
EXPLANATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATIONS

I. AIR QUALITY

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the SCAQMD or Congestion Management Plan?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would create pollutant emissions in the form of demolition debris (i.e., particulate matter) and combustible engine emissions from construction equipment, trucks, and machinery during the construction period. The project may also increase emissions associated with automobiles traveling to the site during on-going project operations. Therefore, the EIR will address these issues as they relate to the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Congestion Management Plan.

Conclusion: This issue will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

b) Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project will generate pollutant emissions during construction and operation in the form of demolition and construction debris (particulate matter) and potentially as a result of increased motor vehicle traffic. Therefore, air quality impacts, in terms of consistency with current air quality standards and regulations of the SCAQMD will be evaluated in the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

c) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the air basin is non-attainment (ozone, carbon monoxide, & PM10) under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed Project will generate pollutant emissions during construction and operation in the form of demolition and construction debris (particulate matter) and potentially as a result of increased motor vehicle traffic. Cumulative air quality impacts in terms of consistency with federal and/or state air quality standards and regulations will be evaluated in the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

d) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Potentially Significant Impact. Sensitive receptors in the project vicinity include single- and multi-family residential uses located on 10th Street, 11th Street, and Arizona Avenue. The proposed project could increase air pollutant emissions during construction and potentially during operation. The EIR will evaluate the project's impacts upon sensitive land use receptors in terms of exposure to unhealthy air pollutant emissions.

Conclusion: This issue will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

e) Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

No Impact. Other than emissions generated by motor vehicles and construction debris, which will be evaluated in the air quality analysis of the EIR, there are no proposed activities that have the potential to emit objectionable odors.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

II. AESTHETICS

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No Impact. The project site is not located within a scenic corridor. The area surrounding the project site is developed with single- and multi-family residential units and other commercial uses. No unusual or scenic views exist in the area. The proposed Madison Theater will involve the construction of a new theater building to replace the current one which is unusable. Portions of the new facility would be approximately 70 feet. This is higher than any other building in the area. Construction of this new facility may affect the views from the neighboring residences, and therefore may result in a potentially significant impact.

Conclusion: This issue will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural feature within a city-designated scenic highway?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project site is developed with an existing campus and is completely devoid of any naturally occurring scenic resources such as trees or rock outcroppings. Any trees occurring on the site are part of the landscaping and will be transplanted or replaced with the new development. The project site is not located within the vicinity or view of any State designated scenic highway.¹ However, existing buildings located on the project site may have historic value. Therefore, the project may result in a potentially significant impact scenic resources.

¹ *The California Scenic Highway System: A List of Eligible (E) and Officially Designated (OD) Routes, Caltrans, <http://svhqsg14.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/cahisys.htm>, March 26, 2002.*

Conclusion: This issue will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

c) Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character of quality of the site and its surroundings?

Potentially Significant Impact. The project is proposed and designed to be an improvement over existing conditions. However, the project will substantially alter the existing visual character of the project site and its surroundings with the development of a new 27,000 square foot, 70 foot high structure. As such, the project has the potential to substantially alter the existing character and quality of the site.

Conclusion: This issue will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would involve the construction of a new 27,000 square foot theater. A portion of the new theater would have a height of approximately 70 feet. These additional features on the project site could potentially generate new sources of light or glare that would affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Conclusion: This issue will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

e) Would the project create a new shadow that would adversely affect a shadow-sensitive use?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would involve the construction of a new theater with portions of the structure being approximately 70 feet in height. This could potentially create shadows on the adjacent residences that do not currently exist. Therefore, the EIR will evaluate the shade/shadow impacts of the project.

Conclusion: This issue will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

III. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact. The proposed project site is located in an urbanized portion of the City of Santa Monica. The northern third of the project site is developed with approximately 39,500 square

feet of classroom facilities. The southern two thirds of the project site is developed with a surface parking lot. Vegetation on the site is limited to shade trees and other ornamental shrubs and landscaping. There is no suitable habitat on-site to support any listed species that occur in natural environments. The project site is surrounded by other urban development (residences and commercial areas) and no species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species are known to occur within the project vicinity. As such, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

b) Would the project 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?

