CITY OF AVALON

PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Pursuant to Division 6, Title 14, Chapter 3, Article 6, Sections 15070 and 15071 of the California Code of Regulations, the **City of Avalon** prepared this Mitigated Negative Declaration for the proposed project, which is described as follows:

PROJECT TITLE: Vons Grocery Story

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The Project involves the construction of a 23,044 sq. ft. grocery store and 6,358 parking lot on a 28,858 sq. ft. area.

PROJECT LOCATION:
On a portion of APN 7480-016-009, bordered by Catalina Ave., Sumner Ave. and Beacon Street in Avalon, CA.

NAME OF PUBLIC AGENCY APPROVING PROJECT: City of Avalon, City Council

CONTACT PERSON: Amanda Cook

NAME OF ENTITY OR AGENCY CARRYING OUT PROJECT: Vons and Santa Catalina Island Company

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION: The City of Avalon has determined that all environmental impacts of the proposed project are either less than significant or can be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of the mitigation measures set forth in the Initial Study. Consequently, the City has determined that a Mitigated Negative Declaration should be prepared in order to analyze the potential adverse environmental impacts of the proposed project.

The attached Environmental Checklist/Initial Study has been prepared by the City in support of this Mitigated Negative Declaration. Further information including the project file and supporting reports and studies may be reviewed at the City of Avalon, 410 Avalon Canyon Road, Avalon, CA.

MITIGATION MEASURES: Mitigation measures have been identified for the proposed project and are identified in the attached Initial Study

Amanda Cook
City of Avalon

October 24, 2014

CEQA Environmental Checklist

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

Project Title:	**Vons Grocery Store**
Lead agency name and address:	**City of Avalon**
Contact person and phone number:	**Amanda Cook**
Project Location:	**Avalon, CA**
Project sponsor's name and address:	**Vons**
General plan description:	**Commercial**
Zoning:	**Commercial**
Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.)	**Construct a new 20,000 sf grocery store.**
Surrounding land uses and setting; briefly describe the project's surroundings:	**Special Commercial housing and businesses**
Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financial approval, or participation agreements):	**City of Avalon, Planning & Bldg Dept's** **LA County Health Dept** **AQMD (kitchen exhaust hoods)**

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project. Please see the checklist beginning on page 3 for additional information.

☐	Aesthetics	☐	Agriculture and Forestry	X	Air Quality
☐	Biological Resources	X	Cultural Resources	☐	Geology/Soils
☐	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	☐	Hydrology/Water Quality
☐	Land Use/Planning	☐	Mineral Resources	X	Noise
☐	Population/Housing	☐	Public Services	☐	Recreation
☐	Transportation/Traffic	☐	Utilities/Service Systems	☐	Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature:	**Date: 10/24/14**
Printed Name: Amanda Cook	**For:**

CEQA Environmental Checklist

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the projects indicate no impacts. A NO IMPACT answer in the last column reflects this determination. Where there is a need for clarifying discussion, the discussion is included either following the applicable section of the checklist or is within the body of the environmental document itself. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to CEQA, not NEPA, impacts. The questions in this form are intended to encourage the thoughtful assessment of impacts and do not represent thresholds of significance.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐
II. AGRICULTURE 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 the 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:

(See attached geotechnical report)

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow	☐	☐	☒	☐
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☒	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Does the project have 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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒

CEQA
EXPLANATIONS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
VONS - CATALINA PROJECT
October 24, 2014

I. AESTHETICS

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

Less than Significant Impact. While no state scenic highways or formal scenic corridors have been designated in Avalon, the proposed project's design will be a significant enhancement to the existing conditions (an essentially vacant gravel lot), complementing the surrounding residential & commercial architecture and having no effect on any scenic vista. A conceptual landscape plan has been prepared, which proposes a mixture of shrubs and willow trees along the perimeter of the project site, which will further enhance the site's aesthetics.

b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway:

No Impact. Currently, there are no officially designated scenic highways within the City of Avalon. Therefore, the project's development of a vacant gravel lot will not damage any trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The existing site currently is a dirt parking lot with two small existing buildings. The proposed project's design components and associated landscaping will be a significant enhancement to the site and great efforts were made to ensure the project will complement the surrounding existing residential and commercial uses. A conceptual landscape plan has been prepared for the site, which will further soften and enhance the aesthetics of the project. Therefore, the project will not degrade the character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Potential sources of light and glare include façade lighting, streetlights, parking lot lighting, security and way-finding lighting, and automobile headlights. However, adherence to the Municipal Code, including Section 9-7.607 (Development of Parking Facilities) and Section 9-7.724 (Direct Lighting) will ensure that new lighting sources are designed and installed to reduce glare and light intrusion onto adjacent parcels. The proposed site plan will not expose any more natural

daytime light or glare from its non-reflective surfaces than is currently the case at the project site; therefore, it is not expected to generate substantially more light or glare into the environment.

II. AGRICULTURAL & FORESTRY RESOURCES

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?

No Impact. There are no areas within Avalon currently utilized for agricultural or forestry activities. Accordingly, the City contains no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Significance, as shown on mpas provided by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Department of Conservation. The project site is proposed in an existing urbanized non-agricultural area zoned for commercial development with its current use as dirt parking lot and small building and therefore has no impact to Farmland.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. There are no areas within Avalon currently utilized for agricultural or forestry activities. Accordingly, the City contains no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Significance, as shown on mpas provided by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Department of Conservation. No agricultural uses or operations occur on-site, the project site is not enrolled under a Williamson Act contract and it zoned commercial, therefore it will not conflict.

