



(310) 253-5635
 FAX (310) 253-5626

9770 CULVER BOULEVARD, CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA 90232-0507

INITIAL STUDY

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM AND ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

Project Title:	P-881 Sepulveda Boulevard Widening		
Lead Agency Name & Address:	City of Culver City, Public Works Department 9770 Culver Blvd., Culver City, CA 90232		
Contact Person & Phone No.:	Hong Wang, Senior Civil Engineer (310) 253-5604		
Project Location/Address:	Sepulveda Boulevard between Playa Street/Jefferson Boulevard and Green Valley Circle in Culver City, CA.		
Nearest Cross Street:	Playa Street/Jefferson Boulevard and Green Valley Circle.	APN:	N/A
Project Sponsor's Name & Address:	City of Culver City Public Works Department 9770 Culver Blvd., Culver City, CA 90232		
General Plan Designation:	Commercial	Zoning:	Commercial General (CG), Commercial Regional Retail (CRR), Industrial General (IG)
Redevelopment Project Area:	Component Areas No. 1 and No. 4		
Overlay Zone/Special District:	None		
<p>Project Description and Requested Action: The proposed project would widen Sepulveda Boulevard by adding an additional southbound lane between Playa Street/Jefferson Boulevard and Green Valley Circle. The purpose of the proposed is to improve the level of service (LOS) by eliminating an existing "bottleneck" on Sepulveda Boulevard.</p> <p>Currently, from Playa Street/Jefferson Avenue until the intersection with Green Valley Circle, Sepulveda Boulevard has two lanes. Just south of Green Valley Circle Sepulveda Boulevard becomes a three-lane roadway. Northbound Sepulveda Boulevard has three lanes throughout the project limits. The proposed project would close the existing gap by widening southbound Sepulveda Boulevard from two to three lanes within the project area. The existing southbound curbside parking lane would be replaced with the third lane between Sawtelle Boulevard and Playa Street/Jefferson Boulevard.</p> <p>The roadway would be widened within the existing right of way. The proposed project would require relocating power lines on the east side of the project adjacent to the Westfield Mall, and widening into the sidewalks at various locations. The sidewalks would remain standard width and would comply with ADA requirements. The proposed project would require excavating approximately two feet under the existing sidewalks or road bed.</p>			
<p>Existing Conditions of the Project Site: The project area is located along Sepulveda Boulevard between Playa Street/Jefferson Boulevard and Green Valley Circle. Sepulveda Boulevard is an arterial roadway, with three lanes in the northbound direction and two or three lanes in the southbound direction. There is a landscaped median along the entire segment broken by numerous turning gaps. There is also a sidewalk running along the outside of both the northbound and southbound lanes. Intermittent landscaping exists along the corridor as part of the commercial development.</p>			
<p>Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: To the east of Sepulveda Boulevard land use is primarily large retail</p>			

commercial businesses and associated parking, including the Fox Hills Mall. To the west of the roadway are smaller commercial lots and, toward the south end of the project limits, the I-405 Freeway. There is some landscaping within the commercial lots and along the east side of the I-405 Freeway; however, the project area consists primarily of commercial buildings and paved streets and parking lots. In addition, the project crosses Slawson Avenue and passes under State Highway 90. To the north and south of the project limits, development is similar. The setting is an urban commercial corridor surrounded by commercial properties and transportation facilities.

Other public agencies whose approval is required: The City of Culver City is the lead agency for CEQA. Caltrans Encroachment Permits Department would need to issue an encroachment permit for construction under State Highway 90. The City of Los Angeles would need to approve the portion of the project within its city limits. The County of Los Angeles would need to approve the catch basin relocation due to the street widening.

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:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

- I find that the project is **EXEMPT** from further environmental impact assessment under Class 1(c) of CEQA Section 15301 and 15304 and per the City's guidelines and regulations for the implementation of CEQA. A **NOTICE OF EXEMPTION** will be prepared.
- 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.