No Impact. The proposed project site is currently developed with a 39,500 square foot classroom building and a surface parking lot. The project site does not contain any water bodies and is incapable of supporting migratory fish or wildlife species. The site is completely surrounded by urban development (single- and multi-family residential and commercial) and does not provide suitable habitat for any migratory species. Therefore, development of the proposed project would not affect the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

c) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance (e.g., oak trees or California walnut woodlands)?

No Impact. The project site is completely developed with a 39,500 square foot classroom building and surface parking lot. All trees on the project site are part of the ornamental landscaping plan and there are no naturally occurring trees or stands of trees on the project site. There are no oak trees or other locally designated sensitive tree species on-site. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any local arbor related policies protecting biological species.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

d) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact. The project site is completely developed within an urban area (see above) and does not contain any suitable habitat for protected species. The project site does not fall within the jurisdiction of any habitat or natural community conservation plans. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any such plans.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

IV. CULTURAL RESOURCES

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA Section 15064.5?

Potentially Significant Impact. Impacts associated with the proposed project with respect to historic resources will be addressed in the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Section 15064.5?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site was originally developed in the late 1800s and redeveloped in the 1930s. The project site is completely paved and developed and the likelihood of discovering archaeological resources during grading and excavation is low. However, the mitigation measure listed below is required to ensure that no impacts to archaeological resources occur should they be discovered during project construction.

1. In the event that subsurface archaeological resources are encountered during the course of grading and/or excavation, all development must temporarily cease in these areas until the archaeological resources are properly assessed and subsequent recommendations are determined by a qualified archaeologist. In the event that human remains are discovered,

there shall be no disposition of such human remains, other than in accordance with the procedures and requirements set forth in California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. These code provisions require notification of the County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission, who in turn must notify those persons believed to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American for appropriate disposition of the remains. Excavation or disturbance may continue in other areas of the project site that are not reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains or archaeological resources.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

c) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is completely paved and developed and the likelihood of discovering paleontological resources during grading and excavation is low. However, the mitigation measure listed below is required to ensure that no impacts to paleontological resources occur should they be discovered during project construction.

1. In the event that paleontological resources are encountered during the course of grading and/or excavation, all development must temporarily cease in these areas until the paleontological resources are properly assessed and subsequent recommendations are determined by a qualified paleontologist.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

d) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project site is currently developed with a classroom building and a surface parking lot. There is no evidence that the project site was formerly used as a cemetery. No impacts upon interred human remains are likely.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

V. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

a) Would the project 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.

Less Than Significant Impact. A project-related significant impact could occur if the project is located within a state-designated Alquist-Priolo Zone or other designated fault zone. There are no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones located within the City of Santa Monica. The Santa Monica Fault, located approximately .5 miles from the site, is considered potentially active, and does not meet the “sufficiently active” and “well-defined” criteria required for the fault to be zoned.² The project site is located approximately 0.25 miles from the limits of the fault hazard zone established by the City of Santa Monica, but the project site does not fall within the zone’s boundaries. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault. Hazards associated with earthquake-induced surface rupture would thus be considered less than significant.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact could occur if the proposed project increases the risk to public safety or destruction of property by exposing people, property, or infrastructure to seismically induced ground shaking hazards that are greater than the average in relation to the greater southern California region. Potential impacts from seismic ground shaking are present throughout the entire southern California area. As evidenced by the January 17, 1994 Northridge earthquake, ground shaking throughout the entire Los Angeles basin resulting from a moderate to major earthquake (i.e., magnitude 6.0 or greater) can be expected during the life span of the proposed project. As such, the proposed Madison Theater will be designed in accordance with modern building codes and construction practices aimed to reduce the structural damage and promote public safety during seismic events. Therefore, with implementation of proper seismic engineering practices, impacts associated with seismically induced ground shaking would not be greater than average at the project site than at any other location within the region. In addition, architectural plans for the proposed theater building will be submitted to the Division of the State Architect (DSA) for review and approval. Impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking would be engineered to ensure a less than significant impact.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

² Draft Santa Monica Master Environmental Assessment, January 2002.

