

Environmental Checklist Form

1. **Project Title:** Annexation No. 01-2006
Pre-zoning Case No. 154-06
General Plan Amendment No. 80-06
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Carson, Planning Division
701 East Carson Street
Carson, CA 90745
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Richard Kawasaki, Planner
(310) 952-1700 ext. 1312
4. **Project Location:** Unincorporated Rancho Dominguez: generally the area bounded by Wilmington Avenue on the west; Del Amo Boulevard on the south; The City of Long Beach corporate limits on the east; and the City of Compton corporate limits on the north.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** City of Carson
701 East Carson Street
Carson, CA 90749
6. **General Plan Designation:** Los Angeles County - Major Industrial
City of Carson 2004 Sphere of Influence – Light Industrial, Heavy Industrial and High Density Residential
7. **Los Angeles County Zoning:** A-2 (Heavy Agriculture), C-M-DP (Commercial Manufacturing - Development Program), M-1.5 (Restricted Heavy Manufacturing), M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing), M-2-DP (Heavy Manufacturing – Development Program), and B-1 (Buffer)
8. **Description of Project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)**

The proposal is to annex the subject area; to amend the City of Carson General Plan and to pre-zone the area with zoning consistent with the General Plan. The existing zoning under the County of Los Angeles includes: A-2 (Heavy Agriculture), C-M-DP (Commercial Manufacturing – Development Program overlay), M-1.5 (Restricted Heavy Manufacturing), M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing), M-2-DP (Heavy Manufacturing – Development Program overlay) and B-1 (Buffer Strip). The existing General Plan designation in the County of Los Angeles General Plan is Major Industrial. The City of Carson has adopted sphere of influence General Plan designations for the area west of Alameda Street: Light Industrial, Heavy Industrial and High Density Residential. The City of Carson General Plan Land Use map depicts the areas so designated. The subject area is approximately 1,710 acres in area.

The proposed zone changes would be from A-2 (Heavy Agriculture) to CG-D (Commercial, General with Design Overlay); from C-M-DP (Commercial Manufacturing – Development Program) to RM12-D (Residential, Multiple Dwelling 12 dwelling units per acre maximum with Design Overlay); from M-1.5 (Restricted Heavy Manufacturing), B-1 (Buffer Strip), M-2-DP and M-2 Heavy Manufacturing) to ML-D (Manufacturing, Light with Design Overlay) and MH-D (Manufacturing, Heavy with Design Overlay). The proposed new zones were selected to most closely match the existing zoning and to match the types of land uses permitted in each respective zone. The proposed general plan land use categories are Commercial General for the area to be zoned CG-D; High Density Residential for areas to be zoned RM12-D; Light Industrial for areas to be zoned ML-D; and Heavy Industrial for areas to be zoned MH-D.

The area proposed to be annexed is generally developed with industrial uses. There are some small retail shops within the industrial buildings to provide limited service to workers in the area. There are several isolated commercial buildings around the periphery of the area. There are no significant vacant parcels available for development within this area. In general the streets and other public facilities do not appear to be in need of major repair or improvement. Because of the industrial nature of the area there are spur line grade crossings across several local roads.

There are two large mobile home parks in the proposed annexation area. They are described in the discussions of sub areas 2 and 4.

The following discussion of the project area land uses is divided into 4 geographic sub areas:

Sub Area 2 This sub area, approximately 109 acres in size, is generally bounded on the north and west by the City of Compton corporate limits; on the east by Santa Fe Avenue; on the south by Victoria Street and its easterly extension. The dominant use is Del Amo Mobile Home Estates, which is located between Apra Street and Victoria Street west of Alameda Street and which has 512 mobile home units covering approximately 57 acres. The mobile home park is located on a bluff with a major view shed toward the east. The mobile home park was completed in 1977 according to the County Assessor.

On the west side of Alameda Street north of the easterly extension of Victoria Street there is a 16+ acre property with historical significance known as the Rancho San Pedro Dominguez Adobe. This property was once the home of the original rancho land grantees, the Dominguez family. The major structures are an adobe dwelling being used as a museum and another multi-story building on the site being used as a seminary. The site is listed as California Historical Landmark No. 152. The property includes a park-like area and a vehicle parking area.

The area north of the Dominguez ranch house and seminary property is developed with a small industrial park (14+ acres).

The Metro Blue Line runs diagonally through this area between the mobile home park and the museum/ seminary property. There are no grade crossings for the Blue Line within this area.