Hong Wang, Senior Civil Engineer Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Responses:				
a). <u>No Impact.</u> The proposed project is located in a developed urban area in Culver City where land uses are primarily commercial, retail, and transportation. There are no scenic vistas located within the project area; therefore, there would be no impact.				
b). <u>Less Than Significant Impact.</u> The proposed project would not impact any rock outcroppings or historic buildings. Non-native trees and bushes exist as landscaping along the median and sidewalks. While it is the City's goal to preserve the landscaping within the project corridor, some tree removal may be required; however, this removal would not substantially affect any scenic resources as additional trees will be planted along corridor parkway. The project would not impact any existing topography or historic buildings, nor is it located within a scenic highway; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.				
c). <u>Less Than Significant Impact.</u> The proposed project would include widening a segment of southbound Sepulveda Boulevard from two to three lanes to meet the existing width of the adjacent segments. Because the existing corridor is dominated by the roadway, these improvements would not substantially alter the visual character of the site. Some tree removal may be required, and existing power lines would be relocated on the east side of the project adjacent to Westfield Mall however, this would not be expected to substantially change the character of the area, which is urban and developed. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.				
d). <u>Less Than Significant Impact.</u> Existing streetlights located within the sidewalk would be relocated; however, the project would not add any additional source of lighting or glare; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.				
Mitigation Measure(s):				
No mitigation measures are required.				
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Responses:

a-e). *No Impact*. The proposed project is located in an urban and developed area of Culver City where land uses are primarily commercial, retail, and transportation. There is no agricultural or forest land within the project limits; therefore, there would be no impact.

Mitigation Measure(s):

No mitigation measures are required.

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. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Responses:

a). *Less Than Significant Impact*. The proposed project is listed in an approved 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP) and the proposed project description is consistent with the RTIP project description. The proposed project would improve LOS along Sepulveda Boulevard by widening this segment of the roadway to match adjacent segments and eliminating the "bottleneck" effect. Improved traffic circulation would be expected to reduce the

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
release of air pollutants; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.				
<p>b-c). <u>Less Than Significant Impact.</u> The proposed project is in a non-attainment area for ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). Temporary increases in pollutant emissions would result from construction activities; however, standard measures to reduce these emissions would be implemented in compliance with applicable regulations, and the project would not be expected to result in any air quality violations. Following construction, improved traffic circulation would be expected to reduce the release of air pollutants; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>d). <u>Less Than Significant Impact.</u> Sensitive land uses are considered those such as residences, schools, day care centers, playgrounds, and medical facilities. The project area is within a commercial area where there are no sensitive land uses. In addition, while there would be temporary increases in pollutant levels during some construction activities, standard measures to reduce these emissions would be implemented in compliance with applicable regulations, and the project would not be expected to result in any air quality violations. Any emissions released would be expected to dissipate quickly and would not expose people to substantial pollutant levels. Operation of the project would not result in any new sources of pollutants; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>e). <u>Less Than Significant Impact.</u> While construction activities may result in the temporary creation of odorous substances, these odors would be temporary and short-term, and would be expected to dissipate quickly outside of the immediate construction area. Operation of the project would not result in any new odor sources; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p><u>Mitigation Measure(s):</u></p>				
<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>				
<p>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:</p>				
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Responses:

- a). No Impact. The proposed project is located in an urban and developed area of Culver City where land uses are primarily commercial, retail, and transportation. No federally threatened, endangered species or habitat is located within or around the proposed project limits; therefore, there would be no impact.
- b). No Impact. The proposed project is located in an urban and developed area of Culver City where no riparian or other sensitive natural communities exist; therefore, there would be no impact.
- c). No Impact. The proposed project is located in an urban and developed area of Culver City where there are no water resources such as streams, rivers, or wetlands; therefore, there would be no impact.
- d). No Impact. The proposed project is located in an urban and developed area of Culver City; however, trees and bushes that are part of the landscaping could provide nesting habitat for birds. If tree removal is required, it would be conducted outside of the nesting season (September 15th to February 15th); therefore, disturbance to nesting birds would be avoided and there would be no impact.
- e). No Impact. While it is the City's goal to preserve the landscaping within the project corridor, if this is not possible then some tree removal would be required. Culver City does not have a tree preservation ordinance, and any replanting of trees would be conducted in compliance with the City's Street Tree Master Plan, which includes specific policies regarding appropriate trees. Therefore, there would be no impact.
- f). No Impact. There are no adopted habitat conservation plans, natural community conservation plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan that would be applicable to this project; therefore, there would be no impact.