(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project site is not located in an area that is susceptible to liquefaction hazards.³ Therefore, it is anticipated that any inherent risks relating to soil stability and potential ground failure can be overcome with standard engineering practices. Impacts associated with seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be considered less than significant.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

(iv) Landslides?

No Impact. The proposed project site is in a relatively level, urban area within the City of Santa Monica. The project site is developed with a classroom building and surface parking lot. Areas immediately adjacent to the site are developed with single- and multi-family residential and commercial buildings. The project site is not located in an area susceptible to landslides. Therefore, impacts associated with landslides would be less than significant.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project site is completely covered with either structural development or the surface parking lot. During construction activities, portions of the existing site would be graded and soil would be exposed to potential erosional effects. Such impacts, however, would be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of best management practices which will be implemented during construction activities. Therefore, impacts associated with the proposed project with respect to soil erosion or the loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

c) Would the project 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed above, the project site is not located in an Alquist Priolo Special Hazards Zone or an area susceptible to landslides or liquefaction. While excavation and shoring activities may be required during project construction, it is anticipated that standard building code measures and safety practices will be employed in accordance with the

³ City of Santa Monica Draft Master Environmental Assessment, Figure 4-5, Liquefaction Susceptibility, January 2002.

Uniform Building Code (UBC) and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requirements. In addition, architectural plans for the proposed theater building will be submitted to the DSA for review and approval. Therefore, the proposed project would not create unstable soil conditions or induce landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

d) Would the project be located on expansive soil, as identified in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were developed on expansive soil without proper site preparation of design features to provide adequate foundations, thus posing a hazard to life and property. The proposed project site is located in an area where the Hanford soil series is prevalent. According to the City of Santa Monica Draft Environmental Assessment (January 2002), these soils have a low potential for expansion. However, prior to the construction of the proposed project, the contractor will review the soil in accordance with the City of Santa Monica Building and Safety Department Guidelines. Therefore, while risks associated with expansive soil on the project site are not likely, such information will be properly evaluated prior to construction. Therefore, impacts associated with expansive soil would be less than significant.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

e) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No Impact. The proposed project is located with a developed area of the City of Santa Monica which is served through a local sewer line and treated at the City of Los Angeles' Hyperion Treatment Plant located near El Segundo. As such, the proposed project will tie into the existing infrastructure and on-site septic systems or alternate wastewater disposal will not be employed.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

VI. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

a) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not involve the routine transport or disposal of hazardous materials. Hazardous materials typically used for the cleaning and routine maintenance of building and landscaping would be used on the project site. In addition, materials such as paints, thinners, and lacquers would likely be used in the creation of sets. Such materials,

however, would be used and stored in accordance all applicable rules and regulations and would not create a significant hazard to the public of the environment. Therefore, impacts associated with the use of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

b) Would the project create significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would use potentially hazardous materials in very small quantities for routine maintenance and cleaning activities. In addition, materials such as paints would be used in the creation of sets. These materials would be used in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations and potential for upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials is very low. In addition, in the event lead based paint and asbestos are present in the existing structure, renovation of this structure could potentially expose individuals to these substances. The existing structure would be tested for the presence of lead-based paint and asbestos and if found abated, in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations prior to renovation. Therefore, impacts to the public or the environment through upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment is less than significant.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

c) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No Impact. The project site is an existing school. As such, it is operated in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations governing schools. The proposed project would use hazardous materials such as cleaning supplies, landscape maintenance supplies, and paints for creating sets. The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle acutely hazardous materials, substances or wastes.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

d) Would the project 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. There are no hazardous materials sites are located on the proposed project site. However, four hazardous materials sites are located within a quarter mile of the project site along Santa Monica Boulevard.⁴ All of these sites are as a result of underground leaking storage tanks at existing car dealerships and a nearby gas station. The project site has existed as a school facility with no impact from these sites. These sites would not impact the new theater and construction of the theater would not impact the sites. Due to the distance, construction, grading, and excavation will have no impact.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

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?