Sub Area 3 This sub area, approximately 870 acres in size, is generally bounded by the City of Compton corporate limits on the north; Susana Road; City of Long Beach corporate limits and the Long Beach (CA 710) Freeway on the east; Del Amo Boulevard on the south; and Alameda Street on the west.

This sub area is generally developed with heavy industrial uses on 2 to 10 acres. However, there are areas where the lots are less than one acre. The development in Sub Area 3 is marked by

outdoor storage not screened from public view by decorative walls and/or landscaping. The buildings are generally older and smaller than in Sub Area 4. Landscaped setbacks are ten feet or less in most cases and totally lacking in a few cases. Chain link or wire security fences are common.

There is a higher risk of fire emergencies due to the nature of the industrial businesses in this area. The notable recent fires in Rancho Dominguez have been within this area.

The County of Los Angeles maintains a large multi-story office building for the Department of Social Services at the intersection of Santa Fe Avenue and the Gardena (CA 91) Freeway. The facility experiences heavy vehicular traffic generated by clients during the weekdays. Bus and rail transit are convenient to the location but do not appear to be significant transportation modes to and from this facility in comparison to private vehicles.

Compton Creek runs in a southeast direction through this area. The creek is concrete lined through Los Angeles City, Willowbrook and the City of Compton but is soft bottomed from several hundred yards north of the Gardena Freeway (CA 91) to its confluence with the Los Angeles River south of Del Amo Boulevard. Compton Creek is part of the Los Angeles River Watershed. Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation has installed the South Compton Creek Bike Trail along the east side of the creek on a former maintenance road. The bike trail is approximately two miles long. A watershed management plan for Compton Creek has been adopted and several demonstration projects related to the improvement of water quality, habitat rehabilitation and public access have been funded by the State Coastal Conservancy.

Los Angeles County Fire Department Station No. 105 is located at 18915 South Santa Fe Avenue north of the bridge over Compton Creek. The Metro Blue Line and Alameda Street restrict fire department access from this station to properties west of Alameda Street.

A Metro Blue Line Station is between Santa Fe Avenue and Compton Creek on the north side of Del Amo Boulevard. There is a large park and ride facility associated with this facility. The Blue Line runs diagonally northwest from this point. There are no grade crossings for the Blue Line in this area. The right-of-way is secured by a wire fence.

A large indoor swap meet facility with approximately 200 small businesses at the northwest corner of Susana Road and Del Amo Boulevard is one of the few retail facilities in the proposed annexation area.

Sub Area 4 This sub area, approximately 707 acres in size, is generally bounded by Victoria Street on the north; Alameda Street on the east; Del Amo Boulevard on the south; and Wilmington Avenue on the west.

Recently developed industrial parks dominate the west part of the area. The Dominguez Technology Center, which is a master planned industrial park in the City of Carson, was also developed in this sub area, north of University Avenue and east of Wilmington Avenue.

There is a large mobile home park in this sub area. The Dominguez Hills Mobile Home Estates, located between University Drive and Gladwick Street east of Dominguez Hills Drive covers approximately 72 acres and contains 511 units. The development is located on a bluff looking eastward. The mobile home park was completed in 1980.

North of the mobile home park is a petroleum product transfer and distribution facility operated by Pacific Energy Partners. There 13 storage tanks on the site with the six largest tanks estimated at 500,000 gallons capacity. Truck traffic associated with the facility is undetermined at this time. Much of the transfer and distribution is accomplished through pipelines. This site was formerly part of the Southern California Edison fuel system.

The City of Long Beach Water Department owns a property at the eastern terminus of University Drive for water and other related storage. The City of Long Beach has apparently leased a portion of its property to Dominguez Hills Mobile Home Estates for mobile home pads and access to Laurel Park Road. There is large FM radio tower (approximately 400 feet high) on the City of Long Beach property. There is a smaller tower on the same property apparently used by the City of Long Beach. There are several other smaller communication towers along Wilmington Avenue and along Alameda Street.

The City of Compton owns a property between Wilmington Avenue and Broadwick Street near Paulhan Street. The Compton property is used for water storage (four tanks) and two communication antennas.

The California Water Service Company uses a property on Wilmington Avenue near University Drive for water storage (four tanks).

There is a retail business at the northeast corner of Del Amo Boulevard and Wilmington Avenue. While it is a warehouse style shoe store, it is not a regionally based business. Adjacent to the shoe store is a medical clinic and credit union located on Del Amo Boulevard.