Mitigation Measure(s):

No mitigation measures are required.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Responses:

- a). No Impact. There are no historical resources within or adjacent to the project area, and the project would not directly or indirectly affect any structures; therefore, there would be no impact.
- b-d). Less Than Significant Impact. Some ground disturbance would be required for the project, but would be limited to two feet of excavation. Archaeological studies completed for the project determined that there are several known archaeological sites within 0.5 miles of the project area; however, the closest site is 0.22 miles away from the project

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

area. In addition, the known sites are located near Centinela Creek, whereas the project is 0.15 miles away from the creek. Due to the project location, as well as the disturbed nature of the site, the discovery of cultural resources, including paleontological resources and human remains, is not anticipated.

Although unlikely, if cultural materials were to be discovered during construction, it is City policy that all earth-moving activity within and around the immediate discovery area would be diverted until a qualified archaeologist can assess the nature and significance of the find. If human remains were to be discovered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that further disturbances and activities would cease in any area or nearby area suspected to overlie remains, and the County Coroner contacted.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98, if human remains were to be found that could be Native American, the Coroner would notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who would then notify the Most Likely Descendent (MLD). At this time, the person who discovered the remains would contact the City so that they could work with the MLD on the respectful treatment and disposition of the remains. Further provisions of PRC 5097.98 would be followed as applicable. Due to the low probability of impacts to archaeological resources and implementation of applicable policies, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s):

No mitigation measures are required.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Responses:

a). *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project is not located on a fault or within a fault zone as delineated on Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, but it is located in the seismically active Southern California region, and subject to potential seismic related ground shaking events associated with the area. Two nearby faults have potential to cause moderate to large seismic events: the Newport-Inglewood Fault, located directly adjacent to Culver City, and the San Andreas Fault, located approximately about 45 miles away. The project is also located within an area prone to liquefaction; however, it is not located within a landslide hazard area.

Project construction would require ground-disturbing activities, including grading and excavation. While these activities would result in temporary changes to the existing topography of the project area, these changes would be minor and would not be expected to result in increased seismic hazards or adversely affect the geology of the area. In addition, the project would be designed and constructed in compliance with requirements for structural safety, and would not be expected to result in substantial risk related to seismic activity; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b). *Less Than Significant Impact.* Some excavation and grading would be required for construction of the project; however, the area to be graded would be limited to the roadway and sidewalk area, and standard erosion and dust control measures would be implemented. Following construction, remaining graded areas would be re-vegetated with landscaping or other erosion control; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c-d). *Less Than Significant Impact.* Soils in Culver City are primarily alluvial deposits from the historic floodplain of a portion of the Los Angeles River, what is now known as Ballona Creek. There are areas of expansive soils associated with the alluvial deposits, and the project area is also in an area prone to liquefaction. In addition, subsidence has been an issue in the city, particularly in the hills, but the project area is located in a portion of the city less affected by subsidence. The project area is not located within a landslide hazard area, and lateral spreading is not expected to occur.

While unstable geological conditions do exist in the project area and vicinity, project-related changes to the existing topography of the project area would be minor and would not be expected to result in increased seismic hazards or adversely affect the geology of the area. In addition, the project would be designed and constructed in compliance with requirements for structural safety, and would not be expected to result in substantial risk related to geologic or soil instability; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e). *No Impact.* The project would not involve construction or use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems; therefore, there would be no impact.

Mitigation Measure(s):

No mitigation measures are required.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS --Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Responses:

a-b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project would improve traffic circulation along Sepulveda Boulevard by widening the segment of this roadway to match adjacent segments and eliminate the "bottleneck" effect. An increase in traffic volume is not expected to result from the project, and improved traffic circulation would be expected to reduce the release of air pollutants; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed project is in a non-attainment area for O₃, CO, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Temporary increases in pollutant

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

emissions would result from construction activities and diesel and gasoline-powered equipment use; however, standard measures to reduce these emissions would be implemented in compliance with applicable regulations, and the project would not be expected to result in any greenhouse gas emission violations. Following construction, improved traffic circulation would be expected to reduce the release of these emissions; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s):