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))?

No Impact. The project site would not rezone forest land or timberland as defined by the Public Resources Code. The project site is and will remain zoned for commercial development, and, under this existing zoning, a grocery store use is permitted and therefore does not conflict with existing zoning and will not rezoning of any forest land.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. Implementation of the project on this site will not result in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use as its current use is a vacant gravel lot in an urban commercial zone.

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?

No Impact. The proposed project will not involve any changes in the existing environment resulting in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The existing environment is fully developed commercial, mixed use residential and residential.

III. AIR QUALITY

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Less than Significant Impact. The project is located within the South Coast Air Basin and is therefore subject to the policies set forth by the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (SCAQMP) to which development and operations will follow and comply. The SCAQMP presents strategies for achieving air quality planning goals set forth in the Federal and California Clean Air Acts. Because the Project is consistent with the Commercial land use designation in the General Plan for the City of Avalon, the Project is considered to be consistent with the SCAQMP. In addition, Project implementation would not exceed any ambient air quality standards or thresholds. As the Project will not conflict or obstruct implementation of the SCAQMP, impacts will be less than significant.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.

Operations Phase: The Project involves development and operation of a new grocery store, which will involve the consolidation of two existing grocery store sites that will be eliminated upon completion of the subject property. Therefore, the Project is not expected to generate significant new pollutant sources above the current levels incurred by the existing two sites. No existing or projected ambient air quality violation currently exists in the area so the Project will not have an effect on an existing or projected problem. The proposed project will not violate any air quality standard and thus the impact would be less than significant.

Construction Phase: Currently, the greater Los Angeles County portion of the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which includes the City of Avalon, is designated non-attainment for ozone (State and Federal standards) and particulates less than 10 micrometers in diameter (PM_{10}) (State and Federal standards). Construction activity associated with Project implementation could cause temporary emissions of various air pollutants. Ozone precursors, namely carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NOx) would be emitted by the operation of construction equipment, while fugitive dust (PM_{10}) would be emitted by activities that disturb the soil, such as grading and excavation and building construction. While such emissions may result in temporary adverse impacts to local air quality by exceeding the maximum daily emissions thresholds established South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) significance thresholds, that is not expected to be the case here as the amount of equipment to be used on the site at one time that is powered by internal combustion engines would not exceed one or two pieces,

which is not sufficient to result in emissions higher than the daily emission thresholds. Furthermore, SCAQMD has established Rules 402 and 403, which require that air pollutant emissions not be a nuisance off-site and reduce the ambient entrainment of fugitive dust. Rule 403 includes best available control measures for all construction activity, contingency control measures for large operations, and conservation management practices for confined animal facilities. Major categories addressed by Rule 403 to reduce fugitive dust includes earth moving, disturbed surface areas, unpaved roads, open storage piles, demolition, and other various construction activities. Adherence to applicable SCAQMD rules would reduce potential construction-related impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation measures to reduce potential temporary impacts to air quality during Project construction to a less than significant level include:

> **MM-AIR 1 Fugitive Dust.** Consistent with SCAQMD Rule 403, during all earth moving and grading phases of construction, the following soil stabilization measures will be implemented to reduce fugitive dust: 1) Apply water to all un-stabilized disturbed areas at least 2 times per day. If there is any evidence of wind driven fugitive dust, watering frequency shall be increased to a minimum of four times per day, and; 2) Apply water to at least 80 percent of all inactive disturbed surface areas on a daily basis when there is evidence of wind driven fugitive dust, excluding any areas which are inaccessible to watering vehicles due to excessive slope or other safety conditions; OR apply dust suppressants in sufficient quantity and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface. No water from the City of Avalon's potable water supply will be used for the above-described construction purposes.

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)?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project region is designated as a nonattainment area for ozone, coarse particulate matter (PM_{10}), $PM_{2.5}$, nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), and lead for state standards and for ozone, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ for federal standards. Given the intermittent and short-term nature of construction emissions, and as outlined and mitigated in section b) above, the impacts would be less than significant. As the proposed project reflects the consolidation and ultimate elimination of two separate grocery stores and the net increase in square footage and traffic related to the new site is not expected to exceed the combined impact of the existing two sites, the Project would also not generate substantial amounts of new criteria pollutant emissions. Therefore, a cumulatively considerable air quality impact would not occur.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Avalon General Plan identifies the following facilities as sensitive receptors: Catalina Island Medical Center, 100 Falls

Canyon Road, Avalon and the Avalon Schools (K-12), 200 Falls Canyon Road, Avalon. These facilities are located approximately 3,000 feet south of the proposed Project

Construction Phase: Project construction for the grocery store requires soil disturbance involving grading and excavation. Construction of the proposed Project could generate short-term emissions. However, given the limited extent and intensity of construction activities, the significant distance between the proposed Project site and the sensitive receptors, and the proposed mitigation measures for fugitive dust, it would not generate substantial amounts of air pollutants impacting sensitive receptors. Therefore, short-term impacts from the project's construction would be less than significant with mitigation measure MM-AIR 1 incorporated.