Sub Area 5 This sub area, approximately 24 acres in size, is generally bounded by the City of Compton corporate limits on the north and east; Charles Willard Street and its easterly extension on the south; and Wilmington Avenue on the west.

This sub area is occupied by industrial park development. A portion of the Dominguez Technology Center, a master planned industrial park, occupies the majority of this area.

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

The area bounding the proposed annexation on the south within the City of Carson is generally industrial in nature including a petroleum storage facility as the most intense use.

Along the west boundary of the proposed annexation south of University Avenue is a large single family development. To the north of University Avenue is the Dominguez Technology Center, a master planned industrial park.

North of the proposed annexation are predominantly industrial properties within the City of Compton. West of Alameda Street the properties are industrial developments. Further north is the Gardena (CA 91) Freeway. Compton Community College is located on the north side of the Gardena Freeway east of Santa Fe Avenue.

Properties within the City of Long Beach along the east side of Susana Road between Victoria Street and the Artesia Freeway are predominantly single family residences which back to Susana Road. Los Angeles County has placed a buffer zone 50 feet wide along the west side of Susana Road opposite the single family homes. The buffer zone restricts building and activity. Susana Road is 100 feet wide in this area. There are some small industrial and commercial uses along

the north side of Victoria Street east of Susana Road. There is a public middle school south of Victoria Street. Further south the area is bounded by the Long Beach (CA 710) Freeway and the Los Angeles River. Mixed (single family and medium density) residential uses are east of the river south of the middle school and north of Del Amo Boulevard.

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

Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO); County of Los Angeles.

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 that preparer cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the reference information shows that the impact simple 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 a “Less than Significant Impact.” The preparer must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analysis,” may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Early analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect analyses are discussed at the end of the checklist.
- 6) Preparers are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). References to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I.	AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation:

(a-d) The project is located in a heavily urbanized part of Los Angeles County. No major development is planned as a result of this project. There are properties with scenic vistas. However, this project would not affect the existing vistas. The proposed design overlay zones will require discretionary review for any scenic vistas and significant view sheds.

Mitigation: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II.	AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) Prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional Model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. <i>Would the project:</i>				
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	use?				
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation:

- (a) According to Appendix G of the State Guidelines and the Department of Conservation, a project will have a significant impact on agricultural resources if it falls into any of the following Farmland designations: Prime Farmland; Farmland of Statewide Importance; or Unique Farmland. Since the proposed project would take place within an existing urban area zoned for industrial development, no agricultural impacts would result.
- (b) The project is located within an existing urban area and there are no properties used for agricultural purposes. The project would not result in direct or indirect impacts to agricultural resources. The project does not comprise an agricultural preserve under a Williamson Act contract.
- (c) The project does not affect agricultural land or farmlands. The project would neither directly nor indirectly result in the conversion of Prime, Unique, or other Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use.

Mitigation: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III.	AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria Established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Violate any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation:

- (a-e) The project is not anticipated to conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans. The project will result in a change of municipal jurisdiction. Operational emissions are not expected to increase as a result of this project.

Mitigation: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation:

- (a) The project area is currently almost 100% developed and no impacts to candidate, sensitive or special species or habitat are expected. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact.
- (b,c) Compton Creek is a riparian habitat identified within the area (sub area 3) proposed for annexation. The proposed project will not affect storm water and drainage regulations. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on riparian habitat or federally protected wetlands.
- (d) The project is located in an urban area. Annexation will not create a barrier to wildlife dispersal. There are no known wildlife migration corridors or known unique, rare, or endangered species inhabiting the project site.
- (e) The project would not conflict with locally adopted conservation plans and policies.

- (f) The proposed project area (sub area 3) contains the Compton Creek Watershed. No impacts are anticipated as a result of annexation to the City of Carson.

Mitigation: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project</i>				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation:

- (a) The Dominguez adobe structure in sub area 2 is an identified historical resource. It will not be affected by this project. The proposed zoning will add stricter discretionary reviews to future development proposals on and near the property.
- (b) The project area is developed and there are no identified archaeological resources on the project site. However, it is possible that unknown archaeological remains may be uncovered. In the event that these remains are uncovered during construction, the City requires that land alteration work in the general vicinity of the find be halted and a qualified specialist be consulted.
- (c) There are no identified paleontological resources in the project area. However, it is possible that unknown paleontological remains may be uncovered. In the event that these remains are uncovered during construction, the City requires that land alteration work in the general vicinity of the find be halted and a qualified specialist be consulted.
- (d) There are no identified human remains or formal cemeteries in the project area.