No mitigation measures are required.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS --Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 airport or 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 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"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Responses:

a-b). Less Than Significant Impact. Sepulveda Boulevard is an existing roadway, and there are existing sources of hazardous materials within the corridor, including a gas station at the corner of Sepulveda Boulevard and Slauson Avenue and other commercial uses; however, these properties would not be expected to impact the project. During construction, any use of hazardous or toxic materials, including transport and disposal, would be in compliance with applicable regulations to avoid the exposure of any workers or other people to these materials. Excavation would be only to the depth of two feet, and it is not likely that hazardous materials would be encountered. Measures would also be

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

implemented to ensure that hazardous materials would not be released into the environment. Operation of the project would not create any new sources of hazardous materials; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c). Less Than Significant Impact. Culver Park Continuation School, El Marino Elementary School, El Rincon Elementary School, Culver High School, and Culver Middle School are located within two miles of the project area. However, during construction, any temporary use of hazardous or toxic materials, including transport and disposal, would be in compliance with applicable regulations to avoid the exposure of any workers or other people to these materials. Operation of the project would not result in the emission of hazardous materials that would affect these schools; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d). No Impact. The project is not located on a site that is listed as contaminated by hazardous materials; therefore, there would be no impact.

e). No Impact. The closest airports are the Los Angeles International Airport and the Santa Monica Airport. The project area is not with the land use planning areas of either of these airports; therefore, there would be no impact.

f). No Impact. The project is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, there would be no impact.

g). Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activities would result in temporary changes to local traffic patterns and access to properties during the phases of construction, which could impact emergency response or evacuation times; however, traffic through lanes and general traffic movement within the project area would be maintained throughout construction. In addition, traffic management plans would be coordinated with the appropriate service providers to ensure that delays are minimized; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

h). No Impact. The proposed project is located in a developed urban area, and there are no wildlands within or adjacent to the site; therefore, there would be no impact.

Mitigation Measure(s):

No mitigation measures are required.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) 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"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Responses:

a). Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is located in an urban and developed area of Culver City, and there are no natural waterways or major drainages within or adjacent to the project area. During construction, standard best management practices (BMPs) would be implemented to prevent onsite pollutants from entering into storm water facilities. Sepulveda Boulevard is an existing roadway, and operation of the project would have a minimal effect on storm water discharges; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b). Less Than Significant Impact. The existing project area is mostly paved for commercial and transportation uses, and the remaining unpaved areas exist within landscaped areas. The roadway widening would result in a slight increase in impervious surfaces; however, the amount would be minimal and would not be expected to substantially affect groundwater recharge. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c). Less Than Significant Impact. There are no natural waterways or major drainages within or adjacent to the project area, and the project would not involve major alteration of any storm drainages. During construction, drainage flows would be accommodated through BMPs to ensure that drainage would be handled properly and onsite pollutants would be prevented from entering into storm water facilities. Following construction, street drainage for the widened portion of Sepulveda Boulevard would be tied into the existing drainage facilities; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d). Less Than Significant Impact. There are no natural waterways or major drainages within or adjacent to the project area, and the project would not involve major alteration of any storm drainages. During construction, erosion and siltation of graded areas would be minimized through BMPs to ensure that drainage would be handled properly and that onsite pollutants would be prevented from entering into storm water facilities. Following construction, graded areas would either be paved or landscaped; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e). Less Than Significant Impact. Sepulveda Boulevard is an existing roadway that currently produces storm water runoff, including polluted runoff from cars and other roadway users. The roadway widening would result in a slight increase in impervious surfaces and a relative increase in polluted runoff; however, the amount would be minimal and would not be expected to result in a substantial increase in storm water runoff or pollutants. Storm water runoff would be accommodated and treated through BMPs in the City's Storm Water Pollution prevention Plan (SWPPP); therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

f). Less Than Significant Impact. Due to the minor alteration of the roadway and the implementation of BMPs, any other impacts to water quality would be less than significant.

g-h). No Impact. The project is not located within or adjacent to the 100-year floodplain, therefore, there would be no impact.

i). Less Than Significant Impact. The project is located within the inundation zone for the Mulholland Dam, Silverlake Dam, and Stone Canyon Dam; however, because Sepulveda Boulevard is an existing road, the project would not expose persons using the road to new or greater risk from inundation; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

j). No Impact. The project is not located within or near to areas subject to inundation from seiche, tsunamis, or mudflows;