Operation Phase: Project operations for the grocery store are not expected to deviate substantially from existing operations at the two existing sites. Therefore, operation of the new grocery store is not expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations above the current levels resulting from the two grocery store sites, especially considering the substantial distance to the identified sensitive receptors.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed use is a grocery store and, as such, no objectionable odors are generated by the operation. Refuse will be stored in a fully-enclosed trash area which will be serviced by the City's solid waste operator. The fully enclosed nature of the trash area and its periodic emptying will prevent significant odor impacts from affecting substantial numbers of people. Furthermore, the grocery store will replace two existing same use facilities that are antique by design offering no such enclosed trash area. This would represent an improvement over current conditions.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is proposed in an existing urbanized area zoned for commercial development with its current use as dirt parking lot and small nursery building. Due to the project site's urban and disturbed nature, the presence of sensitive plant and animal species is extremely low. Therefore the Project will not have any adverse effect on endangered, threatened, sensitive, or special status species.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is proposed in an existing urbanized area zoned for commercial development with its current use as dirt parking lot and small

nursery building. There are no wetlands or riparian habitat areas present on the site. Therefore the Project will not have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

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?

No Impact. The Project site is proposed in an existing urbanized area zoned for commercial development with its current use as dirt parking lot and small building. therefore no wetlands will be affected. No wetland habitat exists on the site.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is proposed in an existing urbanized area zoned for commercial development with its current use as dirt parking lot and small building. The current parking lot is not conducive to migratory wildlife or fish or any other species therefore, the Project will have not interfere with the movement of any native resident, migratory fish or wildlife species. This impact would be less than significant.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No Impact. The proposed Project is consistent with the City's General Plan, zoning code and is requesting no variances. The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances. The City of Avalon GP/LCP recognizes the 1982 Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance which considers oak trees as significant historical, aesthetic, and ecological resources. The Ordinance applies to all unincorporated areas of the County including areas of Catalina Island outside the City of Avalon city boundaries, including identified expansion areas. The Project site is located within the current City of Avalon city limits and no conflict with the County's Oak Tree Ordinance would occur. Also, the project would not affect a tree that would be subject to protections under the County's Ordinance, in any case.

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?

No Impact. The County of Los Angeles (County) has designated the upper Avalon Canyon beyond Memorial Arboretum as a Significant Ecological Area (SEA) as it has important habitat containing valuable water and/or habitat integral to the conservation of rare, threatened or endangered species. SEAs are often designated as valuable wildlife corridors as they provide sufficient forage, water and shelter for animal movement

between regional habitat blocks. SEAs are designated to call attention to valuable biological resources that retain undisturbed examples of species indigenous to the County. The SEA designation does not preclude development but is meant to direct development in a responsible trajectory so as not to jeopardize the biotic diversity within the County. The County has designated 37 SEAs on Santa Catalina Island all of which are named for significant island vegetation. The Project site does not contain a SEA as mapped in the GP/LCP, therefore no impact to an SEA would occur as a result of Project implementation. Furthermore, the City of Avalon is not located within any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan areas.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is proposed in an existing urbanized area zoned for commercial development with its current use as dirt parking lot and small building. A Cultural Resources Assessment Report prepared by Pacific West Archaeology, Inc. (dated Sept 2014 and as amended Oct 2014) was prepared in accordance to the Cultural Resources Management Plan as required by the City of Avalon. The report provides recommendations and instructions which will be adhered to for further exploration of the site during construction of the proposed site in the likelihood of encountering historic era resources. The existing building, which formerly was used as a showering area for Avalon's previous "Tent City," was assessed in the Report and determined to not be eligible for inclusion on the California Register of Historic Resources, and hence its removal as part of the project is not deemed to be a significant impact to a significant historical resources. Thus, this impact is determined to be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. The above-referenced *Cultural Resources Assessment* indicates that a mitigation measure should be implemented to ensure that impacts relating to the uncovering of archaeological resources during project construction be mitigated to a less than significant level. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, this impact is concluded to be less than significant.

> **MM-CULTURAL 1 Archaeological Discovery.** The following practices shall be followed during all phases of site preparation and construction activities: To prevent an adverse change of an archaeological resource, , the applicant will engage a qualified professional Archaeologist or an alternate acceptable to the Native American Heritage Commission as a Monitor. The Monitor shall coordinate with the contractor and conduct a pre-job meeting prior to the start of ground disturbing activities. The approved Monitor shall provide a Monitoring Plan based on proposed construction methodology for the project prior to the City Issuing a Grading Permit. If previously unknown archeological resources are encountered

during excavation or construction, construction personnel shall be instructed to immediately suspend all activity in the immediate area of the suspected resource and the City of Avalon shall be notified. A qualified professional archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's standard of qualifications shall be retained to evaluate the finding. Depending upon the significance of the find as determined by the archaeologist, the archaeologist may decide to record the find and allow work to continue. If the discovery proves significant under CEQA, additional work such as preparation of an archaeological treatment plan, testing, or data recovery shall be implementation.

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

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation. No known paleontological resources or unique geologic features are present within the Project area. Should paleontological resources be discovered during excavation or construction, implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

MM-CULTURAL 2 Paleontological Discovery. The following practices shall be followed during all phases of site preparation and construction activities: Should previously undefined fossil bearing formations be uncovered during site preparation, grading, or excavation, construction personnel shall be instructed to immediately suspend all activity in the immediate area of the suspected resource and the City of Avalon notified. A qualified professional paleontologist shall be retained to assess the find. Depending upon the significance of the find as determined by the paleontologist, the archaeologist may decide to record the find and allow work to continue. If the discovery proves significant under CEQA, salvage and recovery of the resource shall be performed.