No Impact. The proposed project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest airport is the Santa Monica Airport located at 3223 Donald Douglas Loop S., approximately 3.9 miles away. Therefore, the potential impacts associated with airport safety hazards would not be applicable to the proposed project.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

⁴ Draft Santa Monica Master Environmental Assessment, January 2002.

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?

No Impact. This question would apply to the proposed project if it were in the vicinity of a private airstrip. The proposed project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the development of the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

g) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. Construction of the proposed project would not interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. There would be no change in the types of uses of the property and the number and placement of the driveways would remain the same. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the creation of significant impacts by exposing people to health hazards or potential health hazards.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

h) Would the project 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?

No Impact. The proposed project site is located in an urban, portion of the City of Santa Monica. The area surrounding the site is developed with single- and multi-family residential and commercial uses. The area is not considered to be a high fire hazard area. Further, the proposed theater would be equipped with sprinkler systems as a fire prevention and suppression measure. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

VII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Less Than Significant Impact. Significant impacts would occur if a project does not comply with all applicable regulations with regard to surface water quality as governed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). These regulations include compliance with the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan requirements to reduce potential water quality impacts. The proposed project would not include industrial discharge to any public water system and would, therefore, not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. With appropriate project design and compliance with the applicable federal, state, and local

regulations, code requirements and permit provisions, no significant impacts related to water quality are anticipated.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

- b) Would the project 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)?**

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project does not propose any groundwater wells or pumping activities. All water supplied to the site will be derived from the City's existing water supply and infrastructure. There will be no change in the amount of impervious surfaces located on the project site upon project construction. As such, the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

- c) Would the project 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?**

No Impact. The project site is located in an urban, portion of the City of Santa Monica with no stream or river courses located in the project vicinity. The new theater building will be developed in an area that is currently paved and utilized as a surface parking lot. Some changes in drainages patterns on the project site may occur due to placement of internal storm drains and the configuration of the site; however, the project will not alter off-site drainage patterns. No change in the amount of impervious surfaces is anticipated as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, no impacts associated with the proposed project are anticipated with respect to erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

- d) Would the project 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?**

No Impact. The proposed project site is currently developed with a classroom building and a surface parking lot. No change in the amount of impervious surfaces is anticipated as a result of the proposed project. The proposed theater will be constructed in an area that is currently paved and utilized as a surface parking lot. The parking lot for this new facility will be approximately the same size as it is now. Therefore, the project would not result in any increased potential for flooding of or on the project site.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

- e) Would the project 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?**

Less Than Significant Impact. Upon completion of the proposed theater, there would be no change in the amount of impervious surfaces. Therefore, no additional runoff water would be anticipated in excess of current levels. No additional sources of polluted runoff would be generated. Cars parked on the surface parking lot have the potential to deposit certain chemicals including metals, oil and grease, solvents, phosphates, hydrocarbons, and suspended soils. However, the project will be required to comply with water quality standards and wastewater discharge best management practices set forth by the County of Los Angeles and the SWRCB. Therefore, impacts associated with the stormwater drainage systems would be less than significant.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

- f) Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**

Less Than Significant Impact. Other than the sources discussed above, the proposed project does not include other potential sources of contaminants which could potentially degrade water quality. Therefore, the impacts to water quality from the proposed project would be less than significant.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

g) Would the project place within a 100-year flood plain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