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
therefore, there would be no impact.				
<u>Mitigation Measure(s):</u>				
No mitigation measures are required.				
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
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"/>
<u>Responses:</u>				
a). <u>No Impact.</u> Sepulveda Boulevard is an existing roadway, and no neighborhoods or communities are within the project corridor. There are residential neighborhoods five blocks away, but due to their distant location the proposed project would not divide or disrupt these neighborhoods; therefore, there would be no impact.				
b). <u>No Impact.</u> Sepulveda Boulevard is an existing roadway, and the project would result in improved circulation through this area. The project would not result in any changes in land use or zoning, and would be consistent with existing plans in the area; therefore, there would be no impact.				
c). <u>No Impact.</u> There are no adopted habitat conservation plans, natural community conservation plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan that would be applicable to this project; therefore, there would be no impact.				
<u>Mitigation Measure(s):</u>				
No mitigation measures are required.				
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<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"/>
<u>Responses:</u>				
a-b). <u>No Impact.</u> The project area is restricted to areas within the existing roadway and sidewalk. There are no known mineral resources within the project area, and the project would not affect any delineated mineral resource recovery sites; therefore, there would be no impact.				
<u>Mitigation Measure(s):</u>				
No mitigation measures are required.				

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE --Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
Responses:				
<p>a-b). <u>Less Than Significant Impact.</u> Project construction would involve activities that would result in temporary elevation of noise and vibration levels within and adjacent to the project area; however, standard measures would be implemented to reduce noise and vibration to the extent feasible, work would be restricted to certain hours to minimize impacts, and the City would coordinate with business owners to minimize disturbances during construction. In addition, no activities that would result in excessive noise or vibration levels, such as pile driving, would be required for the project. Following construction, noise levels may change slightly due to the shifted alignment and traffic movement; however, these changes would be minimal and would not be expected to result in a substantial change from current conditions; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>c). <u>Less Than Significant Impact.</u> The proposed project would improve traffic circulation along Sepulveda Boulevard, but would not result in an increase in traffic. Following construction, noise levels may change slightly due to the shifted alignment and traffic movement; however, these changes would be minimal and would not be expected to result in a substantial change from current conditions; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>d). <u>No Impact.</u> The project area is subject to a number of regional noise sources, including traffic noise and air traffic. However, because the use of the roadway would continue to be the same, periodic increases in ambient noise levels are not anticipated to be affected; therefore, there would be no impact.</p>				
<p>e). <u>No Impact.</u> The closest airports are the Los Angeles International Airport and the Santa Monica Airport, located several miles from Culver City. The project area is not within the land use planning areas of either of these airports, and the project would not affect current exposure to airport noise; therefore, there would be no impact.</p>				
<p>f). <u>No Impact.</u> The project is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, there would be no impact.</p>				
Mitigation Measure(s):				
No mitigation measures are required.				

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<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"/>
Responses:				
a). <u>No Impact</u> . The proposed project would accommodate existing traffic by upgrading an existing road, and would not include any elements that would induce growth; therefore, there would be no impact.				
b-c). <u>No Impact</u> . The project is not located within or adjacent to a residential area, and would not impact any housing either directly or indirectly; therefore there would be no impact.				
Mitigation Measure(s):				
No mitigation measures are required.				
XIV. 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 of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Responses:				
a). <u>Less Than Significant Impact</u> . The proposed project would result in temporary changes to local traffic patterns and access to adjacent properties during construction, which could affect response times for fire and police protection services. However, traffic through lanes and general traffic movement within the project area would be maintained throughout construction, and no temporary roads, detours, or ramp closures would be required. In addition, traffic management plans would be coordinated with the appropriate service providers to ensure that delays would be minimized. Following project construction traffic circulation would be improved, which would help to facilitate emergency response. There are no parks or schools within the project area, so access to these facilities would not be impacted. The project would accommodate existing traffic and would not result in the need for new or expanded public service facilities; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.				