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

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation. The Project will be constructed in an existing developed and graded area that has been previously disturbed. No human remains are known to exist on the Project site. Should human remains be discovered during excavations or construction, the implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

MM-CULTURAL 3 Burial Discovery.
If human remains are encountered during excavation activities, all work shall halt and the County Coroner shall be notified (California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98). The Coroner shall determine where the remains are of forensic interest. If the Coroner, with the aid of the City-approved Archaeologist, determines that the remains are prehistoric, s/he shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC shall be responsible for designating the most

likely descendent (MLD), who shall be responsible for ultimate disposition of the remains, as required by Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. The MLD shall make his/her recommendation within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The MLD's recommendation shall be followed if feasible, and may include scientific removal and non-destructive analysis of the human remains and any items associated with Native American burials (California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5). If the landowner rejects the MLD's recommendations, the landowner shall rebury the remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location that will not be subject to further disturbance (California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98).

Upon implementation of the above mitigation measures, the Project would not result in any residual significant adverse effect on the environment related to cultural resources.

VI. GEOLOGY & 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 Divisions of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?

Less Than Significant Impact. Although the project site, like much of California, is located in a seismically active area, the site is not located on or adjacent to an Alquist-Priolo Act Earthquake Fault Zone. No known major active or potentially active faults are mapped on Catalina Island. Further, the project would be designed to meet state mandated standards, including the California Building Code, which accounts for seismic safety. On the basis of this available information, the hazard from ground rupture is considered to be a less than significant impact.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact. As stated above, like most of California, the project site, is located in a seismically active area. Although no active faults have been mapped within the City of Avalon; the City is prone to ground shaking associated with occasional earthquakes. As recognized in the City's General Plan and General Plan EIR, the California Geological Survey documents three active faults and three potentially active faults within 25 miles of the City (California Geological Survey, 1999) that could create severe ground shaking in Avalon, namely the Palos Verdes Fault, the San Diego Trough Fault zone, the San Pedro Basin Fault, the Newport-Inglewood Fault, the San Clemente Fault, and the San Andreas Fault. These seismic hazards can affect the structural integrity of buildings and utilities, and, in turn, cause property damage and potential loss of life in the event of a major earthquake due to ground motion. Although no significant damage has occurred to the Project site and its

facilities as a result of previous earthquakes, the site is likely to be subject to strong seismic ground shaking during the life of the Project. Pursuant to Avalon General Code section 8-1.01, the Project would be constructed according to California Building Code seismic standards, which would reduce the risk of structural damage and hazards. Therefore, potential risks would be less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less Than Significant Impact. The term liquefaction describes a phenomenon in which soil loses cohesive strength and acquires a degree of mobility as a result of strong ground shaking during an earthquake. Liquefaction hazards are not expected in the City because groundwater is limited and the water table is low (Santa Catalina Island LCP, 1983). Because the project will be constructed in accordance with California Building Code seismic standards, liquefaction risks are considered less than significant.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. The project site is not located within an Earthquake-Induced Landslide Area as designated by the California Geological Survey. The Project site does not abut a hill and is not susceptible to landslides so no impact would occur. Seismic-related landslides are closely related to liquefaction and can occur when a subsurface layer liquefies and gravitational and inertial forces cause the layer, and the overlying non-liquefied material, to move in a downslope direction. As the water table in Avalon is low, the potential for seismic-related landslides is considered low. In addition, the Project will be constructed in accordance with California Building Code seismic standards

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of erosion control measures required by the AMC Title 6, Chapter 13 Water Quality Control, Section 6-13.106 Control of Runoff Required – Cosntruction Projects and adherence to all requirements set forth in the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit required for construction would reduce any impacts from construction operations to less than significant levels. All exposed soil areas will be revegetated as part of the Project's construction-phase landscape design. No exposed soils are proposed during the Project's operation phase.

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 – or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

No Impact. Per the US Department of Agriculture's National Resources Conservation Service maps, the site is characterized as Urban Land-Xerothents and, as such, is not located on unstable or expansive soils therefore there project site will not result in offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction and / or collapse. The

Project site is located outside of the City's two known landslide areas, namely the road along Pebbly Beach and slide area in the vicinity of Vieudelou Avenue, Hill Street, Olive Street, and Maiden Lane.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. As described above, the subject site is not located on expansive soil therefore the project will not result in creating substantial risks to life or property.

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?

No Impact. No septic system or alternative waste water disposal system is planned in connection with the project therefore no impact.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

a) Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would result in a new grocery store building being constructed to consolidate two smaller, separate grocery stores in Avalon. Greenhouse gas emissions stemming either directly or indirectly from the new grocery store can be expected to be offset by the emissions from the two grocery stores that will no longer operate. Further, the new building will be constructed according to the latest energy efficiency standards, and thus would likely require less electricity and heating/cooling than the existing buildings and result in fewer emissions. Given these facts, any impacts from the generation of greenhouse gas emissions are deemed to be less than significant.

b) Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less Than Significant Impact. Currently, the City of Avalon does not have a published climate action plan; therefore, the Project should be evaluated against the goals of the California Resource Control Board (CARB) Scoping Plan.