Mitigation: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, or 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation:

- (a) The project site is located west of the seismically active Newport-Inglewood fault and northeast of the Palos Verdes fault zone. A portion of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone lies about ¾ mile northwest of sub area 5. Another portion of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone lies about 1 mile southeast of sub area 3. The southern portion of sub area 4 and all of sub area 3 lie within a mapped liquefaction hazard zone. Small areas in sub area 4 north of Del Amo Boulevard and west of Alameda Street lie within a mapped Earthquake-induced Landslide Zone, which prohibits construction. Buildings within the areas mapped as potential hazard areas are constructed following regulations enacted to avoid property damage and risk of injury. The project is not expected to significantly increase the risk of exposure of people to impacts involving seismic ground shaking. Since some additional industrial development under the City of Carson zoning regulations might occur in the few vacant parcels, a less than significant effect is expected.

- (b) The project is a jurisdictional change only and would not cause any grading or other soil movement. No soil erosion or loss of topsoil is expected.
- (c) The project will not cause construction on unstable soil. No impact is expected.
- (d) Parts of the project area may contain expansive soil. The proposed project will change local jurisdiction regulations only. Future construction will comply with all Uniform Building Code requirements of California. No impacts are anticipated.
- (e) The proposed project does not involve the installation or use of septic tanks or alternative disposal systems. Any new development after the proposed annexation would connect to the public water distribution and sewer systems.

Mitigation: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites Compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				

Explanation:

- (a, b) The proposed project is to annex unincorporated land to the City of Carson and to pre-zone the land. The project would not affect existing conditions relative to the exposure of the public and the environment to hazardous materials.
- (c) There is an existing school within the City of Long Beach less than ¼ mile east of the project sub area 3. The project will not affect existing conditions relative to the school. The Los Angeles Unified School District is proposing a new high school approximately one mile south of sub area 3 on Santa Fe Avenue in Long Beach.
- (d) The project area may contain identified hazardous sites on the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) list. The proposed project to annex the land is not expected to create a potentially significant hazard to the environment. Thus, no impact is expected.
- (e, f) The project area is not located within an adopted or proposed airport land use plan. The project area is not located near or within a public airport or public use airport, and would not result in safety hazards to people residing or working in the project area. No new health hazards would be created.
- (g) The project area will be subject to emergency response and evacuation plans for the City of Carson.
- (h) The project area is located in an urbanized area away from wildlands. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

Mitigation: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	siltation on- or off-site?				
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation:

- (a) The proposed project would be required to implement soil erosion and sediment control measures where necessary as required by the City of Carson. A Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSWMP) will be required to address and mitigate stormwater runoff. This is considered a less than significant impact.
- (b-d) The project area is almost fully developed. The proposed annexation is not expected to impact groundwater supplies. The project would not create impervious areas and would not affect or alter groundwater recharge volumes. Impacts to soil above the groundwater table are unlikely and the proposed project is expected to have no impacts to groundwater and surface flow. No rivers and streams are present within the project area.
- (e) The proposed project would not result in substantially more runoff than currently generated. All proposed construction projects would be required to implement soil erosion and sediment control measures as required by the City of Carson. Thus, no significant impact is expected.
- (f) The project would not place housing within a 100-year flood zone as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazards Boundary or Flood Rate Insurance Map or other flood hazard delineation map, and would not expose people or property to any known water-related hazards.

- (g) The project would not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.
- (h) The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.
- (i) The project would not expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The project area is not located in an area prone to such natural phenomenon.

Mitigation: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a)	Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation:

- (a) The project will not divide an established community. Thus, no impact is expected.
- (b) The project site is to pre-zone the proposed annexation land and to amend the City of Carson general plan so that there would be no conflict relative to land use plans, policies or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. No impact is expected.
- (c) The project area is not located within a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No impact is expected.

Mitigation: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X.	MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Explanation:

- (a) The proposed project would 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 because the project site is not located in a mineral rich area nor does it involve any mining practices.
- (b) There are no known locally important mineral resources at the project site. Some minor oil drilling continues which was a significant activity in the area during the 20th century. The project would have no effects on the availability of a mineral resource.

Mitigation: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI.	NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>				
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise level in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	A substantial permanent increase in the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation:

- (a) The proposed project is not expected to create any operational noise impacts above the existing ambient levels. The proposed annexation will not create new noise generators.

