

---

---

## IV.A. IMPACTS FOUND TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

---

---

A Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was initially prepared for the proposed project and circulated for public review on September 13, 2000. Based on the numerous comment letters submitted on the MND, the applicant volunteered to prepare an EIR for the proposed project. As a part of the EIR scoping process, it was determined that development and operation of the proposed project would not result in potentially significant impacts to the environmental impact topics listed below. Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines states:

Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines states:

*“An EIR shall contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR. ”*

The City of Los Angeles determined that there was no evidence that the proposed project would cause significant environmental effects in the following areas and that no further environmental review of these issues was necessary for the reasons described below.

### **1. Agricultural Resources**

The project site is not designated as prime agricultural land and is not zoned “agricultural.” Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use. In addition, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract. Finally, the proposed project would not involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to a non-agricultural use. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any potentially significant impacts to agricultural resources and no further analysis of this issue is warranted.

### **2. Biological Resources**

The project site is located in a highly urbanized area and does not contain 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 (Fish and Game) or U. S. Fish and Wildlife

Service. In addition, there are no known locally designated natural communities on the site or in the project vicinity.

The proposed project would not result in the direct removal, filling or hydrological interruption of a federally protected wetland as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Due to the highly urbanized surroundings, there are no wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites in the project vicinity. The proposed project would not interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. Because there are no known locally designated natural communities on the site or in the project vicinity, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

The vegetation on the site consists of a moderately thick assemblage of cultured trees, chaparral, shrubs, and grasses. Specifically, thirty-six non-native trees are located on the site.<sup>1</sup> These are specimens that measured 12' or larger in trunk diameter. The primary tree species present include fourteen Monterey Pine (*Pinus radiata*), seven Aleppo pines (*Pinus halepensis*), one Canary Island Pine (*Pinus canariensis*), 10 Blue Gum (*Eucalyptus globules*), one Lemon Eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus citriodora*), one NCN (*Eucalyptus* species), and two Shamel Ash (*Fraxinus uhdei*). There are no oak or other indigenous species found on the project site. Twenty-nine trees are proposed for removal with development of the proposed project. However, a majority of the trees found on the site have sparse foliage, insect and disease infestations, and show signs of lack of regular irrigation and proper structural pruning.

While no native bird species have been found on the site, the Department of Fish and Game has expressed concern that the proposed project would result in the removal and/or disturbance of vegetation, ground substrates and building demolition and therefore might have the potential to directly impact nesting native bird species.

The potential impacts to biological resources would be mitigated to a level of insignificance by the following mitigation measures:

1. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a plot plan prepared by a reputable tree expert, indicating the location, size, type, and condition of all existing trees on the site shall be submitted for approval by the Department of City Planning and the Street Tree Division of the Bureau of Street Services. All trees in the public right-of-way shall provide per the current Street Tree Division standards.

---

<sup>1</sup> Source: Horticulture Tree Evaluation for 17331-33 Tramonto Drive, Pacific Palisades, CA, by Pacific Horticulture, July 15, 1999 (Appendix E).

2. The plan shall contain measures recommended by the tree expert for the preservation of as many trees as possible. Mitigation measures such as replacement by a minimum of 24-inch box trees on the site, on a 1:1 basis, shall be required for the unavoidable loss of desirable trees on the site, and to the satisfaction of the Street Tree Division of the Bureau of Street Services and the Advisory Agency.
3. The applicant shall have a field survey conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if active nests of bird species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code are present in the construction zone or within 100 feet (200 feet for raptors) of the construction zone. The field survey shall occur no earlier than 3 days prior to construction or site preparation activities that would occur during the nesting/breeding season of native bird species potentially nesting on the site (typically March 1 through August 31). Additionally, raptor (nesting) surveys shall be conducted on the site prior to the commencement of construction related activities. Should an active raptor nest be discovered on the site, a 500-foot buffer shall be maintained between project-related activities and the nest until such time fledglings leave the nest and the site and it has been determined by the sites' biological monitor that the nest is not being used for repeated, same season nesting attempts. If active nests are found (other than raptors), a minimum 50-foot fence barrier shall be erected around the nest, and clearing within the fenced area shall be postponed or halted, at the discretion of a biologist, until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting, as determined by a qualified biologist. Construction personnel should be instructed on the sensitivity of the area. The project proponent should record the results of the recommended protective measures described above to document compliance with applicable State and Federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds.

### **3. Cultural Resources**

No National Register or California State Historic Resource properties, California Historical landmarks, California Points of Historic Interest exist on the proposed project site or within one-half mile radius of the site. Additionally, the project site does not contain any significant paleontological resources or unique geological features. Further, no known prehistoric archaeological resources exist on the project site, and no known human remains are interred on the site. Based on a cultural resources records search conducted by the South Central Coastal Information Center (Appendix H), no historic archaeological sites or historic isolates have been identified within a one-half mile radius of the site. In addition, no recorded historic built environments have been identified within a one-half mile radius of the site. Therefore, no significant impacts to cultural resources would occur.

#### **4. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The project site has never supported land uses that could have resulted in on-site contamination. However, two apartment buildings (consisting of a total of 20 dwelling units) known as the Ocean Woods Terrace apartments are present in the central portion of the site. The existing apartment buildings were built in 1962 and 1965. Given the age of existing structures on the project site, there may be asbestos containing materials (ACMs) in pipe insulation, fire retardant features, roofing, flooring, etc. of the existing residential buildings. If ACMs are present in the structures, they must be removed by licensed contractors using control methods prescribed in SCAQMD Rule 1403 (See Section IV.C. Air Quality). This is a potentially significant impact, which is addressed in Section IV.C of the Draft EIR, and can be mitigated to a less than significant level via mandatory compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1403, which would insure safe exposure for both abatement workers as well as the general public.

Due to the proposed land use type (multi-family residential housing), the project would not use, store or transport significant amounts of hazardous materials. Minor amounts of hazardous materials may be used by project residents, including motor oil, grease, paints, solvents, pesticides and herbicides. However, residents would be required to use and dispose of such materials in compliance with the State Health and Safety Code, City of Los Angeles Municipal Code, and the Uniform Fire Code (UFC).

#### **5. Mineral Resources**

There are no known economic mineral resources beneath the project site. The project site is not within a known source area for aggregate or other mineral resources. Additionally, the project site is not in an area of potential petroleum resources. Therefore, 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. In addition, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. The proposed project would not result in any potentially significant impacts to mineral resources and no further analysis of this issue is warranted.

#### **6. Libraries**

The increased on-site residential population created by the proposed project would result in greater demands for library services. The City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide states that a project consisting of 75 residential units or more could have a potentially significant impact to libraries. Because the proposed project would result in a net increase of 62 multi-family units, no significant impacts to libraries are anticipated.