The ARB Board approved a Climate Change Scoping Plan in December 2008. The Scoping Plan outlines the State's strategy to achieve the 2020 greenhouse gas emissions limit. The Scoping Plan "proposes a comprehensive set of actions designed to reduce overall greenhouse gas emissions in California, improve our environment, reduce our dependence on oil, diversify our energy sources, save energy, create new jobs, and enhance public health" (California Air Resources Board 2008). The measures in the Scoping Plan have been in place since 2012.

In May 2014, CARB released its First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan (CARB 2014). This Update identifies the next steps for California's leadership on climate change. While California continues on its path to meet the near-term 2020 greenhouse gas limit, it must also set a clear path toward long-term, deep GHG emission reductions. This report highlights California's success to date in reducing its GHG emissions and lays the foundation for establishing a broad framework for continued emission reductions beyond 2020, on the path to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.

The 2008 Scoping Plan calls for an "ambitious but achievable" reduction in California's greenhouse gas emissions, cutting approximately 30 percent from business-as-usual emission levels projected for 2020, or about 15 percent from today's (2010) levels. On a per-capita basis, that means reducing annual emissions of 14 tons of carbon dioxide for every man, woman and child in California down to about 10 tons per person by 2020.

The Project reflects the consolidation of two existing stores into one single store. Per the Traffic Study performed for this proposed Project, the Project is not expected to generate any new traffic trips above the number of trips that are currently generated for the existing two stores. Therefore, the Project's GHG emissions are expected to be at or below the current two-store condition. Thus, the Project would not interfere with or conflict with the goals and applicable strategies of the CARB Scoping Plan – and the City's General Plan - and would result in a less than significant impact.

VIII. HAZARDS & 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. A hazardous materials survey has been performed and any materials identified as requiring removal by a certified hazardous materials contractor, will be removed and documented per existing regulations. Construction of the new buildings may require the use of potentially hazardous materials, including oils, paint, adhesives, surface coatings, and other finishing materials. Operation of the Project would involve the use of limited quantities of potentially hazardous materials such as cleaning solvent for custodial maintenance of the buildings and pesticides for landscaping. However, all potentially hazardous materials would be used, stored, and disposed of in accordance with manufacturers' specifications as well as applicable federal, state, and local health and safety regulations. As such, impacts related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant

b) Would the project 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed project may involve the use of hazardous materials, such as fuels, oils, mechanical fluids, or other chemicals. However, transportation, storage, use, and disposal of these materials during construction activities would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations. Compliance would ensure that human health and the environment are not exposed to hazardous materials and this impact would be less than significant..

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 is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school nor will it introduce the emission or handling of hazardous materials.

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?

No Impact. The Project is not located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

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 project is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

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. As described above, the proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project will not change or impede any current or planned traffic routes and therefore will not impair the implementation of or interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. This impact would be less than significant.

h) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?

Less Than Significant Impact. The entire Santa Catalina Island, including Avalon, is designated as a very high fire hazard zone by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. However, as the project is located in a developed, urbanized area and will be constructed in a manner that will meet all relevant fire codes, it will not expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild fires.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project will not alter existing water quality standards. To ensure that no water quality standards are violated, during construction, the contractor will implement standard measures, pursuant to a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan prepared under the NPDES stormwater permit administered by the local RWQCB for construction activities, to further minimize the Project's less than significant impacts, including but not limited to regular sweeping of active construction areas to reduce sediment tracking off the Project site, covering dumpsters or keeping uncovered dumpsters under a roof (or secured with tarps or plastic sheeting), and conducting vehicle/equipment maintenance, repair, and washing away from storm drains. Implementation of such required Best Management Practices will ensure that impacts are less than significant.

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 lever (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 project site is not located in an area of significant groundwater recharge, and thus would not interfere with the replenishment of the local aquifer. The Project has received a water allocation from Southern California Edison in the amount of 0.28 acre-feet which will fully cover the Project's proposed water usage. Impacts would be less than significant.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The existing site comprises an urban infill location surrounded by paved surfaces and some pervious areas within the Golf Gardens complex. The Project comprises the construction of approximately 27,500 square feet of impervious area on an existing site with approximately 2,200 square feet of impervious area. The existing pervious area on the site is compacted dirt parking and does not provide much opportunity for storm water to percolate within the site. Therefore, the development of additional paved and building surfaces on this site will not result in substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern or substantial amounts of additional runoff flowing from the site. The project will comply with City Floodplain Management,

Section 6-9.403, Development Permit and Section 6-9.501 Standards of Construction. This impact would be less than significant.

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 of amount of surface runoff in a manner which result in flooding on or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact. As described above the site comprises improvements to only a partially improved gravel lot without any designed drainage pattern. The proposed project will manage the drainage pattern by design, where no such management currently exists, and do so in a manner that avoids environmental impacts. The project will comply with City Floodplain Management, Section 6-9.403, Development Permit and Section 6-9.501 Standards of Construction. Therefore, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site resulting in flooding, and this impact is concluded to be less than significant.

e) Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project does not expect to introduce any additional water runoff into existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide additional sources of polluted runoff. As detailed above, the site does not allow significant amounts of percolation so runoff from the site is not expected to increase substantially post-project as compared to existing conditions. Furthermore, in the post-project condition runoff will be managed in a more designed fashion, thereby actually improving impacts from onsite runoff. This impact would be less than significant.

f) Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project will not substantially degrade water quality as Best Management Practices required under local ordinance and the local RWQCB's MS4 permit would ensure that runoff from the site does not contain impermissibly heightened levels of pollutants. Furthermore, as described above, the amount of runoff from the site is not expected to change, post-project. Thus, this impact would be less than significant.

g) Would the project 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?