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<u>Mitigation Measure(s):</u> No mitigation measures are required.				
XV. RECREATION --				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<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 physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Responses:</u> a-b). <i>No Impact.</i> The project would accommodate existing traffic and would not result in additional use of parks or other recreational facilities. As such, no expanded or new facilities would be required; therefore, there would be no impact. <u>Mitigation Measure(s):</u> No mitigation measures are required.				
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulating system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Responses:

a-b). Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would improve traffic circulation along Sepulveda Boulevard by widening the segment of this roadway to match adjacent segments and eliminating the “bottleneck” effect. Construction activities would result in temporary changes to local traffic patterns and access to properties during construction; however, traffic through lanes and general traffic movement within the project area would be maintained throughout construction, and no temporary roads, detours, or ramp closures would be required. In addition, traffic management plans would be coordinated with the appropriate service providers to ensure that delays are minimized. Following construction, LOS on this portion of Sepulveda Boulevard would be improved; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c). No Impact. The proposed roadway improvements would not include elements that would affect air traffic patterns; therefore, there would be no impact.

d). Less Than Significant Impact. The project would upgrade Sepulveda Boulevard within the project limits to match surrounding roadway segments. This would improve the safety of the roadway design; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e). Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would result in temporary changes to local traffic patterns and access to properties during the phases of construction, which could affect response times for fire and police protection services. However, traffic through lanes and general traffic movement within the project area would be maintained throughout construction, and no temporary roads, detours, or ramp closures would be required. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

f). Less Than Significant Impact. There are bus lines on both Sepulveda Boulevard (Line 6) and Green Valley Circle (Line 3), with several bus stops located within the project limits. The proposed project would result in temporary changes to local traffic patterns and access to bus stops during the phases of construction, which could affect bus services. In addition, access to certain portions of the sidewalks would be affected during the roadway widening. However, traffic along Sepulveda Boulevard would be maintained throughout construction, and traffic management plans would be coordinated with appropriate service providers, including public transportation services, to ensure that disruption of services would be minimized. If necessary, alternative locations for pedestrian passage and bus stops would be provided. Following construction, existing bus stops would be re-established; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s):

No mitigation measures are required.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS –Would the project:

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Responses:				
a-b). <u>No Impact</u> . The project would include widening an existing roadway and would not include any elements that would require wastewater treatment; therefore, there would be no impact.				
c). <u>Less Than Significant Impact</u> . The project would involve widening the existing roadway and sidewalk, including the storm drainage system. During construction, BMPs would be implemented to prevent onsite pollutants from entering into storm water facilities. Following construction, the storm drainage system for the widened roadway would be tied into the existing drainage and would not be substantially changed from the existing facility; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.				
d). <u>Less Than Significant Impact</u> . The project would not require any water supply other than what may be required for landscape irrigation. This amount would not be expected to exceed the water supply currently available; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.				
e). <u>No Impact</u> . The project would widen an existing roadway and would not include any elements that would require wastewater treatment; therefore, there would be no impact.				
f-g). <u>Less Than Significant Impact</u> . During construction, small amounts of debris would be disposed of; however, disposal would be in compliance with all applicable regulations for waste disposal, and the amount of waste generated would not be expected to exceed the available capacity of the landfill. Operation of the project would not require any solid waste disposal; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.				
Mitigation Measure(s):				
No mitigation measures are required.				
XVIII. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Responses:</u></p>				
<p>a). <u>Less Than Significant Impact.</u> No federally threatened, endangered species or habitat is located within or around the proposed project limits. If tree removal is required, it would be conducted outside of the nesting season (September 15th to February 15th); therefore, disturbance to nesting birds would be avoided. The discovery of cultural resources is not expected, and with implementation of standard policies in the event of such discovery, impacts to these resources would be avoided. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>b). <u>Less Than Significant Impact.</u> The project would contribute to cumulative impacts in the following areas: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, public services, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems. However, with adherence to applicable policies and regulations, all project impacts would be less than significant and would not require mitigation. Therefore, project contributions to cumulative impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable.</p>				
<p>c). <u>Less Than Significant Impact.</u> The project would result in the following impacts that could affect humans either directly or indirectly: aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, public services, and transportation and traffic. However, with adherence to applicable policies and regulations, all project impacts would be less than significant and would not be expected to result in adverse effects on humans. Therefore, impact would be less than significant.</p>				
<p><u>Mitigation Measure(s):</u></p>				
<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>				

References Utilized:

1. Culver City Municipal Code
2. Culver City General Plan (1995)
3. SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan (2007)
4. Culver City Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (2010)