No Impact. The project site is not located in a 100-year or 500-year flood hazard area.⁵ Therefore, the proposed project would not place structures in a flood plain which would impede or redirect flood flows.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

h) Would the project 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. Stone Canyon Reservoir and Riviera Reservoir are located near the City of Santa Monica. The Stone Canyon Reservoir is located in Stone Canyon on the south flank of the Santa Monica Mountains. In the event on dam failure, areas within the vicinity of the freeway (I-10) corridor would be affected. The Riviera Reservoir is located in Santa Monica Canyon, approximately 2,000 feet northeast of the City limits. In the event of failure, most of the water would be contained with the Santa Monica Canyon tributary and flood control channels.⁶ Due to the distance of the project site from these two water storage facilities and the amount of city infrastructure between the project site and freeway corridor, the possibility of flooding as a result of dam failure is low. Therefore, no significant impact to the project site is anticipated with respect to flooding.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

i) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project site is located less than one mile from the ocean. A tidal phenomenon could potentially cause an impact on the project site. However, such impacts would not be greater than what exists throughout the immediate project area and other coastal environments throughout southern California. In addition, the high cliffs overlooking the Pacific Coast Highway would prevent 10 foot high waves from extending into parts of the City. Due to the project site's distance from the ocean and the high cliffs overlooking the ocean, the potential for the project site to be inundated by tsunami is low. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

⁵ www.esri.com/hazards, March 27, 2002.

⁶ City of Santa Monica Draft Master Environmental Assessment, January 2002.

VIII. NOISE

- a) **Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise in levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would involve the construction of a new theater. In addition, portions of the existing on-site structures and the parking lot will be renovated and refurbished. Upon completion of the construction, the theater will be used for classroom lectures and performances by a variety of groups. This could potentially generate noise levels in excess of current levels. Therefore, this issue will be further discussed in the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

- b) **Would the project result in exposure of people to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would involve the construction of a new theater. In addition, portions of the existing on-site structures and the parking lot will be renovated and refurbished. Construction activities will require the use of heavy machinery and equipment. As such, groundborne vibration or groundborne noise could have an impact. Construction noise impacts will be further discussed in the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

- c) **Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would involve the construction of a new theater. In addition, portions of the existing on-site structures and the parking lot will be renovated and refurbished. Once completed the theater would be used for classes and theater productions, concerts, etc. The increase in use of the facility has the potential to impact the existing ambient noise level. Therefore, this issue will be further discussed in the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

- d) **Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would involve the construction of a new theater. In addition, portions of the existing on-site structures and the parking lot will be renovated and refurbished. Construction activities would involve the use of heavy machinery and equipment and could result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels. Therefore, this issue will be further discussed in the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

- 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?**

No Impact. This question would apply if the project site were within two miles of a public airport. The nearest airport to the project site is the Santa Monica Airport, approximately 3.9 miles away. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

- 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?**

No Impact. The proposed project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the development of the proposed project would not result in excessive noise levels for the people residing or working in the area.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

IX. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) **Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government 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 objective for any of the following public services:**

Fire protection?

Potentially Significant Impact. This proposed project would result in increased activity on the project site. This could result in a greater demand for fire protection services. Therefore, this issue will be addressed in the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

Police protection?

Potentially Significant Impact. This proposed project would result in increased activity on the project site. This could result in a greater demand for police protection services. Therefore, this issue will be addressed in the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

X. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

- a) **Would the project cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to ratio capacity on roads, or congestion at intersections)?**

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction and operation of the proposed project may increase the volume of traffic in the area, especially on evening and weekends when there are scheduled performances. As such, this issue will be further addressed in the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

- b) **Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

Potentially Significant Impact. As discussed above, operation of the proposed project may affect the level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency. As such, this issue will be further addressed in the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

- c) **Would the project 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?**

No Impact. This question would apply to the proposed project only if it were an aviation-related use. The proposed project does not include any aviation related uses. Therefore, this question is not applicable to the proposed project.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

d) Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact could occur if the project includes a new roadway design or introduces a new land use into an area with specific transportation requirements and characteristics, which had not been previously experienced in the area. The proposed project would not involve any changes to the existing surrounding streets and no new streets would be added. In addition, access to the project site would be the existing access points off of Santa Monica Blvd and Eleventh Street. The proposed project would not bring in a new type of use, only increase the frequency of use. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated as a result of a design feature or incompatible uses.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

e) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Potentially Significant Impact. As required by law, the proposed project would conform to the City of Santa Monica Fire Department requirements pertaining to emergency access. Emergency vehicle access would be available via any of the project access roads. As a standard condition of approval, all plans will need to be submitted to the fire department for approval. An additional emergency access point is proposed off of Tenth Street, adjacent to the proposed theater loading dock area. This access driveway will be used for emergency access only and will be designed with bollards to allow pedestrian access only. However, due to the increased use of the project site for performances, this issue will be further addressed in the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

f) Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would refurbish the existing surface parking lot with parking for approximately 300 vehicles. Due to the increased use of the project site, parking capacity will be further addressed in the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be further addressed within the scope of the EIR.

g) Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project does not involve any modifications to alternative transportation routes (e.g., bicycle paths, public transportation) or are any in conflict with the project site. Compliance any existing alternative transportation plans, policies, or programs will be addressed in the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be further addressed within the scope of the EIR.

XI. UTILITIES**a) Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed theater is estimated to generate additional wastewater as compared the existing development due to the increase in building area and on-site activities. The wastewater flow from the proposed project will discharge to a local sewer line and be conveyed to the Hyperion Treatment Plant for treatment. Impacts to the wastewater lines serving the site and the capacity of the treatment plant and applicable requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board will be discussed within the scope of the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be further addressed within the scope of the EIR.

b) Would the project 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?

Potentially Significant Impact. As discussed above, the proposed project is estimated to generate additional wastewater as compared to the existing facility. Impacts to the public water/wastewater infrastructure will be addressed in the scope of the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be further addressed within the scope of the EIR.

c) Would the project 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?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would not change the amount of impervious surfaces located on the project site. However, locations of existing drainage patterns may need to be changed depending upon the final site configuration. Therefore, impacts to the storm drain system will be discussed in the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be further addressed within the scope of the EIR.

d) Would the project have significant water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project may require more water than is currently used on the project site. Water in the City of Santa Monica is obtained through groundwater pumping and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. Sources and availability of water supplies will be addressed in the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be further addressed within the scope of the EIR.

- e) **Would the project 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?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project is anticipated to generate more wastewater than is currently generated by the existing facility. This issue will be discussed within the scope of the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be further addressed within the scope of the EIR.

- f) **Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project will increase solid waste generation on the project site. This issue will be discussed within the scope of the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be further addressed within the scope of the EIR.

- g) **Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

No Impact. A significant impact could occur if the proposed project would generate solid waste that was not disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations. All solid waste generated on-site would be disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, state and local regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, there would be no impact on federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Conclusion: No further analysis of this issue is warranted.

XII. NEIGHBORHOOD EFFECTS.

- a) **Will the proposal have considerable effects on the project neighborhood?**

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated. The proposed Madison Theater has the potential to negatively affect the neighborhood with respect to construction and parking lot noise, land use consistency/compatibility, aesthetics/views, light and glare, shade/shadow, and traffic/transportation. Each of these issue areas will be evaluated within the scope of the EIR.

Conclusion: This issue will be further addressed within the scope of the EIR.

XIII. 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?**

Potentially Significant Impact. While the project will not remove or destroy wildlife habitat or have a significant impact on any wildlife species, the project has the potential to degrade the quality of the environment in a broader urban context. The project may result in environmental impacts in the form of: land use consistency/compatibility, traffic and circulation, air quality, noise, public services, utilities, aesthetics/views, and historic resources. As such, these issues will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

- 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)?**

Potentially Significant Impact. It has been determined that the project has the potential to result in adverse impacts upon the environment and an EIR is required. As mandated by CEQA, the project’s cumulative impacts will be addressed within the scope of the EIR. The cumulative analysis will include the possible effects of other projects, including the effects of probable future projects within the City of Santa Monica.

- c) **Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

Potentially Significant Impact. As determined above, the project has the potential to result in environmental impacts which could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. The project EIR will address the project’s potential to create impacts in the following environmental issue areas: land use consistency/compatibility, traffic and circulation, air quality, noise, public services, utilities, aesthetics/views, and historic resources.