No Impact. The developed area of the project site is within a mapped 100-year floodplain but does not include the construction of housing. The project will comply with City Floodplain Management, Section 6-9.403, Development Permit and Section 6-9.501 Standards of Construction Thus, no impact would occur in this regard.

h) Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project area is designated on Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) #06037C2204F (effective date 9/26/08) as within an AE zone, defined as being a Special Flood Hazard Area subject to being inundated by the 1% chance annual flood (100-year flood plain). On the referenced FIRM, the flood elevation at the proposed site is approximately 21-22' MSL. According to a recent project survey, the current project site is at Elevation 18-19' MSL. The Project development plan will involve raising the building pad such that the building is above the flood plain elevation, thereby protecting the grocery store from 100-year flood flows. As described above, the amount of runoff exiting the site will not vary significantly from the pre-project condition, and thus there should not be any impacts related to increased runoff as well. The project will comply with City Floodplain Management, Section 6-9.403, Development Permit and Section 6-9.501 Standards of Construction. This impact is therefore less than significant.

i) 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. The project will not expose people or structures to flooding-related risk of loss, injury or death as the site will be elevated above the 100-year flood level and will comply with City Floodplain Management, Section 6-9.403, Development Permit and Section 6-9.501 Standards of Construction. There is also no dam or levee nearby.

j) Would the project be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project is located on the leeward side of Catalina Island and is over a mile inland from the Ocean. As such, the exposure of the project facilities to high risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow is minimal.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The project comprises improvements to a partially developed gravel lot in a commercial zone to facilitate an established community. The proposed building height is within the development code standards for this zone and the design is respectful of the surrounding community. Therefore, the project will not physically divide an established community, nor will it conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

b) Would the project 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?

No Impact. The uses proposed by the project are consistent with the goals and policies of the certified City of Avalon Local Coastal Plan (LCP). The project site is in the Commercial (C) zone, the purpose of which is to "provide areas for the development of certain ... services and related uses, namely such uses as can conveniently serve the public." (Avalon Municipal Code, § 9.6-201.) The proposed use is consistent with the principal uses as described in the Avalon LCP (Avalon Municipal Code, § 9.6-202.). Further, the project is consistent with the development standards described in the Avalon Municipal Code. The height of proposed structures is within the maximum building height, (Avalon Municipal Code, § 9.6-204).

c) Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impact. The Project comprises improvements to a partially developed gravel lot in a commercial zone to facilitate an established community. Therefore, the Project will not physically divide an established community, nor will it conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

a) Would the project 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?

No Impact. The Project is not located on or near an area of known mineral resources and will not interfere with development or production of a mineral resource, nor does it involve consumption of locally or regionally important mineral resources such as aggregate, shale, etc.

b) Would the project 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?

No Impact. The Project also will not inhibit the future use or loss of availability of any mineral resource as it does not impact any recovery site on any plan.

XII. NOISE

a) Would the project result in 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?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation. A Noise Survey Report was prepared by ARUP (dated July 2014) for the proposed project to analyze the potential impact on the surrounding properties. The study includes the existing noise patterns at and around the proposed site as well as the two existing Vons store sites due to the building systems operations, delivery trucks and potential traffic increase. Noise levels due to traffic, including deliveries, would not be substantially greater than existing noise levels since,

as per the project traffic report, the number of trips generated by the new store is not expected to exceed those generated by the two existing stores it would replace, and those two existing stores are located close enough to the new store site such that the amount of trips on nearby roads would not double (which is the amount of increase in traffic required before a noticeable increase in noise (i.e., a 3 dB increase) would occur). With regard to noise from building systems, it should be noted that there are no specific guidelines for exterior noise limits from new developments in the City of Avalon Municipal Code, therefore, LA County Code levels for noise from building systems were utilized for this report. As per the Noise Survey Report, the implementation of mitigation measures controlling the design of the project would ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

MM-NOISE 1 Operation-phase Noise. The following practices shall be implemented during the Operation phase of the Project:

MM-Noise 1.1. The proposed Project's mechanical system will incorporate noise mitigation measures to meet the County Noise Ordinance standards, as stated within the Noise Survey Report (i.e., 60 dBLaeq from 7am to 10pm, and 55 dBLaeq from 10pm to 7am). Potential noise mitigation measures include: (1) selection of quiet mechanical equipment with no tonal character. (2) Solid parapet wall construction at the perimeter of the building to a minimum height which blocks line of sight to roof mounted mechanical equipment from nearby residential properties and to contain any mechanical noise within the space. (3) Sound attenuators and/or acoustic louvers at air passage openings to mechanical spaces. This will provide attenuation of noise from either AHU or refrigeration equipment.

MM-Noise 1.2. The Project's loading dock/delivery area design will incorporate noise mitigation measures (as stated in the Noise Survey Report) to minimize the generation of onsite noise. Mitigation measures include: (1) provisions of an enclosed loading area with openings to allow for the truck to back up into the building. (2) Acoustic treatment (mineral fiber panels or equivalent min 2" thickness) shall be provided to reduce potential noise reflection and build up.

b) Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

No Impact. The project would not result in excessive ground borne vibrations. No pile driving or other intensive construction techniques would be used during construction, and grocery operations do not involve any activities that create detectable vibrations.