- (b) The proposed project is not expected to expose persons to excessive ground-borne vibrations or ground-borne noise levels. This is considered a less than significant impact.
- (c) The proposed project is an improvement to the property and industrial use is allowed with the approval of a conditional use permit within the MH zone. Operational sounds from the facility will be less than the ambient noise presently on the property.
- (d) Construction activities generated by the proposed project would temporarily increase noise levels in the area. However, the project would generally be constructed during daylight hours. Construction would be a very short term activity. This is considered a less than significant impact.
- (e) The project site is not located within two miles of an airport.
- (f) The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Mitigation: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII.	POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the project</i>				
a)	Induce substantial growth in an area either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation:

(a, b, c) The project site is located in a developed industrial area and will not induce substantial growth nor displace residents. The project will not create any new residentially zoned land. Existing law strictly regulates the conversion of mobile home parks to other uses. The displacement of population and housing is not expected.

Mitigation: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII.	PUBLIC SERVICES.				
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 public services:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation:

(a) *Fire Protection* - Fire service to the project area will continue to be provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department. The project would require compliance to the City Building Code and Fire Code. Documentation of adequate fire service to the site would be requested from the County prior to any new construction. The project is not expected to increase the level of service required for the area.

Police Protection - Police protection will continue to be provided by the Los Angeles County Sheriffs Department (Carson Substation). The project is not expected to increase the level of police protection above what is currently required.

Schools – The proposed project does not rezone land for additional residential use and will not directly generate schoolchildren. The land currently used for mobile home parks will allow residential uses at the same density. The State law and the City of Carson municipal code contain strict protection for mobile home parks. No increase in the demand for school facilities is expected.

Parks – The proposed project would not significantly impact any nearby park facility. There is an existing community park, Anderson Park, at the southwest corner of Wilmington Avenue and University Drive. The park is over 8 acres in size.

Other public facilities – No impacts are expected.

Mitigation: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV.	RECREATION.				
a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration the facility would occur to be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation:

- (a) The project would not affect demand for neighborhood or regional parks, nor increase the demand for such facilities. The two mobile home parks have existing recreational facilities. The residents already use City of Carson neighborhood parks and other existing regional facilities.
- (b) The project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV.	TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a)	Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to design feature (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"/>

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g)	Conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation:

- (a) The proposed project will not add vehicle trips to the existing traffic condition on local streets or regional transportation links.
- (b) The project will not cause any changes in the level of service relative to the adopted congestion management plan.
- (c) The project would not have direct access to or use of any air transportation facilities, and would not affect air traffic patterns.
- (d) The project will not affect the design of any existing streets, highways or other transportation links. No impact is expected.
- (e) The proposed project will have no impact to emergency access. Emergency services will be provided by the same agencies.
- (f) Parking requirements within the City of Carson are the same or greater than those under the Los Angeles County jurisdiction. Thus, no impact to parking capacity is expected.
- (g) The proposed project would not create impacts to policies, plans, or programs for alternative transportation. There will be no impact.

Mitigation: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Result in 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation:

- (a) The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The proposed project is not expected to generate additional wastewater.
- (b) The project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.
- (c) Site erosion and siltation control measures would be incorporated into the project design any new construction to prevent runoff contaminants from entering offsite areas. Regulation of these issues will remain the same as the current regulations.
- (d) The annexation area is expected to continue to be served by the existing water service provider. No impacts are anticipated.
- (e) The project would not result in the generation of wastewater in excess of the capacities of the current wastewater treatment provider.
- (f) Solid waste generated would continue to be transported to appropriate disposal facilities.
- (g) The project will not cause any changes to federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes. Therefore, no impacts are identified.

Mitigation: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII.	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation:

- (a) The project site is in a developed urbanized area and does not contain any sensitive, protected, rare, or endangered wildlife or vegetation. No impacts area anticipated.
- (b) The proposed project would not significantly contribute to cumulatively considerable traffic, air quality, and noise impacts. Thus, this is considered a less than significant impact.
- (c) The proposed project is not expected to have a substantial adverse effect on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Mitigation: None required.

XVIII. Earlier Analysis

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects may have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration, Section 15603(c)(3)(D). *Los Angeles County General Plan and EIR.*

Relative information for the proposed project was used, *including various documents and correspondences with the applicant, information in the application, and information from the Existing Conditions Report (April 2000) prepared for the General Plan Update.* These documents are available for review at the City of Carson Planning Division located at 701 E. Carson Street, Carson, CA.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

For

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION (completed by the Lead Agency):

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

References

City of Carson. April 2000. Existing Conditions Report for the General Plan Update.