. The measure incorporated in the Specific Plan include: (a) walls will be constructed on the project site to reduce potential noise levels from adjacent industrial uses; and (b) the project site will have 5-foot wide landscaped buffers on the site's boundaries.

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:

a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

DISCUSSION: The demand for fire protection by the proposed residential uses are well within the current capacity of existing services; the demand will be less than from the existing industrial uses on the project site. The demand for police protection by the proposed residential uses are well within the current capacity of existing services. The school fees (based on \$1.84/sq. ft. of residential use) is estimated to be \$510,000 to the Los Angeles Unified School District. The schools fees will be used by the LAUSD to off-set the effects of project-related student enrollment. Approximately 83 elementary school students, 41 junior high school students, and 41 high school students will be generated by the proposed project. No new schools would be required by the increased population generated by the project and the school impact fees will enable the LAUSD to increase the capacity of the area's public school system to accommodate the project-related enrollment.

No additional demand for recreational facilities will be generated by the project.

There will be no impact on the maintenance of the road system; in fact, the proposed project may represent a beneficial impact since the forecasted decrease in site-generated traffic will be primarily passenger cars, rather than a mix of large trucks and passenger cars traveling to and from the site. Other governmental services will not be have increased demands on them because of the project.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.

Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alternation to the following utilities:

- a) Power or natural gas?
- b) Communication systems?
- c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?
- d) Sewer or septic tanks?
- e) Storm water drainage?
- f) Solid waste disposal?
- g) Local or regional water supplies?

DISCUSSION: Existing capacities in power and gas utility lines (with existing lines in both 228th Street and Main Street.) are adequate to serve the project. Existing communication systems are adequate to serve the project. The existing water system supply is adequate to serve the proposed project.

The proposed residential development will not create a significant demand for sewage conveyance or sewage treatment; the proposed project is estimated to generate approximately 8,500 gallons of sewage per day, a less than significant amount. Continued industrial/warehouse uses on the site could result in potential



Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact  
Unless  
Mitigation  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No  
Impact

*hazardous waste disposal problems that will be eliminated by the development of residential uses and compatible industrial uses of the proposed project.*

*There will be no significant increase in storm water run-off. The project site currently has an estimated storm runoff of 35 cubic feet per second (cfs); the proposed project will result in a minor increase to 48 cfs. On-site runoff will be collected in an on-site private drainage system to be connected to the existing LA County Flood Control system lines in Main Street.*

*The proposed project will decrease the amount of site-generated solid waste requiring disposal in landfill(s). The proposed project will participate in the City's curb-side recycling program. The proposed Specific Plan is estimated to generate 2,200 pounds per day of solid waste; the existing industrial land use and zoning designation for the project site could result in approximately 10,000 pounds per day of solid waste.*

**XIII. AESTHETICS.** Would the proposal:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Have a demonstrated negative aesthetic effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Create light or glare?                         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

*DISCUSSION: The existing view of a old and poorly maintained industrial uses on the site from the adjacent residential areas will be improved by the introduction of single-family homes more in keeping with the scale of uses in the area.*

**XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the proposal:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Disturb paleontological resources?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Disturb archaeological resources?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Affect historical resources?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

*DISCUSSION: Any archaeological sites would have been discovered and removed at that time the site was developed with oil tanks. There are no local, state or federally designated sites in the area of the site.*

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact  
Unless  
Mitigation  
Incorporated

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No  
Impact

**XV. RECREATION.** Would the proposal:

- a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?
- b) Affect existing recreational opportunities?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*DISCUSSION: The project will not effect the level of demand, level of use, or physical features of existing recreational opportunities.*

**XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

- a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definite period of time while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)
- c. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environment is significant.)
- d. Does the project have environmental effects which all cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*DISCUSSION: The current uses of the land is devoid of significant animals and plant communities. The historic resources on the project site will be donated for preservation off-site. Retaining the existing uses on the project site is an example of a short-term environmental goal at the cost of a longer term goal. The project will aid in the City's long-term goal to improve the City's owner-occupied residential housing stock. The project will not result in cumulative adverse effects. There will be no potential effects (ie., air quality, noise, traffic, etc.) that may effect humans directly or indirectly.*

## EARLIER ANALYSIS

Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets:

- a) **Earlier Analysis Uses.** Identify earlier analysis and state where they are available for review.
- b) **Impacts adequately addressed.** Identify which effect from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and state where 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.

**ATTACHMENT A: PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL AVAILABLE AT THE CITY OF CARSON PLANNING DEPARTMENT.