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

Less Than Significant With Mitigation. See discussion of noise impacts under section a), above. With the implementation of the mitigation measures contained therein, this impact would be less than significant.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Project construction will involve noise emissions associated with the use of construction equipment. The City's General Plan EIR Noise Element Table 4.10-4 identifies typical construction equipment noise emissions as ranging from 76 dBA to 89 dBA when measured 50 feet from the source. Temporary construction noise emissions may cause temporary disturbance at neighboring properties. Therefore, the City's Municipal Code prohibits construction activities between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m., and no construction is permitted on Sundays, with the exception of emergency construction work. In addition to compliance with the Municipal Code, implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce potential construction-phase noise impacts to a less than significant level.

MM-NOISE 2 Construction-phase Noise. The following practices shall be followed during all phases of site preparation and construction activities:

MM-Noise 2.1. Construction activities shall be prohibited between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m., and no construction is permitted on Sundays, with the exception of emergency construction work.

MM-Noise 2.2. All construction equipment with internal combustion engines used on the Project site shall be properly muffled and maintained in good working condition.

MM-Noise 2.3. Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines shall be strictly prohibited.

MM-Noise 2.4. All stationary noise generating construction equipment, such as air compressors and portable power generators, shall be located as far as possible from noise-sensitive receptors, such as schools and existing residences.

MM-Noise 2.5. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project site shall be posted with the name and contact number of the lead contractor in a location visible from Avalon Canyon Road so that the contractor can be made aware of noise complaints.

MM-Noise 2.6. Construction equipment, vehicles, and workers associated with the development of the Project shall not be permitted to park on residential streets.

MM-Noise 2.7. A Construction Staging Plan shall be submitted with a schedule that includes material storage locations and parking.

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. The project is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport, or within the vicinity of a private airport.

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 Project is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport, or within the vicinity of a private airport.

XIII. POPULATION & HOUSING

a) Would the project 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)?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The Project proposal is a replacement/consolidation of two existing grocery stores. Construction activities for the Project will not involve population changes or housing impacts. The construction work force will be temporary, and is expected to come partially from the existing labor pool in the local area. Much of the construction period will be during the off-season so any off-Island labor will be housed in existing rental facilities. The proposed project does not propose any construction of new housing and will not induce substantial population growth in Avalon as it is a replacement of an existing service. However, the two existing sites will be vacated and presumably reoccupied with other commercial uses. Those commercial uses, as well as the Vons project itself, are "new development" subject to the provisions of the City's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, under which rental housing, or suitable alternative mechanisms, such as land dedication or in lieu fees, sufficient to meet the needs of one half of the peak season employees must be provided. With the application of the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance to the present proposed project and any future new uses at the vacated sites, a less than significant impact with mitigation would occur.

MM-Population/Housing 1

MM P/H 1.1: Applicant will provide an Inclusionary Housing Plan as required by Avalon Municipal Code for approval by the City, which will address the housing needs of one half the number of additional peak season employees expected at the new Vons store. The City shall apply the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance to any new uses of the two vacated sites, as well, in order to ensure comprehensive coverage of all housing impacts.

b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. The Project comprises improvements to a vacant lot and with a small manufactured commercial building. No homes or businesses will be displaced as a result of this project, and no construction of replacement housing will be necessary. No impact will occur.

c) Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. The Project comprises improvements to a vacant lot and with a small manufactured commercial building. No people are expected to be displaced as a result of this project, and no construction of replacement housing will be necessary. No impact will occur.

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 for:

i) Fire Protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. Fire and emergency services are provided by the Avalon Fire Department, which is well-equipped and trained for responding to and dealing with fires, paramedic rescues, and certain types of hazardous materials incidents. Best Practices will be implemented during construction to avoid any conditions that could induce fire or other emergency conditions. During the building permit process, the Project improvement plans will be reviewed by Avalon Fire Department personnel and any conditions of development imposed by same will be adhered to during construction and operation of the Project. This impact would therefore be less than significant.

ii) Police Protection?

No Impact. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department provides full law enforcement services for the existing facility through the Avalon Sheriff's Station. Since the Project is within the existing City of Avalon boundary and the use is already in service, there are no additional requirements for police protection. No impact will occur.

iii) Schools?

No Impact. Because the Project will not involve growth in population and will not substantially increase employment beyond the current employment level at the two existing grocery stores to be replaced, it will not place any incremental demands on local schools.

iv) Parks?

No Impact. Because the Project will not involve growth in population and will not substantially increase employment beyond the current employment level at the two existing grocery stores to be replaced, it will not place any incremental demands on local parks.

v) Other public facilities?

No Impact. Because the Project will not involve growth in population and will not substantially increase employment beyond the current employment level at the two existing grocery stores to be replaced, it will not place any incremental demands on other public facilities.

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?

No Impact. The Project does not include any parks or recreation facilities or influence any incremental increase in the use of existing recreational facilities.

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?

No Impact. The Project does not include recreational facilities and will not require construction or expansion of them.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC

a) Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account of 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. A Traffic Impact Report prepared by Fehr & Peers (dated August 2014) was prepared for the proposed subject site to analyze the potential for traffic impacts. The study includes the existing traffic patterns at and around the proposed site as well as the two existing Vons store sites with consultation from the City of Avalon Staff, Vons customers and current store employees. As shown in Table 5 of the Traffic Study, using County of Los Angeles criteria for determination of significant impacts, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts to the circulation system. The Study indicates that the primary project intersections at Beacon and Sumner (at the proposed project entry) and at the intersection of Sumner and the northern continuation of Beacon Street both operate at a good level of service (LOS A) in both the Existing (2014)

and Opening Year (2015) Without Project scenarios. These intersections continue to operate at a good level of service with the addition of project traffic (LOS B).

Project design features that will improve the safety and circulation of traffic at the proposed project site include relocation of a stop sign from the existing position on Sumner just above the northern continuation of Beacon Street to a position on Sumner just north of the Project entry. This creates a fully controlled intersection at the Project entry, leaving a stop-controlled Beacon Street at Sumner just north of the Project Entry. A crosswalk is also proposed across Sumner just south of the Project entry. All impacts will be less than significant.

b) Would the project 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. Notwithstanding the fact that there are no designated CMP facilities within the City, the Traffic Study referenced above indicates that the primary project intersections at Beacon and Sumner (at the proposed Project entry) and at the intersection of Sumner and the northern continuation of Beacon Street both operate at a good level of service (LOS A) in both the Existing (2014) and Opening Year (2015) Without Project scenarios. These intersections continue to operate at a good level of service with the addition of project traffic (LOS B). As shown in Table 5 of the Traffic Study, using County of Los Angeles criteria for determination of significant impacts, the proposed Project would not result in any significant impacts to the circulation system.

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. The Project is not within the vicinity of a public or private airport and will not alter existing air traffic patterns or affect air safety.

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. Proposed Project features that will improve the safety and circulation of traffic at the proposed project site include relocation of a stop sign from the existing position on Sumner just above the northern continuation of Beacon Street to a position on Sumner just north of the Project entry. This creates a fully controlled intersection at the Project entry, leaving a stop-controlled Beacon Street at Sumner just north of the Project Entry. A crosswalk is also proposed across Sumner just south of the Project entry. There are no design features to the project that will increase hazards.

e) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

No Impact. The project will not result in inadequate emergency access as it does not involve the change of any existing access routes and will be constructed to code that addresses such matters. Therefore, there is no impact.

f) Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

No Impact. The Project will not involve and therefore not conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs with respect to public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. The sidewalks along Catalina and Beacon streets will remain in their existing conditions, and transit routes will not be changed. No impact will result.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

No Impact. The Project reflects a consolidation of two separate grocery store sites into a single building. As such, the amount of water consumption – and therefore wastewater consumption – is projected to be less than the current two-store condition. Therefore, the Project is not expected to create any impact on wastewater treatment requirements of the Los Angeles County Regional Water Quality Control Board.

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?

No Impact. The Project reflects a consolidation of two separate grocery store sites into a single building. As such, the amount of water consumption – and therefore wastewater consumption – is projected to be less than the current two-store condition. Therefore, the Project will not result in the need to construct new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities.

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?

Less than Significant Impact. The existing site comprises an urban infill location surrounded by paved surfaces and some pervious areas within the Golf Gardens complex. The Project comprises the construction of approximately 27,500 square feet of impervious area on an existing site with approximately 2,200 square feet of impervious area. The existing pervious area on the site is compacted dirt parking and does not provide much opportunity for storm water to percolate within the site. Therefore, the development of additional paved and building surfaces on this site will not result in significant additional offsite storm water management requirements and therefore will not result in the construction of new or expansion of existing storm water drainage facilities.

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

No Impact. The project will utilize a pre-existing water allocation of 0.28 acre-feet from the water purveyor, Southern California Edison. Therefore, sufficient water supplies have already been allocated to the proposed Project and no new or expanded entitlements are required for development of the Project.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Facilities and Services Holding Capacity Report indicates that there is sufficient capacity for the project. Therefore, the Project will not result in the need to construct new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities.

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

No Impact. with the Facilities and Services Holding Capacity Report indicates that there is sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

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

No Impact. The project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, such as those that require or encourage recycling, or that require special treatment of hazardous waste.

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, substantially 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?

No Impact. As previously mentioned above, there is no threat to sensitive biological species or habitat as the result of the proposed project. Because the project is an offsite redevelopment of an existing use upgrading facilities and equipment to current environmental practices and standards and is being developed on a commercially zoned vacant gravel lot, the project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, does not threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, impact a rare or endangered plant or

animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b) Does the project have 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)?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project consists of the construction of a new facility to facilitate the relocation of an existing community service on a commercially zoned vacant gravel lot and no adjacent or associated development exists or is proposed. The Project is not dependent on any future project(s) for the provision of infrastructure or supporting facilities and the Project does not propose infrastructure which incrementally would contribute to the effect of past, current or future projects. Furthermore, the amount of growth on the island occurring in the reasonably foreseeable future that has any connection in nature or kind with the present project is small, and hence there is no likelihood that this project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact.

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

No Impact. The project will continue to provide and enhance visitor- and resident-serving commercial services in downtown Avalon. The development of this grocery store will not result in environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly.

References

1. Traffic Study for the Avalon Vons Store Relocation Project (Fehr & Peers, August 2014).

2. Vons Catalina Island Noise Survey Report (ARUP, August 2, 2014).

3. A Cultural Resources Assessment Report (Pacific West Archaeology, Inc., Sept. & Oct 2014).

4. Facilities and Services Holding Capacity Report (Pacific Municipal Consultsnts, October 2006)